



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-321128-24

Development	Demolition of dwelling and 5 outbuildings and construction of 14 apartments in a two storey building , bicycle storage/parking, refuse storage, outdoor amenity area/open space, car parking and ancillary works.
Location	New Line/Harrison Place, Charleville, Cork
Planning Authority	Cork County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	245474
Applicant(s)	Pat and Catherine Meskell
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Pat and Catherine Meskell
Observer(s)	Jayne Kavanagh
Date of Site Inspection	8 th September 2025
Inspector	Suzanne Kehely

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	7
3.1. Decision	7
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	8
3.3. Other Technical Reports	9
4.0 Planning History.....	10
5.0 Policy Context.....	11
5.1. National Planning Policy	11
6.0 EIA Screening.....	17
7.0 Water Framework Directive Screening	17
8.0 Natural Heritage Designations.....	21
9.0 The Appeal	21
9.1. Grounds of Appeal	21
9.2. Planning Authority Response.....	22
9.3. Observations.....	22
10.0 Assessment.....	22
10.2. Principle of Development - Zoning:	23
10.5. Impact on traffic safety	27
10.6. Water Quality.....	28
11.0 AA Screening.....	30
12.0 Recommendation	31
Reasons and Considerations	32

Appendices

Appendix 1 - EIA Pre-Screening – Form 1

Appendix 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination – Form 2

Appendix 3 - AA Screening Determination

Appendix 4 – Water Framework Directive Screening Matrix

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. This corner site of c. 0.17 hectares is at the junction of New Line and Harrison Place on the southwestern side of the Glen River Bridge to the south of Charleville town. New Line is a main road into the town centre although by-passed by the N20 to which it connects south of the town. New Line is characterised by established and two storey terraced residential development in the vicinity of the site. Harrison Place is a narrow rural type road with no footpath, and it loops around the hinterland of the site to reconnect with New Line /Old Cork Road. It has extensive low-density housing comprising older semi-detached /semi-dormer cottages, (from early-mid-20th century.)
- 1.2. The site is occupied by a large six bay dwellinghouse with extensive outbuildings which extend along both road frontages and the site is otherwise bound by high stone rendered walling which encloses a garden yard, paddock, dividing walls and other ancillary structures as depicted in the site survey drawings. The immediate curtilage to the front of the dwelling house is delineated by a railed frontage with a set of decorative gates and wall piers. The house has an old modern styled flat roof single storey extension at the northern end of the façade which projects to the boundary and partly obscures the original facade.
- 1.3. The house appears to be occupied. At time of inspection a car was parked in the curtilage and domestic bins were in the garden/yard area. The submitted conservation report by the applicant includes floor layouts and interior photographs of the building.
- 1.4. On the New Line frontage, the site is adjacent to a row of two storey houses that are set back from the southern boundary. Along the Harrison Place frontage to the west a single storey dwelling on a detached site with another to its rear adjoin the site. A terrace of two storey houses as part of a small housing development backs onto the southern side of the site.
- 1.5. The road carriageway along Harrison Place where it fronts the site is narrowly aligned with c. 3.1m to 4.5 m in width (as depicted in the site survey). Open space as part of a linear riverbank corridor forms the northern side of Harrison Place.

- 1.6. The site is roughly square with dimensions of approx. 47m x 35m. Vehicular access is off the New Line Road frontage.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development as shown in the submitted drawings comprises:
- Demolition of dwelling house and all outbuildings including all boundary walls and features along the road frontage.
 - Construction of 2 x two-storey blocks joined by a stairwell – arranged along the road frontage with a c.4m gap along the Harrison Place frontage. The blocks enclose a landscaped courtyard type space with Bicycle parking and bin storage (in an enclosed building) along the south boundary.
 - The buildings are set back from the respective road frontages and provide parallel on-street parking with tree planting and a c. 1.8m wide footpath between the parking and building facade.
 - The blocks at a proposed height of 7.2m (as scaled from drawings) provides for 5 different apartment types over two levels.
 - Each unit has external access. At ground level it is from the courtyard and at first floor level from an external balcony corridor. Both levels are accessed via a porch entrance/stairwell off Harrison Place.
 - All units have private balconies – 10 of which face on to the street and 4 face into the courtyard in the layout.

An architectural statement accompanies the application and sets out the design rationale. The demolition is stated to be justified as the house was removed from the Record of Protected Structures. It is submitted this was based on the absence of features and alterations.

2.2. Summary of Development as set out in submitted details.

Development Parameter	Proposed as Revised in Further Information
Application Site (Gross Site Area)	0.2ha. site outlined in red
Application Site (Net Developable Site Area)	Not stated but reduced by set back

Demolition	House (256sq.m.) outbuildings (161.6sq.m.) and boundary walls and internal walls
existing/Former use	Residential and veterinary services
No. of additional residential units	14 units to replace all former uses
	6 x One bed @ 49.3 sq.m. (2 person) 8 x Two bed @ 67-82 sq.m. (two 3-person and six 4-person)
Gross Internal Floor Area	919 sq.m.
Density	70dph as stated based on site area of 0.2ha
In excess of min floor area	All in excess
Site coverage	Approx. 30% (from drawings)
Plot Ratio	0.5
Height	2.7m floor to ceiling height at ground floor – overall height of 7.6m (114.25mOD) (scaled from drawings)
Lift	None
Communal and Public open space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communal open space of c.460sq.m. • (485sq.m. less bin/bike store) • New public footpath along northern frontage consequent on demolition and set back • New public lighting
Residential Amenity	As above
Private Amenity Space	Balconies for each unit
Dual Aspect	All are at least dual aspect.
Car Parking Spaces	9 spaces on street
Car Parking Ratio	0.64 per unit – site within walking distance of shops and services
Cycle Parking	32 spaces in secure area in communal private space. 8 of these are for visitors.
Part V	2 units to be provided.

Entrance	No vehicular access, road widened along Harrison Place.
-----------------	---

2.3. The application was accompanied by a comprehensive set of drawings and technical reports which include the following documents as revised where applicable in further information:

- Design Statement as prepared by Healy Partner Architects. This provides background to the design process which involved consideration of alternatives including the retention of the house and 8 additional units and also provision of 3 storey development providing 21 units.
- Architectural Drawings and report
- Conservation response report which sets out planning history and the background for removing house from the RPS. This report includes internal photographs and layout plans
- Flood Risk Assessment concluding no flood risk.
- Report on Engineering Services which includes detailed measures and calculations for surface run off incorporating SuDs/Nature based drainage systems.
- Uisce Eireann letter of 24th July 2024 confirming feasible water supply and wastewater connection. without infrastructure upgrade by Irish Water. Some localised upsizing of sewer may be required for wastewater connection to be determined at connection stage.
- Asbestos survey
- Site lighting and lighting report
- Part V acceptance letter.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. By Order 20th June 2025 the Planning authority issued notification of decision to refuse permission

