



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-318138-23

Development	Two Storey extension to existing retail warehouse (Home Store + More) to provide a ground floor retail unit and first floor office unit
Location	Clonard Retail Park, Killeens, Wexford Town, Wexford
Planning Authority	Wexford County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	20221693
Applicant(s)	Samia Ltd.
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission with Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Joyces Wexford Ltd.
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	7 th August 2024
Inspector	Matthew McRedmond

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description.....	3
2.0 Proposed Development.....	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.3. Planning Authority Reports.....	4
3.4. Prescribed Bodies.....	6
3.5. Third Party Observations.....	6
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
5.3. County Development Plan.....	8
5.4. Natural Heritage Designations	10
5.5. EIA Screening	10
6.0 The Appeal.....	11
6.1. Grounds of Appeal.....	11
6.2. Applicant Response.....	11
6.3. Planning Authority Response	12
6.4. Observations.....	12
7.0 Assessment.....	12
8.0 AA Screening	18
9.0 Recommendation.....	18
10.0 Reasons and Considerations	18
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is approximately 2.4km south west of Wexford town centre and to the east of the N25 within the Clonard Retail Park, which is adjoined by Wexford Retail Park to the west. There is a range of retail units within both retail parks.
- 1.2. The subject site is located at Clonard Retail Park, Kileens, Wexford Town and adjoins the south elevation of the existing Home Store + More retail unit (stated Gross Floor Area of 2,322m²) at this location. The appeal site is 0.97 hectares and currently consists of an existing footpath, hardstanding area/car parking/access road and landscaping strips.
- 1.3. The appeal site is accessed from the wider road network via White Mill Road from the south and Clonard Road and Clonard Retail Park Road to the north. There are 3no. detached residential units located to the southwest separated by mature landscape screening. There is a bus stop located on the north side of White Mill Road, 120m to the east of the subject site, which serves the town centre.
- 1.4. There are a number of access points to the appeal site from Clonard Retail Park Road to the north and east, which are associated with the existing retail warehouse unit at this location. Existing delineation of car parking spaces provides a total of 105 car spaces and 3no. accessible parking spaces.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises a part one-storey and part two-storey stand alone unit to the side of the existing retail warehouse unit to include a retail unit at ground floor level (GFA 255m²) and office space at first floor level (GFA 135m²), re-alignment of the existing car park to increase car parking spaces from 105no. to 115no. spaces, bicycle parking (20no. stands), signage and all associated site works.
- 2.2. The proposed elevations include ground and first floor external glazing and proposed signage.
- 2.3. The applicant proposes a new connection to the existing water supply and public sewer.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.2. On the 6th September 2023, Wexford County Council granted planning permission subject to 11 no. conditions to Samia Ltd. for the proposed two storey building attached to the side of the existing retail warehouse to provide retail and office uses.

3.3. Planning Authority Reports

3.3.1. Planning Reports

The Local Authority Planner had regard to the locational context of the site, planning history including any pre-planning engagement, national and local policy and to the referral responses and submissions made. Their assessment included the following:

- They note the proposed extension is acceptable in principle at this location
- The proposed design, layout and materials were considered appropriate
- Drainage proposals were considered appropriate
- Further information was requested in relation to a number of items

Further Information request

- The applicant was requested to submit a confirmation of feasibility letter from Irish Water in relation to public water mains and sewer connection
- To submit a retail impact assessment
- Provide a response to issues raised in a third-party submission
- A biodiversity planting proposal plan to be provided
- Site layout plan showing rights of way to be provided
- Cycle stands to be shown on revised plans

Further Information Response

The applicant submitted a further information response which includes the following:

- Letter of confirmation of feasibility from Irish Water

- A Retail Impact Assessment for the proposed retail floorspace extension, which confirms the retail element would be for non-bulky comparison goods retail floor area
- A response to issues raised in the third-party submission on file
- A proposed landscaping drawing
- A revised site layout plan showing existing wayleaves in yellow
- Bicycle parking is illustrated on the revised site layout plan indicating 20no. bicycle stands. 4no. electrical vehicle charging spaces are identified, two of which are also identified as accessible car parking spaces.

