



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Commission Direction
CD-001419
PL-501681-WD-26

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 15 October 2026.

The Commission decided to refuse permission, generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, for the following reasons and considerations.

Planning Commissioner:

Mary Gurrie

Mary Gurrie

Date: 16/10/2026

DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER

Reasons and Considerations

1. Policy Objective ECON 24 (Tourism Accommodation) of the Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-2028 seeks to support a variety of accommodation types, including glamping, and outlines that such accommodation should generally be located within towns and villages unless otherwise justified

to the satisfaction of the planning authority. Policy Objective ECON 25 (Camping/ Caravan Sites) outlines that camping sites which support rural tourism initiatives developed upon rural enterprise, natural heritage assets and outdoor recreational activities may be facilitated at a rural location subject to the capacity of the site and location. On the basis of the information submitted with the application and appeal, it is considered that the applicants have not demonstrated suitable justification for the siting of the proposed development on a rural site removed from the nearest settlement of Cheekpoint and remote from services, including retail and social facilities. It is acknowledged that the subject site is located in proximity to a designated recreational walking route under the development plan, however, it is noted that this route also serves the settlement of Cheekpoint and rural node of Faithlegg. It is considered that there are no other sustainable connections to any natural heritage assets or outdoor recreational activities notwithstanding the proximity of the site to the shoreline of the River Suir. The proposed development is, therefore, considered contrary to policy objectives ECON 24 and ECON 25 of the development plan. Furthermore, the proposed development as set out would contribute to the encroachment of random rural development in the area, would militate against the preservation of the rural environment and would set an undesirable precedent for other similar inappropriate development in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Having regard to the location of the proposed development on an elevated site overlooking the River Suir in an area designated 'high sensitive' in the Scenic Classification in the Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment of the Waterford City & County Development Plan 2022-2028 it is considered that the

proposed development would detract from the visual amenity of the area and would be contrary to Landscape Policy Objective L 02 of the Waterford City & County Development Plan 2022 2028 which seeks to “protect the landscape and natural assets of the County by ensuring that proposed developments do not detrimentally impact on the character, integrity, distinctiveness or scenic value of their area and ensuring that such proposals are not unduly visually obtrusive in the landscape, in particular, in or adjacent to the uplands, along river corridors, coastal or other distinctive landscape character units.” The proposed development would be contrary to the policies and objectives of the Waterford City & County Development Plan 2022-2028, would set an undesirable precedent for similar type developments and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Notes:

1. The Commission noted the inspector’s assessment of the visual and landscape impacts of the proposed development. However, having regard to the ‘high sensitive’ location and the presumption against development on elevated and exposed sites in Landscape Policy Objective L03, the planning history of sites in the area, and the undesirable precedent for other similar type developments, the Commission disagreed with the opinion of the inspector and concurred with the planning authority’s second reason for refusal.
2. The Commission noted and agreed with the inspector’s second recommended reason for refusal in relation to the deficiency in sightlines, the extent of hedgerow removal required to achieve sightlines and the requirement for works outside the red line boundary. While ordinarily this would warrant further consideration and a request for further information, in this instance given the substantive reasons

for refusal above, it was decided not to pursue these matters under the current appeal.

3. The Commission noted the inspector's opinion that the proposed wastewater treatment plant and associated percolation area may be undersized having regard to the nature of the proposed development, and that an impact on water quality could not be ruled out. Furthermore, the Commission agreed with the inspector's assessment in relation to there being insufficient information to carry out screening for Appropriate Assessment. While ordinarily this would warrant further consideration and a request for further information, in this instance given the substantive reasons for refusal above, it was decided not to pursue these matters under the current appeal.

4. The Commission noted that the location of the proposed borehole to supply water to the glamping units, which would constitute a small private water supply, is situated approximately 44m from the proposed percolation area and as such would not comply with the separation distance of 60m as required by the EPA Code of Practice for Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10) for distance between a public/group water supply well and the components of the wastewater treatment system. While ordinarily this would warrant further consideration and a request for further information, in this instance given the substantive reasons for refusal above, it was decided not to pursue these matters under the current appeal.