Objective HE 16-19 (a) of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 seeks to protect, maintain and enhance the established character, forms, features and setting of vernacular buildings and the contribution they make to local character, history and sense of place. There is also presumption in favour of retaining vernacular buildings and encouraging their re-use under objective HE16-19 (c). Furthermore, PL 3-1 (a) seeks to achieve /reinforce a better sense of place and history and heritage context of a town and provides for protection of heritage features and no structural heritage that area important and intrinsic part of the distinctive and character of the settlement. The proposed development would involve the demolition of a vernacular dwelling and its features which makes a significant contribution to the local character, distinctiveness and sense of place. Accordingly, to grant permission would not contribute to sustainable placemaking and would result in a development which materially contravenes objective HE 16-19 (a) ad (c) of the CDP 2022 and objective PL3-1 (a) and (b) of the CDP 2022.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. **Planning Reports:** The initial report (25/9/24) considers the proposal in the context of objective ZU 18-19 regarding existing residential /mixed residential and other uses whereby overall increase density is encouraged by normally respecting the pattern and grain of existing development. In terms of heritage, it is noted that the site is not part an Architectural Conservation Area and that the House was formerly part of the RPS. However, the dating of the building from pre-1842 based on ordnance survey maps is considered to make Objective HE 16-19 applicable.
- 3.2.2. In terms of urban design, Chapter 3 Settlements and Placemaking and Chapter 4 are relevant to ensuring principles of urban design are applied within Charleville.
- 3.2.3. In terms of density the proposal at a rate of at least 70/hectare is considered high. As Charleville is a large town, Table 4.1 of the CDP identifies the town as growing to over 5000 and that medium density of 30-50 units/ha is generally applicable. However, the Density ranges for such town sizes are noted to be set out in table 3.5 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities and are also applicable. Given the site location and

classification as an urban neighbourhood, a density of 40 unit per hectare upward is considered appropriate.

- 3.2.4. However, it is considered the density should be influenced and informed by a design and proposal that also responds to the site features and historic context. The option to retain the existing house and construct apartments as referred to in the design statement is considered more appropriate. This would have a density in the order of 45 unit/ hectares. Although it is accepted that a higher density could be achieved with this general layout if the existing house was subdivided.
- 3.2.5. The submitted Housing Mix Statement is described as brief, and the intended use is queried noting the reference to BTR in the submitted design statement. A greater mix of units would be desirable otherwise a clear rationale for the mix of just 1 and 2 bed units is needed.
- 3.2.6. The concerns about demolition of the house and reason to refuse permission in this regard was endorsed in reports by both the Senior Executive Planner and Senior Planner. The senior planner's report refers to the strong development policy to retain such structures and that its loss would be detrimental to heritage protection into the future, It is further noted that the applicant has not adhered to the guidance and advice provided at a pre-application meeting in relation to an appropriate re-use of the building. Accordingly, a request for further information is not advised.

3.3. Other Technical Reports

- 3.3.1. Conservation officer: refers to CDP policy which supports retention of house and recommends a deferral of decision pending revised proposal incorporating retention.
- 3.3.2. Senior Executive Architect: supports retention of prominent building of character and its re-use as part of a new residential scheme given its important vernacular and heritage value. Deferral of decision recommended on the basis of potential for a revised proposal.
Later single storey extension could be removed and modification to fenestration as part of its re-use may be options.
- 3.3.3. Area Engineer: no objection in principle to junction alteration, however if house is to be retained, car parking and access needs to be addressed. Site is not at risk of

flooding and is noted to be served by a public sewer. FI information for junction upgrade works in event of house retention and parking quantity and location.

3.3.4. Public lighting: Further information

3.3.5. Estates Primary Report: No objection subject to conditions.

3.3.6. Housing: Applicant's intention to meet Part V obligation by providing 2 units is noted.
No objection

3.4. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.4.1. No submissions.

3.5. **Third Party Observations**

- A number of submissions are noted and issues and summarised in PA report which relate to, traffic safety along Harrison Place, density, water supply, impact on character of area, demolition/construction phase and associated traffic and overlooking from a height.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. **The site**

4.1.1. Planning Authority Reference TP 07/7102 refers to refusal for development of site on grounds of protected structure, traffic safety and site layout open space and car parking

4.2. **Other recent decision in Charleville – site east of N20 in development area.**

4.2.1. An Bord Pleanála reference 321035 refers to a refusal of permission for construction of 2 single-storey dwellings, 4 two-storey dwellings, revised entrance and associated site works for 2 reasons relating to:

- Urban design and therefore being contrary to SPPRR2 and SPPR4 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines 2024 and failing to comply with Policy and objectives 4.2 and 5.1 of same.
- Failure to comply with DEMURS and potential endangerment of public safety by reason of traffic hazard.

In a note attached to the Order, it is stated: The Commission noted the concerns of the Inspector in relation to the capacity of the Charleville Wastewater Treatment Plan and the potential impact of the proposed development on receiving waters (the CHARLEVILLE STREAM 010 IE SH 24C020780). The Commission also noted the absence of any pre-connection enquiry and confirmation of feasibility from Uisce Eireann or specific details regarding proposed service connections from the proposed development to public water and wastewater services. However, given that this was potentially a new issue, not raised by the planning authority in their decision to refuse planning permission, and given the substantive reasons for refusal set out above, the Commission decided not to attach reasons three and four as recommended by the Commission's Inspector.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Planning Policy

5.1.1. **Project Ireland 2040 - National Planning Framework:** Part of the vision of the NPF in managing growth is directing significant amounts of new housing into existing built-up areas of cities, towns and villages and doing this particularly through infill and brownfield sites while the rest of new homes will be targeted on greenfield edge of settlement areas. The NPF also sets out a number of National Strategic Outcomes which include Compact Growth and facilitating greater densities while delivering high quality design. Relevant objectives include:

- NPO 3 - Compact Smart Sustainable Growth -30% of all new housing outside major cities to be within existing urban footprint in the southern region.
- NPO 11 - Planned growth at a settlement level shall be determined at development plan-making stage and addressed within the objectives of the plan. The consideration of individual development proposals ... shall have regard to a

broader set of considerations beyond the targets including the receiving capacity of the environment.

- NPO 22- performance based criteria for housing standard, height, parking provision.
- NPO 43 Prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location.
- NPO 45 Increase residential density in settlements, through a range of measures including reductions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, **infill development** schemes, area or site-based regeneration, increased building height and more compact forms of development

5.1.2. National Guidance and Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines

- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) – these revoke Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (2009)
 - In refining density to a particular site, Section 3.4.2 refers to consideration of character, amenity and natural environment. The evaluation of impact on local character should focus on the defining characteristics of an area, including for example, the prevailing scale and mass of buildings, urban grain and architectural language, any particular sensitivities and the capacity of the area for change.
 - It will be necessary to consider the impact of a proposed development on the amenities of residential properties that are in close proximity to a development site. The key considerations should include privacy, daylight and sunlight, and microclimate. These considerations are addressed in more detail in Chapter 5 Development Standards.
 - SPPR1 minimum separation distances
- Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities issued under Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended) July 2023. These and preceding guidelines are revoked by 2025 Apartment guidelines however these new guidelines only apply to applications lodged post July 2025.

- Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2013)
- Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011).
These guidelines provide practical guidance for planning authorities and for all others on the protection of the architectural heritage in the context of Part IV of the Planning and Development Act 2000. Section 1 provides a rationale for protecting our architectural heritage.

5.2. **Development Plan – Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028. (CDP)**

- 5.2.1. **General:** Charleville is in the Kanturk Mallow Municipal District and is the second largest town. There are plans to examine feasibility of reopening the rail link to Cork
- 5.2.2. Charleville is located on a broad and undulating plain containing high quality agricultural land and which is crossed by several small rivers that drain to the River Maigue to the north or the Awbeg to the south.
- 5.2.3. It has good Drinking Water Status and some capacity in terms of wastewater status (based on 2021 Assessment). The WWTP is currently not compliant with Waste-Water Discharge Licence emission limit values but is capable of achieving at least UWW standards.
- 5.2.4. Section 2.5.61: SuDs to be incorporated into design.
- 5.2.5. Section 5.6.62 identifies Charleville as being at risk of flooding.
- 5.2.6. **Zoning:** The existing house site is in a residential zone RS where it is an objective 'to provide residential development and protect and improve residential amenity.' The land to the north along the river bank is part of the largest green space as identified in the Green Infrastructure Diagram for the town. (Fig 3.2.4)
- 5.2.7. The **vision** for Charleville is set out in section 2.5 of Volume 3.
 - Charleville has been allocated a population target of 5,112 in the County Development Plan to 2028 representing growth of about 1,193 people on Census 2016 figure.
 - As part of the Council's commitment to deliver compact growth within the town a new focus is placed on the better utilisation of the existing building stock, prioritisation of brownfield and under-utilised land and identification of regeneration and infill opportunities that can contribute positively to Charleville's

housing stock and 30% target of 137 units. It is proposed that the 456 new housing units required to 2028 be delivered primarily on Residential and Mixed-Use Zoning including Compact Growth Sites. The subject site is not identified as such.

- The plan emphasises the important on placemaking and consolidation and identifies a number of regeneration sites. The subject site is not included in this.
- CV-GR-03 Open Space/Park. Town Park and associated recreational facilities. Site includes the Glen River an important local biodiversity area within the town
- CV-GO-16 All development shall contribute to improved, safe pedestrian and cyclist connectivity and shall include proposals for the provision of improved pedestrian / cycle access routes, provision of new footpaths or improvement of existing footpaths and provision of facilities for cyclists, as appropriate.
- CV-GO-12 In accordance with Chapter 11 of the Plan, all new development will need to make provision for Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDs) and provide adequate storm water infrastructure. Surface water management and disposal should be planned in an integrated way in consideration with land use, water quality, amenity and habitat enhancements as appropriate.

5.2.8. **Built and Cultural Heritage:** Chapter 16 sets out policy and objectives for Built and Cultural Heritage. Key objectives include:

- HE 16-19: Vernacular Heritage a) Protect, maintain and enhance the established character, forms, features and setting of vernacular buildings, farmyards and settlements and the contribution they make to our architectural, archaeological, historical, social and cultural heritage and to local character and sense of place. b) Cork County Council encourages best conservation practice in the renovation and maintenance of vernacular buildings including thatched structures through the use of specialist conservation professionals and craft persons. Development proposals shall be accompanied by appropriate documentation compiled by experienced conservation consultant. c) There will generally be a presumption in favour of the retention of vernacular buildings and encouragement of the retention and re-use of vernacular buildings subject to normal planning

considerations, while ensuring that the re-use is compatible with environmental and heritage protection.

- HE 16-21: Design and Landscaping of New Buildings a) Encourage new buildings that respect the character, pattern and tradition of existing places, materials and built forms and that fit appropriately into the landscape. b) Promote sustainable approaches to housing development by encouraging new building projects to be energy efficient in their design and layout. c) Foster an innovative approach to design that acknowledges the diversity of suitable design solutions in most cases, safeguards the potential for exceptional innovative design in appropriate locations and promotes the added economic, amenity and environmental value of good design. d) Require the appropriate landscaping and screen planting of proposed developments by using predominantly indigenous/local species and groupings and protecting existing hedgerows and historic boundaries in rural areas. Protection of historical/commemorative trees will also be provided for.

5.2.9. Placemaking principles

- In volume 1, Table 3.1 sets out these principles under the headings of character and identity, continuity and enclosure, quality of the public realm/ open space, ease of movement, legibility, adaptability, diversity and vibrancy
- Objective PL 3-1 Building Design, Movement and Quality of the Public Realm: Support measures to improve building design quality, accessibility and movement including investment in quality public realm across the settlement network of the County linked to the following design criteria: a. **To achieve/ reinforce a better sense of place and distinctiveness strengthening local character.** b. **Create a design that is sensitive to the history and heritage context of a town / village setting and provides for protection of heritage features and non structural heritage that are important and intrinsic part of the distinctiveness and character of the settlement such as historic boundaries (stone and earthen), pillars and gates, street furnishing, paving and kerbing, trees, hedgerows;** c. Ground floor buildings within the town centre should aim to have a 4m floor to ceiling height, where possible, to facilitate active ground floor uses. d. The use of awnings should be utilized in a manner that

respects and enhances the historic town centre environment and adds to the town centre experience. e. New buildings should provide for high quality, local material choice and the design shall draw on the local architectural language of place and reinterpret these in a contemporary manner. f. Promote enhanced and increased public realm opportunities including a shared use of spaces, for outdoor experiences, with a priority on pedestrian usage. g. Provide multi-functional spaces suitable for all age cohorts in the community and capable of accommodating cultural events. h. Develop and strengthen the use of the green and blue infrastructure in a town / village setting including the retention and enhancement of existing trees and landscape features, the use of SUDs and permeable paving to achieve climate adaptable places. i. Achieve inclusive public realm working from the centre of a town / village setting which minimizes clutter and maximises opportunities for active mobility. j. Achieve permeability and connectivity in town centre / village locations which contributes to the 10 Minute Town Concept and Sustainable Neighbourhood Infrastructure. The loss of existing laneways will normally not be permitted. k. Delivers legible routes and urban way finding in the larger towns. l. Ensure universal design standards are achievable. m. Ensure that the aged community and the needs of all ages are facilitated, e.g., through the provision of seating areas and public toilet facilities. n. Consider the impacts, positive and negative, of lighting within the public realm which performs an important safety function and can be an aid to the legibility and distinctiveness of a place. Lighting should be designed to minimise negative effects on wildlife. See also Chapter 15 Biodiversity and Environment including paragraph 15.11.3 and Objectives BE 15-13(d) and (e). o. Encourage and facilitate the creation and use of public realm and outdoor spaces for outdoor dining in line with Fáilte Ireland's new Outdoor Dining Enhancement Investment Scheme

5.2.10. **Transport**

- Objective TM 12-9 provides for parking standards to be subject to maximum limits where residential sites are within walking distance of town centres.
- Objective TM12-2-1 Active Travel includes provision such that (b) All new developments are to be designed to latest DMURS standards, unless precluded by space or other constraints, to be accessible and permeable for pedestrians,

cyclists and those of reduced mobility and (c) Applications for all new developments are to be accompanied by a statement of how enhanced and inclusive permeability will be achieved, to include a statement of compliance with DMURS (2020 or later revision) and a quality audit (as referred to in DMURS).