Planner's Response

The Planner's response to the F.I. Request included the following:

- The Confirmation of Feasibility letter from Irish Water submitted by the applicant is considered acceptable
- The Retail Impact Assessment carried out by the applicant is considered to have addressed the further information request
- The revised site layout plan is considered to have addressed all existing and proposed car parking spaces and layouts
- The landscaping plan submitted is considered acceptable
- The revised site layout with wayleaves in yellow is considered to address the further information.
- The revised site layout showing cycle parking and EV charging points is considered acceptable.

3.3.2. Other Technical Reports

- Executive Roads Technician – Grant subject to conditions – consider a nature based attenuations SUDs approach to deal with surface water
- Water Services – Request further information/confirmation of feasibility from Irish Water, which was provided by the applicant at further information stage
- Access Officer – A Disability Access certificate is required for the proposed works including connecting pedestrian walkway to proposed development.

3.4. Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Eireann

Uisce Eireann advise that in response to the pre-connection enquiry, the proposed connections can be facilitated and are feasible without an upgrade relative to Wastewater Treatment and the Water Supply Network. However, they note the existing watermain and sewer network within the retail park are private and relevant permissions for connections and works shall be the responsibility of the applicant.

3.5. Third Party Observations

A submission was received from the adjoining landowner/occupier expressing concerns about procedural issues related to land ownership and property rights and additional information required to fully assess the impacts of the proposed development. As the observer party are the subsequent Third-Party Appellant, their concerns are noted and considered further in the context of the Grounds of Appeal and Assessment below.

4.0 Planning History

Ref. 20071186 – Granted permission for the existing retail warehouse development to Edward Lynch and Sean Carey. Condition 11 (b) of the grant of permission restricted the proposed use to bulky goods retail.

W20110303 – Permission granted to Declan and William Devereux on 31st May 2011 for the amalgamation of units 2, 3 and 4 into a single retail warehouse unit, internal alterations and minor changes to elevations.

20064162 – Permission was refused on 7th February 2007 to Ned Buggy for alterations to the internal layout of unit 2 of the existing retail warehouse unit. Permission was refused on the grounds that the proposal would represent comparison retail activity which did not fall within the definition of bulky goods retailing and the zoning provisions of the area at the time.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Policy

5.1.1. National Policy Framework (NPF) – Project Ireland 2040

National Policy Objectives 4, 5 and 6 of the NPF seeks to provide compact and sustainable growth and create more attractive places where people can live and work and places that can foster enterprise, innovation and employment growth. In planning for strategic employment growth, the NPF emphasizes it is important to identify locations where enterprise can access competitively priced development lands, utilities, density of workers, land-take and resource/infrastructure dependency, including town centres, business parks, industrial estates and significant single enterprises. NPO 11 identifies that in meeting urban development requirements there will be a presumption in favour of development that can encourage more people and generate more jobs and activity within existing cities, towns and villages, subject to development meeting appropriate planning standards and achieving targeted growth.

5.2. Retail Planning Guidelines

- 5.2.1. The Retail Planning Guidelines 2012 state that Retail impact assessment and transport impact assessments may be required for significant retail development which due to their scale and/or location may impact on the vitality and viability of city and town centres. The Guidelines go on to state Planning applications for retail development proposals must comply with the criteria on location, suitability of use, size and scale and accessibility set out in the retail guidelines and development plan/joint or multi-authority retail strategy to ensure that the site chosen is the most suitable and best available site for the type of retailing proposed. Where the location of a proposed retail development submitted on a planning application has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the planning authority that it complies with the policies and objectives of a development plan and/or relevant retail strategy to support city and town centre, additional supporting background studies such as a demonstration of compliance with the sequential approach, below, or additional retail impact studies are not required.
- 5.2.2. The guidelines state that planning applications should be assessed using the 'Sequential Test'. The overall preferred location for new retail development is within city and town centres. In addition, only in exceptional circumstances where it can be demonstrated that there are no sites or potential sites available either within the centre or on the edge of these centres should an out-of-centre site be considered.

5.2.3. Annex 1 definitions in the Guidelines, sets out the following:

Retail warehouse: a large single-level store specialising in the sale of bulky household goods such as carpets, furniture and electrical goods, and bulky DIY items, catering mainly for car-borne customers and often in out-of-town centre locations.

