



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Addendum 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
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Joyces Wexford Ltd.
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	7 th August 2024
Inspector	Matthew McRedmond

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. This report is an addendum report to the Inspector's report in respect of ABP-318138-23 dated 13th August 2024.
- 1.2. A notice under Section 137 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, issued to the parties as per the Board Direction dated 27th August 2024, giving the last date for receipt of response as being on or before 18th September 2024. The Board sought the views of the parties in relation to the following:

“The Board may consider that having regard to the established 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 2022-2028, the proposed development, comprising a standalone new retail and office development, might 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.”

- 1.3. The Board received a response to the Section 137 notice by the applicant and the appellant within the statutory timeframe.
- 1.4. These responses were circulated to the parties under Section 131 of the Act as per the Board Direction dated 26th September 2024, giving the last date for receipt of response as being on or before 21st October 2024.
- 1.5. The Board received a response to the Section 131 notice by the applicant and the appellant within the statutory timeframe.
- 1.6. This addendum report has been prepared to assess the responses received from the applicant and the appellant.

2.0 Response of Applicant and Appellant to the Board's Notice to Parties

- 2.1. The applicant submitted the following main points:

- The proposed development comprises an extension to an existing retail warehouse and is therefore not a 'standalone new retail and office development' and therefore does not contravene Objective ED50 of the County Development Plan.
- The proposal does not contravene retail planning policy as it is not a new out-of-town retail park but is an extension to an existing, established retail park.
- The range of goods to be sold in the proposed unit are non-bulky and not dissimilar to the range of goods in the existing store to which it is attached.
- The modest extension of non-bulky comparison goods retail floor area is required based on retail needs projections.
- The third party appellant reference to land ownership issues at this stage are outside the scope of the notice from the Board and should be dismissed summarily.
- The subject proposal is consistent with the policies and objectives of the Wexford County Development Plan as assessed in the Retail Impact Assessment submitted with the application.

2.2. The third party appellant states the following:

- Matters in relation to land ownership are reiterated.
- The proposed non-bulky retail will not provide tangible benefits to the retail offering of the County. The applicant could lease the unit to retail of bulky or non-bulky goods unless specified by the Board by way of condition.
- The proposed development is not an extension to the exiting Home Store + More, rather it is a new standalone retail unit attached to the existing building.
- The subject proposal goes against County Development Plan policy (Objective WXC08) in relation to a presumption against out of town retail parks.

3.0 Assessment

- 3.1.1. The applicant has confirmed in the submitted documentation that the proposed retail unit does not form an extension to the existing store but is attached to the established 'Home Store + More' retail unit, and would be for the sale of non-bulky retail items 'not dissimilar to the goods sold in the existing store'.
- 3.1.2. Based on the submissions provided, I maintain 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 (Reg. Ref. 20071186). 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.
- 3.1.3. Volume 8 of the County Development Plan includes the Wexford Retail Strategy, which 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.
- 3.1.4. I note the details provided in the Retail Impact Assessment (RIA) submitted at further information stage of the application, 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.
- 3.1.5. 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 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.

4.0 Recommendation

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

5.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 5.1. 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

20th November 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)
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:** _____

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

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	
<p>The Board carried out a preliminary examination [ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development regulations 2001, as amended] of at least the nature, size or location of the proposed development, having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations.</p> <p>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</p>		
	Examination	Yes/No/ Uncertain
<p>Nature of the Development. Is the nature of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment.</p> <p>Will the development result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants?</p>	Retail and office unit is not out of context at this urban location and will not result in any significant waste or pollutants.	No.
<p>Size of the Development Is the size of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment?</p> <p>Are there significant cumulative considerations having regard to other existing and / or permitted projects?</p>	Retail and office unit is not out of context at this urban location and will not result in any cumulative considerations.	No.

<p>Location of the Development</p> <p>Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining, or does it have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location, or protected species?</p> <p>Does the proposed development have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area, including any protected structure?</p>	<p>Site is adequately removed from the Wexford Harbour and Slobbs SPA and Slaney River Valley SAC to minimise any potential impacts.</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Conclusion</p>		
<p>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>EIA is not required.</p> <p>✓</p>	<p>There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.</p>	<p>There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>EIAR required.</p>

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____

Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)