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

7.0 Water Framework Directive Screening

- 7.1.1. The site is an urban serviced site with a single house and ancillary outbuildings. There is no watercourse on site but it is within 50m of the Glen River which is partly culverted and is a tributary to the River Maigue.
- 7.1.2. In the EPA maps this river is classed as CHARLEVILLE STREAM_010 (IE_SH_24C020780) with a WFD Status of 'Poor' for the periods 2016-2021 and 2019-2024. The underlying Charleville Ground Waterbody is IE_SH_G_055 is recorded as 'Poor' for the periods 2019-2024 (previously it was 'good' for the period 2016-2021.)
- 7.1.3. The proposal development will generate additional loading onto the existing wastewater treatment plant which has an amber status (Uisce Eireann capacity register (published August 2025). It has capacity issues and discharges to a surface waterbody with poor status and this raises significant water quality issues.
- 7.1.4. The pressures, as currently stated on the EPA publicly available portal, on the above river waterbody are categorised as follows:

Category	Sub Category	Name	Significant	Created In
----------	--------------	------	-------------	------------

Urban Waste Water	Agglomeration PE of 2,001 to 10,000	Charleville and Environs	No	WFD Cycle 2
Domestic Waste Water	Single House Discharges	n/a	Yes	WFD Cycle 2
Industry	IE	Kerry Ingredients (Ireland) Ltd Charleville	No	WFD Cycle 2
Agriculture	Pasture	n/a	Yes	WFD Cycle 2

7.1.30. As the development does not involve agricultural development nor is it reliant on a septic tank, the nature of the development does not, based on the above identified pressures, on the face of it potentially pose a significant risk to the receiving surface waters. On my review of the recent Uisce Eireann Annual Environment Report prepared for D0204-01, Charleville, in Cork in accordance with the requirements of the wastewater discharge licence for the agglomeration, the data indicates a potential vulnerability of the treatment system. The AER for example highlights that the WWTP is failing to achieve its Emission Limit Values for Total Ammonia.¹ The data in the AER suggests that the WWTP serving Charleville is having a negative impact on the concentration of Total Ammonia in the Charleville Stream_010 waterbody. In addition, increases in concentrations of ortho-phosphates and Biochemical Oxygen Demand were noted between the monitoring locations upstream and downstream of the WWTP.

7.1.31. The risk posed by foul effluent generated by the development potentially is I consider a significant issue given that the waterbody in question is already below good status and the Water Framework Directive requires that no single element of a status be allowed to deteriorate. While this is a matter for Uisce Eireann insofar as it is required to comply with the terms of the discharge license there is an onus on the relevant planning authority to consider the matter. I refer to Regulation 5 of SI 272 of

¹ The annual mean value for Total Ammonia increased from 0.032 mgN/L upstream of the WWTP to 0.409 mgN/L downstream of the discharge from the WWTP in 2024. This represents a 12-fold increase in Ammonia concentrations in the receiving waters of the Charleville Stream. The Environmental Quality Standard (EQS) for Total Ammonia in surface waters is 0.065 mgN/L for Good status and the waters downstream of the WWTP were found to be on average 580% of this EQS

2009 European Communities Environmental Objectives (Surface Waters)

Regulations 2009 which state that “A public authority shall not, in the performance of its functions, undertake those functions in a manner that knowingly causes or allows deterioration in the chemical status or ecological status (or ecological potential as the case may be) of a body of surface water.” An Coimisiún Pleanála is listed in Schedule 1 of those Regulations as a public authority.

- 7.1.32. While Uisce Eireann has indicated to the applicant in response to a pre-connection enquiry that there is some capacity without requiring an infrastructure upgrade at the time of its response in 2024, I consider, in light of the AER data, circumstances appear to have changed. While I note it has not expressly stated a direct impact from the proposed development which would compromise its compliance with emission limits, I consider a precautionary approach is appropriate. There is no demonstrable evidence on file to support the case that the proposal would not have negative consequences on surface water quality.
- 7.1.33. I note in the recent appeal case that similar concerns arose in the inspector’s report in the case of An Bord Pleanála reference 321035 and were acknowledged by the Commission as cited in this report. That case, while smaller in scale had however the added complication of a combined sewer use which is not the case here.
- 7.1.34. In respect of the surface water drainage, I note that the proposal is to maintain the connection to the public stormwater network which discharges to the River but that SuDs and Natural Drainage systems form part the design. These measures include pollutant mitigation which take account of that typically associated with the nature of proposed land-use. The projected managed run off rate is very low at a rate of 2 litres per hectare per second and would I consider be imperceptible both quantitatively and qualitatively in terms of posing a risk to the surface water quality.
- 7.1.35. In respect of the ground water waterbody the Charleville Groundwaters (IE_SH_G_055) status is also Poor and it is At Risk of not achieving its WFD objectives. This risk status is driven by a priority issue - Groundwater contribution of phosphate to associated surface water bodies (At Risk). A 2023 Characterisation Update showed that despite the status of the waterbody being Good at that time for the period (2016-2021) the waterbody is At Risk. This is attributed to individual site concentrations of Groundwater which were found to be high in ortho-phosphates

despite the aggregated pollutant (Phosphate) concentration being below Threshold Values. This means that groundwaters in certain areas were found to be high in phosphates and this is feeding into surface waters and causing them to fail due to high phosphates. Given the surface water management measures as outlined above I do not consider the underlying Groundwater to be likely to be impacted by the proposed development subject to standard construction management and on-going maintenance of the surface water drainage system within the site. As the WWTP discharges to the surface water, the increase in loading does not pose a direct risk to groundwater.

7.1.36. Having assessed the proposed development and reviewed the publicly available data from the EPA, including the license profile for Charleville D0204-01 and Uisce Éireann and considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration and having further considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I consider that the proposal constitutes a potential risk to the above surface waterbody qualitatively.