Bulky goods: goods generally sold from retail warehouses --where DIY goods or goods such as flat pack furniture are of such size that they would normally be taken away by car and not be portable by customers travelling by foot, cycle or bus, or that large floor space would be required to display them.

Section 4.11.2 of the Guidelines states that in order to minimise adverse impacts on central areas, it is important that the range of goods sold in both existing and any future retail parks is tightly controlled and limited to truly bulky household goods or goods which are not portable by customers travelling by foot, cycle or bus.

Comparison Goods retail are defined to include a range of items including furniture, furnishings and household equipment. Bulky goods also come under the Comparison Goods definition.

5.3. County Development Plan

Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028

The current Development Plan came into effect on 25th July 2022. The subject appeal was submitted under the provisions of this plan.

5.3.1. Volume 1 – Chapter 6 Economic Strategy

Relevant objectives include the following:

Objective ED45 seeks to direct commercial development to the settlements identified in the Settlement Hierarchy. Economic development proposals will be permitted within settlements on suitably zoned land or within towns and villages defined within the Core Strategy / Settlement Hierarchy, subject to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. Exceptions to the objective will be permitted in accordance with those outlined in this chapter, Chapter 7 Tourism Development, Chapter 12 Coastal Zone Management and Marine Spatial Planning, Chapter 14 Recreation and Open Space Strategy, Volume 8 Retail Strategy and Volume 10 Energy Strategy of the Plan.

Objective ED50 seeks to ensure retail development is located in accordance with the objectives contained in the Retail Strategy contained in Volume 8.

Objective ED51 is to ensure that, where economic development uses bound sensitive uses such as residences, natural and built heritage assets or community and education uses, that an appropriate buffer is maintained to protect the sensitive use.

5.3.2. **Volume 2 – Development Management Manual**

Section 5 – Enterprise and Employment

This section of the plan notes that retail development should be appropriately located in accordance with the role and function of the retail centre and accord with the scale and type of retailing identified for that location. New retail developments shall accord with the Retail Planning Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012) and the contents of Volume 8- Retail strategy.

5.3.3. **Volume 8 – Retail Strategy**

Volume 8 of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 states that for large scale retail applications, the onus will be on the applicant to demonstrate as part of the sequential test assessment that existing vacant units within the retail core are not suitable, viable and available to accommodate a development.

The Wexford Retail strategy goes on to state in keeping with the sequential approach, a focus on encouraging retail occupancy of vacant premises located within the retail core should be prioritised in the first instance.

In considering expenditure levels, the Wexford Retail Strategy notes that significantly different levels of turnover will apply to comparison goods such as clothing and footwear and smaller household durables than would apply to bulky household goods sold in retail warehouses. Retail warehouses have a distinct function and are generally located outside of a city or town centre. It is considered important to split between expenditure available for bulky household goods and non-bulky comparison goods as a result.

Relevant objectives from the Retail Strategy are as follows:

Objective WXC06: It is the objective of the Council to prohibit new retail development if they would (either by themselves or cumulatively with other

developments) negatively impact the vitality and viability of existing retail centres within the County. This objective aims to protect the existing vitality and service provision of the town centres by preventing the development of retail enterprises in inappropriate locations or at a scale which would have a negative impact on retail competition within the County.

In terms of Retail Warehouses and in accordance with the Retail Planning Guidelines the Wexford Retail Strategy states there should be a presumption against the further development of out of town retail parks and a preference for sites in or adjacent to town centres to ensure the potential for linked trips and commercial synergy, and that over the lifetime of this plan these developments will not generally be supported. Key criteria for the assessment of retail warehouse applications include scale and design of the development, appropriate vehicular access and the quantitative need for such development. In accordance with the Retail Planning Guidelines within County Wexford the following caps on floorspace of such retail development shall be applied (gross floorspace quoted including storage and garden centres):

- individual retail units should not be less than 700m²

Furthermore, the range of goods sold shall be restricted by planning condition to bulky goods as those defined within Annex 1 of the Regional Planning Guidelines. These include but are not limited to household appliances, bulky pet products, tools and equipment for the house and garden, furniture and furnishings.

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

The closest Natura 2000 sites are the Slaney River Valley SAC (Site Code: 000781) and Wexford Harbour and Slob SPA (Site Code: 004076), both located circa 2.7km to the east of the subject site.