7.1.37. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

tThe Discharge Licence Profile by EPA for Charleville D0204-01 and the Uisce Éireann Annual Environmental Report for same which indicate significant breaches of ammonia levels that indicate the WWTP is a likely source of significant pressure on water quality, and

- the scale and infill nature of the proposal in an urban serviced area reliant on connection to a WWTP with restricted capacity and which is breaching emission limits of its discharge license and which may be exacerbated,

I conclude that on the basis of the available information, that it cannot be concluded that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives.

8.0 Natural Heritage Designations

8.1.1. The nearest sites are:

- SAC: 002170 - Blackwater River (Cork/Waterford) SAC – approx. 3.4 km to the south.
- SAC: 002036 - Ballyhoura Mountains SAC – approx. 7.5 km to the southeast.
- pNHA: 002036 - Ballyhoura Mountains – approx. 7 km to the southeast.
- pNHA: 002088 - Mountrussell Wood – approx. 7 km to the east.

9.0 The Appeal

9.1. Grounds of Appeal

9.1.1. The agent for the applicant has appealed the decision to refuse permission based on the following grounds:

- The application of the criteria in Objective HE 16-19 is not relevant to this site. The approach is seen as an inappropriate blanket ban on demolition of vernacular buildings despite precedence for demolition of such in a Part 8 application.
- A reasonable approach would require an appraisal as to whether the character form, features and setting of the dwelling are of conservation value and integral to the local character of New Line/Harrison Place. In this regard the case is made that the site does not meet the criteria of part a) of the objective HE16-19 for reasons listed in section 3.2 and 3.3 of the appeal submission which document interventions and condition and support its removal from the RPS.
- It is also argued that the building design addresses the corner site and strengthens the streetscape in a more effective placemaking sense as compared to an inhibited redevelopment constrained by retention of the present structures on site.
- The proposed development in overall terms will enhance the public realm and traffic safety of Harrison Place.

- As the criteria of HE 16-19 (a) does not apply, the other requirements of this objective are not applicable and therefore the proposal does not materially contravene this objective of the County Development Plan
- The retention of the house on site is not a requirement to meet with the criteria of Objective PL3-1. Accordingly, as the design criteria in this objective is met by the proposed design in terms of quality, accessibility and movement, e.g., it Includes investment in the public realm. It therefore accords with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

9.2. **Planning Authority Response**

No further comments.

9.3. **Observations**

One observation was received from a local resident in support of the decision to refuse permission. In summary, the following points are made:

- Loss of a prominent vernacular building: The proposed demolition of what is described as a vernacular dwelling constitutes destruction of local heritage. This is contrary to the development plan policies for placemaking (Table 3.1) which emphasise the need to protect the historic environment.
- Impact of density on residential amenity and traffic safety: The proposed number of dwellings will contribute to noise and generate car parking demand in excess of what is provided for by way of 9 car park spaces on -street. This will give rise to traffic hazard
- The house is presently occupied contrary to application details.

10.0 **Assessment**

10.1. **Issues**

- 10.1.1. This case relates to an urban infill type development in the environs of Charleville. Having examined the application details and all documentation on file, the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, observation comments and having inspected the site, and having regard to the

relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive planning issues in this appeal to be considered are as listed:

- Principle of development having regard to
 - Zoning
 - Demolition
 - Urban Design value
- Impact on traffic safety
- Water quality
- Density

10.2. Principle of Development - Zoning:

- 10.2.1. The proposed housing is in a residential area which is zoned as 'Existing Residential/Mixed residential and Other Uses' and provides for residential development in principle. This is supported in development plan policy in section 2.5 of Volume 3 wherein the vision for Charleville is a 'commitment to deliver compact growth within the town, a new focus is placed on the better utilisation of the existing building stock, prioritisation of brownfield and under-utilised land'. This policy is in line with national policy for achieving compact settlement within urban areas that are serviced. It for example specifically aligns with National Planning Framework NPO 3 - Compact Smart Sustainable Growth aims such that 30% of all new housing outside major cities will be within existing urban footprint in the southern region.
- 10.2.2. Infill sites are specifically identified as a means to delivering this although the subject site is not identified as a designated infill site or regeneration site in the development plan (vol.3). The critical issue in this case is that development relies on the demolition of a prominent building of vernacular interest and while not precluded from demolition within the Planning Acts in that it is not a Protected Structure, the planning authority considers on its merits and having regard to objectives to protect the vernacular, that its retention is warranted. The loss of a substantial dwelling dating from the early 1800s is accordingly a substantive issue in the decision by the planning authority to refuse permission.

10.3. Principle of Demolition:

- 10.3.1. The applicant makes the case that the altered structure in the first instance is without significant merit to warrant its retention. It is for example argued that as the building is no longer part of the Record of Protected Structures there is no mandatory restriction on its demolition. Secondly, the design quality of the proposed development will contribute positively to the area in terms of meeting key urban design criteria and therefore demolition is warranted.
- 10.3.2. While I note the house is no longer included in the RPS and I accept that the area is not in an ACA, I note the contents of the Conservation Officer about the features and particularly the pre 1842 date and the scarcity of built heritage features in the vicinity of the bridge. I consider the date, scale and location of the dwelling constitutes a significant link to the historic past and contributes to the unique identity of this part of Charleville town. Its scale and form, notwithstanding the alterations, extension and removal of chimney, stand out in contrast to that of the finely grained terraces both old and new that front the street in the immediate environs. Its moderately elevated position on an entrance point to the town south of the bridge and the expansive river bank setting adds to the drama of the house in its environs.
- 10.3.3. I concur with the Senior Architect's assessment in terms of importance and of note, its adaptability which further supports the retention while I note according with infill and re-use policies and which support the case that the building is intrinsic to the defining the local historic character. The report states 'The existing dwelling holds an important vernacular and heritage value despite being delisted from the current RPS list and despite some of its original interior fittings and fixtures being lost as well as an inappropriate flat roof single storey extension being added in the past to the front elevation. I would submit that the existing building has potential for reuse as part of the proposed redevelopment where issues around technical building regulation compliance can be overcome to meet with current standards. By way of a revised design, the existing single storey front extension could be demolished and removed and the original front elevation returned to its former glory with a proposed 2 storey apartment block to the rear to be attached to the existing dwelling house by means of a glazed link that would serve as a means of an integrated and compact design solution where the proposed density could be maintained. The north elevation

of the existing dwelling could be modified if necessary with some additional window installations as it faces in the direction of the Town Centre.’ In this way I accept that there are reasonable alternatives to developing the site that would protect the key vernacular structure in the immediate environs that defines the area’s uniqueness and links it with the past. This approach is provided for in objective HE 16-21 which seeks to sensitively develop in a manner that respects the character, pattern and tradition of existing places, materials and built forms and that fit appropriately into the landscape.

10.3.4. The applicant emphasises the unsympathetic addition to the building where it presents to the street frontage at a point overlooking the riverbank open space. While I accept that this is an incongruous feature in the streetscape it remains a subordinate modification and its existence does not warrant the removal of the entire original structure. It is a substantial six bay building and of type suited to the policies in the development plan and national policy in respect re-use and adaptation. The alterations and more modern interventions can be reversed or adapted and having reviewed the conservation and related reports for the applicant and planning authority, I consider, give scope for some flexibility to adapt the building for a future use rather than supporting a case for its demolition.