5.5. EIA Screening

- 5.6. Having regard to the limited nature and scale of the proposed development and the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity/ the absence of any connectivity to any sensitive location, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for

environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A third party appeal was submitted by Joyces Wexford Ltd. who own Expert Electrical in a neighbouring retail unit. The main issues raised by the appellant can be summarised as follows:

- There is no objection to the principle of the proposed development but seek clarity in relation to a number of items.
- Concerns are raised that the planning application does not appropriately identify any wayleaves within the red line boundary. The appellant goes on to state that they have the benefit of use over communal lands within the retail park, some of which are within the red line boundary of the proposed site.
- Identified areas of car parking to the north end of the appeal site are not within the ownership of the applicant and the application should have been made invalid.
- The proposed development would result in a loss of car parking spaces, despite generating an additional demand for spaces. Details on car parking numbers are unclear. No traffic impact analysis has been provided by the applicant to allow a full appraisal of the proposal in the context of the local road network.
- The proposed construction management plan does not provide for adequate consultation and agreement with the appellant. No condition is attached to the grant of permission that requires details of construction management to be agreed with the Local Authority. A condition in this regard would be welcomed.

6.2. Applicant Response

The applicant's response can be summarised as follows:

- Letter from the applicant's solicitor is provided illustrating proof of ownership with wayleaves provided in yellow.
- The proposal will result in the removal of 4no. car parking spaces. Existing car parking provision is noted as being adequate as identified by the Local Authority Planner. A surplus of car parking spaces is provided within the site with additional improvements including EV charge points and bicycle parking.
- The construction management issue is related to the land ownership issue, which has been incorrectly questioned by the appellant. The applicant reiterates a commitment to 'good neighbour' practices and would accept a condition in relation to construction management.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- None received

6.4. Observations

- None

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having reviewed the details and appeal documentation on the file, the submissions made, having visited the site, and having regard to relevant local and national policy and guidance, I consider the main issues to be the following:

- Principle of Development (New Issue)
- Land Ownership
- Car Parking and Traffic
- Construction Management

Appropriate Assessment (AA) also needs to be considered. I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise.

7.2. Principle of Development – New Issue

7.2.1. The existing warehouse unit was granted permission under Reg. Ref. 20071186 in 2007 under a previous development plan. The granted permission restricted the use

of the floor space to exclusively storage and selling of bulky household goods (Condition 11 (b)).

- 7.2.2. The Planning Authority considered commercial/comparison retail development at this location and had no issue with the principle of the currently proposed development.
- 7.2.3. The previous 'bulky goods' zoning for the site is noted under the Wexford Town and Environs Plan 2009-2015 (extended to 2019). The site is currently not zoned in the current Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 and the Wexford Town Local Area Plan is pending, therefore, there is no defined land use zoning for the subject site.
- 7.2.4. The principle of the development shall therefore be considered on its own merits, and in accordance with the current Development Plan.
- 7.2.5. The applicants have not provided any definitive supporting documentation for the retail element of the proposed uses, other than to clarify in the Retail Impact Assessment, submitted at further information stage, that it would constitute non-bulky comparison goods retail floor space. The proposed non-bulky comparison goods retail is a use that is contrary to the retail warehouse type use envisaged for this site under previous development plans and the expired Wexford Town and Environs Development Plan 2009-2015 (as extended to 2019), as well as the granted permission for the existing unit. The proposed non-bulky comparison retail unit at ground floor and office space at first floor, represent uses that would not be consistent with the primary use of the retail warehousing park, and their use in this location would be contrary to the provisions of National and Local Policy. Chapter 6 of the County Development Plan requires new retail to be appropriately located to support the scale and role of the retail centre. I do not accept that the subject proposal does so.
- 7.2.6. The Wexford Retail Strategy, incorporated at Volume 8 of the Development Plan, aims to protect the existing vitality and service provision of the town centre by preventing the development of retail enterprises in inappropriate locations or at a scale which would have a negative impact on retail competition within the County. The Retail Strategy also stipulates a minimum size of 700m² for retail warehouse units. The proposed retail unit of 255m² is considerably below this threshold.
- 7.2.7. As set out in the Retail Planning Guidelines, the purpose of retail warehouse parks is to provide for the sale of bulky goods generally sold from retail warehouses, where

DIY goods or goods such as flatpack furniture are of such a size that they would normally be taken away by car and are not manageable by customers travelling by foot, cycle or bus. This definition is key to the consideration of the subject proposal.

- 7.2.8. The sequential approach is appropriate in terms of identifying vacant retail floorspace in the core area, and the applicant has not provided appropriate evidence that there are insufficient available sites to cater for the proposed retail unit within the town centre. Several vacant retail units in the town centre are identifiable.
- 7.2.9. I note the details provided in the Retail Impact Assessment (RIA) submitted at further information stage, including the proposed non-bulky comparison retail use and the projected shortfall in comparison floor space by 2025. However, the RIA does not include sufficient information to justify the proposed non-bulky comparison retail unit within an identified retail warehouse park, at the expense of a more suitable location in the town centre.
- 7.2.10. I have concerns in relation to the principle of the proposed development at this location and refer to the existing policy context in operation, the pattern of development in the area, and have reference to the previous land use zoning for the site, which defined much of the existing development pattern of retail warehousing for this location.
- 7.2.11. To allow small-scale retail units for non-bulky comparison goods within an established retail warehouse park would negatively impact the vitality and viability of existing retail centres within the County.
- 7.2.12. The development for permission would not be in accordance with the prevailing pattern of development in the area, that was established under the zoning objectives for the site as set out in the Wexford Town and Environs Development Plan (expired) and defined by the original permission for the main unit, whereby a condition attached to the permission restricted the use to the sale of bulky goods. The proposed use would contravene the policies and objectives of the Development Plan including Objective ED50, aimed at restricting the role of retail warehousing to the sale of bulky goods, and would seriously injure the vitality and viability of Wexford Town Centre. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 7.2.13. The proposed office use at first floor level is considered a commercial use that is generally not consistent with the bulky goods retail activity at this location. While the

office element may be utilised in conjunction with the proposed retail unit as an ancillary/complementary use, there is insufficient detail in the submitted documents to suggest this would be the case. A level of flexibility in relation to end users and the inter-relationship between both units is considered appropriate, however given the non-conformity of the proposed retail element and the independent nature of the proposed office element, the office use is therefore not considered to be acceptable at this location and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

7.2.14. The principle of non-bulky comparison retail and office use at this location is a new issue and the Board may wish to seek the views of the parties in this regard.

7.2.15. In conclusion, having regard to the provisions of the Retail Planning Guidelines in relation to the sequential approach, the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 in the context of appropriate locations for new retail development, as also set out in Volume 8 – Retail Strategy, the parent permission for this unit that restricts retail activity to the sale of bulky goods, and the established pattern of development in the area, I conclude that the principle of non-bulky comparison goods retailing and office development as proposed is not considered appropriate at this location and I recommend that the subject proposal be refused permission.

7.3. Land Ownership

7.3.1. The Third-Party Appeal is concerned that the ownership of the site is not clearly defined, and wayleaves are not appropriately delineated. They provide that no agreements have been made with them on the use of common areas within the retail park and as such the drawings submitted to the Planning Authority in support of the application are incorrect and therefore invalid.

7.3.2. The First Party response provides that the issue regarding land ownership and common areas is not substantiated. The proposed development is in the ownership of the applicants and the folio information and plan provided, illustrates any wayleaves in yellow and the red line boundary is clear. There are no notable covenants on the folio to suggest common areas or agreements for use exist within the boundary of the appeal site.

7.3.3. It must be noted that the issue of validity of the application as submitted is within the remit of the Council rather than the Board.

- 7.3.4. It is of note that the issue of ownership/encroachment is a civil matter and I do not propose to adjudicate on this issue. I note here the provisions of s.34(13) of the Planning and Development Act: *“A person shall not be entitled solely by reason of a permission under this section to carry out any development”*. Under Chapter 5.13 ‘Issues relating to title of land’ of the ‘Development Management - Guidelines for Planning Authorities’ (DoECLG June 2007) it states the following: *“The planning system is not designed as a mechanism for resolving disputes about title to land or premises or rights over land; these are ultimately matters for resolution in the Courts...”*
- 7.3.5. Given the evidence presented on the appeal file, it remains open to the Board to grant permission on this issue as the applicant has adequately provided folio information confirming title and any encumbrance related to the subject site, which do not present any impediments to the proposed development.