10.3.5. In view of the foregoing, in my judgement, the demolition would be inconsistent with the strategic objective to promote local character within the townscape and villagescape of Cork county settlement network by responding and reinforcing locally distinctive patterns of development, landscape and culture and protecting the historic environment. The objective HE 16-19 is quite clear in supporting the retention of such vernacular heritage in the county and I concur that to permit demolition in this case would materially contravene this objective. This objective is I consider reasonable in the context of the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) which in Section 1 provide a rationale for protecting our architectural heritage: ‘Structures can be read as historic evidence just like written documents and can aid the understanding of past conditions and of how society changes. Social history is revealed by structures.’ The means to achieve this by the planning authority are acknowledged in its statutory powers: ‘Planning authorities are empowered to protect the architectural heritage, in the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development within their respective functional areas, and

to prevent its deterioration, loss or damage. This will be reflected in the adoption of suitable policies for protecting the architectural heritage in their development plans and giving practical effect to them through their development control decisions, generally by liaison between planning officers and conservation officers.’ Accordingly I consider permission should be refused on the basis of the proposed demolition.

10.4. Urban Design Value

- 10.4.1. It is argued that the benefits of the proposed scheme outweigh any perceived benefits in the retention of the extant house. The benefits of the scheme are multi factored and are considered by the applicant to address placemaking and urban design in addition to traffic safety benefits derived from the proposed widening of the road where there is presently a pinch point due to the gable end of the house along Harrison Place.
- 10.4.2. Table 3.1 in volume 1 of the Development Plan sets out these principles under the headings, character and identity, continuity and enclosure, quality of the public realm/open space, ease of movement legibility, adaptability, diversity and vibrancy. Under the heading of character and identity, it states, the strategic objective is to promote local character within the townscape and villagescape of Cork County settlement network by responding to and reinforcing locally distinctive patterns of development, landscape and culture and protecting the historic environment. The local outcomes are stated to be elements of local distinctiveness such as local materials, building forms and elements including fenestration patterns, awnings, roof profiles and features should inform the design and detailing of new development...’
- 10.4.3. While I accept that there are many merits of the proposal as a greenfield development in terms of defining streetscapes, enhancing footpaths and the public realm with tree planting and interactive frontages while also providing generous open space with nature based drainage, I consider the overriding issue of demolition of the existing house inherently runs counter to promoting local character and reinforcing a sense of place and distinctiveness or the strengthening of the local character. I do not consider the demolition of this intrinsic building to be sensitive to its immediate townscape and local historic context. I therefore concur that the permission for the development involving such demolition would contravene objective PL 3-1 in respect

of Building Design, Movement and Quality of the Public Realm which aims to 'Support measures to improve building design quality, accessibility and movement including investment in quality public realm across the settlement network of the County linked to the following design criteria. I refer to sub section a) which aims 'To achieve/ reinforce a better sense of place and distinctiveness strengthening local character', and also to subsection b) which aims 'to create a design that is sensitive to the history and heritage context of a town / village setting and provides for protection of heritage features and non-structural heritage that are important and intrinsic part of the distinctiveness and character of the settlement such as historic boundaries (stone and earthen), pillars and gates, street furnishing, paving and kerbing, trees, hedgerows;'

10.5. Impact on traffic safety

- 10.5.1. Residents in the area object to the car parking and likely traffic movements associated with the proposed development by virtue of its density and also by virtue of the car parking ratio which does not provide one space per dwelling. I consider the applicant makes a reasonable case for the car parking ratio of 9 spaces for 14 units, having regard to the proximity of the units to the town and its services therein and the policies in the Development Plan (TM 12 -2 and TM 12-9) support this approach as is supported in national policy.
- 10.5.2. Another perspective on the proposal is that the existing road alignment is substandard, and an improved alignment has considerable traffic safety benefits, and I note no objection from a roads engineering perspective of the PA . I note the existing road carriageway along Harrison Place measures approximately 4.55m at the house gable and this width extends for a distance of about 20m from its junction with New Line Road. It then narrows with pinch points in the order of 3m beyond the gable of the house. While I accept that the widening of the road may provide for an improved movement of traffic and passing vehicles, the width of 4.5m is I consider acceptable for a short distance on an established urban road in the context of the standards set out in DMURS. I refer to the use of pinch points as a traffic calming measure. The removal of the wall beyond the house gable would permit widening for a passing bay and thereby enhance traffic safety without removing a building of character. The Council may also consider widening on the other side where it is

open space, subject to the normal statutory provisions. I say this without prejudice and simply to underline how there are potential alternatives to demolishing the house should there be an overriding need to widen the road at this point.

10.5.3. Accordingly, having regard to the modest scale of development and traffic generated on an established loop road with alternative access onto the New Line Road, I do not consider a refusal permission on the basis of traffic volume and associated hazard is warranted. I accept however that the parallel parking at the junction along Harrison Place is not best placed for safety purposes. A revision to car parking could address this matter.

10.5.4. Nor do I consider the benefits of a road widening scheme in terms of traffic flow and safety to outweigh the importance of retaining a building of character. On balance I do not consider traffic safety to be a determining factor in either granting or refusing permission.

10.6. **Water Quality**

10.6.1. The issue of infrastructure capacity was not considered to be an issue by the planning authority in its consideration of the case and in this regard, I note the lack of objection or any substantive infrastructural issues arising in the internal technical reports or from Uisce Eireann in 2024. However, under the provisions of the Water Framework Directive, which require a screening assessment, the issue of water quality has thrown up significant issues as set out in detail in section 7.0 of this report. The substantive issue in this regard relates to the poor status of the receiving waters of the Charleville wastewater treatment plant combined with the considerable exceedance of its emission limits as set down in the EPA Discharge License. I note that this matter similarly arose in the case of small-scale housing development in the same townland also within the town. Although in that case the surface water and foul sewer were combined and loading and impacts were somewhat different. The Commission in its Order acknowledged the matter but in view of the substantive reason for refusal decided not to seek any further submissions on the matter.

10.6.2. In this case I consider there is a basis to refuse permission on the basis that:

Having regard to the data in Uisce Eireann Annual Environmental Report on the Charleville Wastewater Treatment Plant, notwithstanding the letter of feasibility of connection to the applicant, the Commission is not satisfied that Charleville Wastewater Treatment Plant has can accommodate a connection for the proposed development without exacerbating an exceedance of its emission limits as set in its Discharge License. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development is likely to cause serious water pollution due to the inadequate capacity of the local authority waste water treatment plant to adequately treat the waste water from the proposed development in addition to the existing load on the plant. It is considered that the proposed development would result in non-compliance with the "combined approach" -(as defined in the Waste Water Discharge (Authorisation) Regulations 2007 (S.I. No. 684 of 2007) due to the waste water from the development impacting on the local authority waste water treatment plant so that the discharge from the treatment plant in conjunction with existing discharges to the receiving waters would result in the receiving waters not achieving the environmental objectives established for these waters which is 'Good' status to be met by 2027. It is further considered that it is not possible to achieve such controls or limits by way of condition and consequently the Commission must refuse permission having regard to Regulation 43 of the Waste Water Discharge (Authorisation) Regulations 2007.