7.4. Car Parking and Traffic

- 7.4.1. The proposed development is a standalone retail/office unit within an area of the existing surface car park serving the established retail warehousing park. The Planning Authority have noted that the overall development (existing and proposed) would only require 23 spaces based on the current County Development Plan. The existing car park includes 105 spaces as identified on the submitted site layout plan.
- 7.4.2. The proposed development extends into the existing car park, resulting in the loss of 4no. car parking spaces. The proposed development proposes a re-alignment of existing spaces to provide additional car parking numbers to the north end of the site and to the rear (west) of the existing building. The appellant argues that the number of spaces that exist on the ground are not reflected in the submitted plans, with less car parking available than shown on the provided plans at initial application and at further information stage.
- 7.4.3. The county development plan requires 1 space per 100m² for office and retail. This equates to a requirement for 4 additional car spaces. The subject proposal provides in excess of this requirement.
- 7.4.4. I noted at the time of my site inspection which was a midweek day at approximately lunchtime that there was car parking availability within the retail park, which had a number of spaces generally consistent with the submitted plans, with line markings less prominent at some areas and the spaces to the rear of the existing unit being

utilised for servicing and storage purposes. I accept that the proposed retail unit could attract dual use / cross trips whereby customers would visit more than one unit at a time. As such I would consider that the proposed use would not generate any significant additional car parking demand based on its location within the retail park and the scale of the proposed premises.

7.4.5. Based on the details provided and the existing provision of car parking within the retail park, I am satisfied that adequate car parking is available for existing and proposed uses

7.4.6. In relation to the potential for traffic impacts as identified by the appellant, I refer to my earlier point in relation to the possibility for multi-purpose trips. In addition, given the scale of the subject proposal, I do not consider a likelihood of significant additional traffic generation as a result of the proposed development. This is secondary to the principle of a smaller retail unit being located within this retail park, which is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of Wexford Town.

7.4.7. In conclusion, I would consider that there is sufficient car parking provision within the retail park to accommodate the proposed development and there would not be a significant increase in traffic as a result of the proposal, that would present a reason for refusal in this case.

7.5. Construction Management

7.5.1. An Outline Construction Management Plan was submitted as part of the planning application and is noted. The appellant submits that they enjoy the benefit of use of common areas within the site and any impacts in this regard would be unacceptable. I refer to my previous conclusions in relation to land ownership issues within the site and do not consider these to be relevant to the issue of construction management.

7.5.2. The applicant has committed to undertake construction management in accordance with the detailed requirements of the planning authority. The applicant notes they would accept a condition to any grant of planning permission that requires any points of detail to be agreed with the Planning Authority and that any construction management measures will be based on 'good neighbour' agreements with other users in the retail park.

- 7.5.3. While I acknowledge the concerns expressed in relation to construction impacts, I do note that any such negative impacts would be short-lived and temporary in duration. I consider that any negative impacts arising from standard construction traffic would not be so great as to warrant a refusal of permission. I recommend that the matter of construction management be dealt with by means of condition, if the Board is disposed towards a grant of permission.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, the nature of the receiving environment, and the proximity of the lands in question to the nearest European site, it is my opinion that no appropriate assessment issues arise and that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, on any Natura 2000 site.

9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1. I recommend that permission be refused for the following reasons and considerations.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 10.1. Having regard to the established development pattern in the area for bulky goods retail, the 'Retail Planning Guidelines for Planning Authorities', issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in January, 2012, the Wexford Retail Strategy contained in Volume 8 of the County Development Plan and Objective ED50 as set out in the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028, it is considered that the proposed retail and office development would be contrary to the policies and objectives aimed at restricting the role of retail warehousing parks to the retailing of bulky goods and would seriously injure the vitality and viability of Wexford Town Centre. The proposed development would conflict with National and Local policy and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Matthew McRedmond
Senior Planning Inspector

13th August 2024

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-318138-23		
Proposed Development Summary	Two Storey extension to existing retail warehouse (Home Store + More) to provide a ground floor retail unit and first floor office unit		
Development Address	Kileens, Wexford Town, Wexford		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	√
		No	No further action required
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	√		Proceed to Q.3
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)
			Conclusion
No	√	N/A	No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes			Proceed to Q.4

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?

No	N/A	Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____