10.6.3. This, however, is a new issue in this case and in the interest of reasonableness the Commission may wish to invite further submissions in this regard, for example, to clarify the anomaly in the listed significant pressures but which excludes the WWTP notwithstanding the AER records of ammonia levels downstream of the discharge point. However, in view of the substantive reason for refusal, I do not consider this step to be entirely warranted.

10.7. Density of Development

10.7.1. The issue of density is raised in the observation as grounds for objection. The density proposed is in the order of 70 units per hectare which is at the higher end for the site location. Having reviewed the Development plan and Guidelines for Apartments and Compact Settlement Guidelines (as listed in section 5.0), I do not

consider the density overly excessive. The planning authority refers to the Compact Settlement Guidelines which are in compliance with the NPF Strategic Objective for compact urban form. They provide guidance on achievable levels of density for urban areas in section 3. The applicant makes the case for 50-100 range being applicable whereas the planning authority applies a lower level by applying an urban neighbourhood category. The guidelines place emphasis on context and in view of the heritage value of the house on site I consider the density to be a secondary issue. Ultimately it is not a site of such strategic importance in urban renewal or densification of the town. It is not included in lists for such development in Volume 3. A similar density could be achievable subject to meeting other criteria while retaining the existing house as pointed out by the Senior Architect for the PA. On balance I do not consider density by itself to constitute grounds for refusal of permission or justification for the demolition of the house at this location.

11.0 AA Screening

- 11.1.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 11.1.2. The site is located in an urban serviced site within the development boundary of Charleville town. The nearest European sites are the - Blackwater River (Cork/Waterford) SAC (site code: 002170) which is approx. 3.5 km to the south and - Ballyhoura Mountains SAC (site code: 002036) which is over 7 km to the southeast. There is no hydrological connection to these sites. The river to the north of the site (at a distance of 45m) and to which the surface water drains is part of the Shannon catchment and the associated SAC/SPA are over 30km to the north and an even greater distance downstream along which the dissipation and dilution factor would be considerable.
- 11.1.3. The proposed development comprises the construction of a modestly scaled residential development and ancillary site development works including nature-based drainage measures and limited run-off. The proposed development will discharge wastewater to the public foul sewer and as identified in the WFD screening assessment there are localized issues in term of water quality of the receiving waters.

In view of the distance involved from the receiving waters downstream of the Charleville stream I do not consider this is likely to have any significant impact on habitats or qualifying interest of any European site connected to the waters.

11.1.4. I note the planning authority has screened out the need for appropriate assessment and I concur with this.

11.1.5. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. It is therefore determined that Appropriate Assessment [under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000] is not required.

11.1.6. This conclusion is based on:

- The nature, scale and location of the development,
- Standard construction and operational surface water pollution controls that would be employed regardless of proximity to a European site and the effectiveness of same.
- The absence of a direct hydrological link to any European Site and the distance of the site from any European Sites and the limited potential for pathways to any European Site.

11.1.7. No measures intended to avoid or reduce harmful effects on European sites were taken into account in reaching this conclusion.

12.0 Recommendation

Having considered the grounds of appeal and the responses thereto, it is my recommendation based on my assessment of the proposal, the site and all submissions and observations that the proposed development in the context of the relevant provisions of the Development Plan and national policy and guidance be refused permission for the following reasons.

Reasons and Considerations

- 1) The proposed development involves the demolition of substantial house and what the Commission considers, by reason of its age, size, form, features and siting, to be a vernacular building of intrinsic value to the local character, distinctiveness, sense of place and history in this area of Charleville town. Objective HE16-19 a) of the Cork County Development Plan 2022 to 2028 seeks to protect and maintain and enhance the established character forms features and setting of vernacular buildings and the contribution they make to local character history and sense of place. There is also a presumption in favour of retaining vernacular buildings and encouraging their reuse under objective HE16-19 (c). Furthermore PL3-1 (a) and (b) seeks to achieve/reinforce a better sense of place and distinctiveness. These objectives are considered reasonable having regard to the Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authority (2011). It is therefore considered that the proposed development would materially contravene objective HE 16-19 a) and c) and objective PL3-1 a) and b) of the Cork County Development Plan 2022 to 2028 and that the proposed development would 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.

Suzanne Kehely
Senior Planning Inspector
21st November 2025

Appendix 1 - EIA Pre-Screening – Form 1

An Bord Pleanála	ABP-321128- 24		
Case Reference			
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition and construction of 14 apartments in an urban site house on an urban infill site.		
Development Address	New Line /Harrison Place, Charleville		
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	X
		No	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?			
Yes	X	Class 10(b)(i) 'Construction of more than 500 dwellings units' Class 10(b)(iv) 'urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere	Proceed to Q3.
No			
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	X		Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes	X	14 no residential units in 2no two-storey blocks, road widening, demolition on a site of less than 0.2 ha.	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)

5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
Yes		Screening Determination required
No	X	Screening determination remains as above (Q1 to Q4)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination – Form 2

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-321128- 24
Proposed Development	Demolition and construction of 14 apartments in an urban site houses on an urban infill site.
Development Address	New Line /Harrison Place, Charleville
<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. This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</p>	
<p>Characteristics of proposed development</p> <p>(In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).</p>	<p>The proposed development involves demolition of a house and outbuildings/sheds and construction of a two-storey apartment development of 14 units with ancillary communal open space and consequent road widening south of the River Glen (50m north) . It is within the development boundary of the town and is serviced. four</p> <p>The proposal is consistent in urban form with neighbouring development reinforces the emerging urban character; construction materials will be typical of an urban environment, and any construction impacts would be local and temporary in nature, and the implementation of a standard Construction Management Plan will satisfactorily address potential impacts.</p> <p>Operational waste will be managed via a Waste Management Plan.</p> <p>The site is not at risk of flooding as indicated in the FRA. There are no SEVESO/COMAH sites in the vicinity of this location.</p> <p>The site coverage represents a modest intensification of building footprint and does not involve the use of substantial natural resources or by itself give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. However the</p>

	<p>issue of the ‘combined effect’ on water quality is potentially an issue as highlighted and captured in the WFD Screening.</p> <p>The development, in overall terms, by virtue of its type and scale, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health. Issues of built heritage are addressed in the planning assessment within the scope of planning considerations.</p>
<p>Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).</p>	<p>The site is not located within a designated protection area for a natural landscape, habitat or any species. The site does contain a Signiant building of local vernacular interest</p> <p>The development will implement a range of natural drainage systems which will control surface water run-off. The site is served by a local urban road network, along which active travel would be available for future residents. Vehicular traffic impact is likely to be negligible.</p> <p><u>Surface Water:</u> Impacts on water quality will be mitigated by standard good practice construction stage measures and the operational surface water drainage system.</p> <p><u>Foul drainage:</u> the proposal is reliant on connection to the Charleville WWTP which has an amber status and based on the latest AER is breaching its discharge licence with notably considerably elevated ammonia levels</p>
<p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity,</p>	<p>The proposed development while involving the loss of prominent vernacular architecture contrary to built heritage policy (as addressed in the planning assessment) will otherwise not be out of scale with the prevailing urban form. The principle of intensification with a modest building form would not by itself be likely to result in significant environmental effects.</p>

duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	<p>The additional loading on the wastewater treatment plant is likely to exacerbate the exceedance of the Discharge Licence limits having regard to considerations are set out in section 7.0 of this report. This is a significant localised issue addressed within the provisions of the WFD and given its scale and magnitude is not likely to generate significant wider environmental impacts that warrant a full EIA.</p> <p>Accordingly, having regard to the nature of the proposed development, its location relative to sensitive habitats/features, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.</p>		
Conclusion			
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA		Yes or No
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.		Yes
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.		No
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIAR required.		No

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

DP/ADP: _____ **Date:** _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix 4			
WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Bord Pleanála ref.	ABP- 321128	Townland, address	New Line/Harrison Place, Charleville, Cork
Description of project		<p>Demolitions works and construction of c.1000 sq.m. of development of a site of c. 0.17hectares.</p> <p>The Report on Engineering Services describes the context of site services and proposals. The FRA confirms the site is not at risk of flooding.</p>	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening		<p>The site is a low-density single house site within the development boundary of Charleville and within a serviced urban area. It has a moderate slope sloping downwards in a northerly direction towards the River Glen (Charleville stream on EPA maps).</p> <p>Existing stormwater services exist on New Line road and the current network outfalls to the Glen River and the site is currently connected to this.</p>	
Proposed surface water details		<p>Propose to discharge to existing storm sewer to the north of the site. It is described as a drain to the river.</p> <p>Propose to incorporate SuDs as part of the development with low levels of discharging to the sewer at a managed flow rate of two litres per hectare which</p>	

	<p>equates to 0.34 liters per second for the size of 0.17 hectares. This would attenuate the surface runoff and ease loading on the public drain.</p> <p>SuDs Measures Include rainwater harvesting, green roof in the flat area, permeable pavements, tree pits, swales and rain gardens. These are categorized in terms of pollutant hazards and table 2.4 .3 of the Report on Engineering illustrates negative indices which demonstrate enough treatment is provided for total suspended solids, metal and hydrocarbons typically generated by the proposed land uses such as residential roofs, roads and driveways.</p>
Water supply	Public Water Mains.
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues	To foul sewer which is connected to the WWTP with capacity issues.
Other matters	<p>The Charleville wastewater treatment plant is in breach of its Discharge license and has amber status which indicates limitations on its capacity. Recent data in the Uisce Eireann AER since the UE letter of connection feasibility issued to the applicant highlights significant breaches of ammonia and ortho phosphate levels which indicate that the wwtp presents a significant pressure on the receiving waters of poor status. This pressure however is not formally identified on the EPA website. (see section 7 of this report)</p>

Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection						
Identified water body	Distance to (m)	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature
River – River Glen	45m north	CHARLEVILLE STREAM_010 IE_SH_24C02 0780	Poor	At Risk	Nutrients, organic	Yes – Via foul sewer to WWTP which has a discharge licence
Groundwater	Underlying site	Charleville IE_SH_G_055	Poor	At risk	Not stated	Yes – Via Surface water run-off
Step 4: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage.						

CONSTRUCTION PHASE							
No	Component	Water body receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' /'uncertain' proceed to Stage2.
1.	<u>Surface water run-off</u>	CHARLEVILLE STREAM_010 IE_SH_24C0 20780	Existing surface water drainage system via the public stormwater drain which discharges to the Glen River	Siltation, hydrocarbon spillages, siltation, ph concrete	Standard construction practice CEMP could be agreed.	No	Screened Out

2.	<u>Earthworks and seepage to Ground water</u>	Charleville IE_SH_G_055	The pathway is through soil.	Hydrocarbon spillages	As above	No	Screened Out
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
1	<u>Surface water run-off</u>	CHARLEVILLE STREAM_010 IE_SH_24C020 780	Existing surface water drainage via foul sewer which discharges to a water body	Siltation, hydrocarbon spillages, siltation, ph concrete	Standard maintenance. SUDS/nature based measures proposed to address surface water run-off before discharging to public sewer,	No	Screened Out
	<u>Connection to foul sewer</u>	CHARLEVILLE STREAM_010 IE_SH_24C020 780	Via the WWTP which discharges to this surface water	Effluent loading with associated increased level of ammonia & other organic compounds (ortho-phosphate)	WWTP to take measures to comply within its Discharge license. Potential capacity relies on additional loading not significantly breaching	Yes – as mitigation not certain. The additional loading is likely to exacerbate exceedance of emission limits..	Screened In

					the combined approach under Art. 43 of the Wastewater Discharge Regulations		
2	<u>Run-off and seepage to Ground water</u>	Charleville IE_SH_G_055	The pathway is through soil if unfiltered .	Hydrocarbon spillages	SUDS/nature-based measures which incorporate pollution mitigation for the nature of specific land uses. uses. Table 8 <u>Mitigation Indices Calculation</u> of the Report of Engineering services indicates sufficient treatment is provided. This will address surface water run-off and dissipated run-off to groundwater.	No	Screened Out

DECOMMISSIONING PHASE					
N/A					

STAGE 2: ASSESSMENT					
Details of Mitigation Required to Comply with WFD Objectives					
Surface Water					
Developme nt/ Activity	<u>Objective 1:Surface Water</u> Prevent deterioration of the status of all bodies of surface water	<u>Objective 2:Surface Water</u> Protect, enhance and restore all bodies of surface water with aim of achieving good status	<u>Objective 3:Surface Water</u> Protect and enhance all artificial and heavily modified bodies of water with aim of achieving good ecological potential and good surface water chemical status	<u>Objective 4: Surface Water</u> Progressively reduce pollution from priority substances and cease or phase out emission, discharges and losses of priority substances	Does this component comply with WFD Objectives 1, 2, 3 & 4? (if answer is no, a development cannot proceed without a derogation under art. 4.7)

	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 1:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 2:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 3:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 4:	
Foul connection to WWTP	Compliance with Discharge License limits	Compliance with Discharge License limits	NA	NA	No – See section 7.0 in main body of this report for conclusion