



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

### ABP-321397-24

#### Development

Erection of 5 chalet units and a communal facilities building to provide sustainable tourist accommodation. A proposed wastewater treatment system and all associated ancillary services and works.

#### Location

Castletown Road, Rathnamuddagh, Dysart, Co. Westmeath.

#### Planning Authority

Westmeath County Council

#### Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2460339

#### Applicant(s)

Torleh Limited

#### Type of Application

Permission

#### Planning Authority Decision

Refuse permission

#### Type of Appeal

First Party

#### Appellant(s)

Torleh Limited

#### Observer(s)

Lough Ennell Trout Preservation  
Association  
Anthony and Mary Cassidy

Pat and Marie Kincaid  
Raymond and Sandra Gavigan  
Dysart Residents Association  
Sean and Laura Carley  
Jennifer Fay  
James Fay  
Brendan Flanagan  
Adrian Murphy

**Date of Site Inspection**

19<sup>th</sup> February 2025

**Inspector**

Emma Nevin

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The appeal site comprises a relatively flat greenfield site with a stated area of 0.58ha and is situated within the townland of Rathnamuddagh within the rural settlement of Dysart. The site is bounded to the north by the R391 and to the south by L-1235 together with residential dwellings on the opposite side of the L-1235. The site is located c. 11km southwest of Mullingar. A row of residential dwellings are located immediately east of the application site whilst agricultural land bounds the site to the west. There is a public house located to the northeast of the site.
- 1.2. The site is bounded by mature roadside hedgerows along the northern boundary (R319) and along the boundary eastern boundary, and the southern boundary addressing the L-1235 comprises low scrub hedging.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the development of tourism chalet accommodation comprising.
  - The erection of 5 no. chalet units and communal facilities building to provide sustainable tourist accommodation totalling 516 sq. m. to facilitate the accommodation demands of visiting tourists,
  - The provision of associated visitor parking (9 no.), secure cycle parking (20 no.)
  - New proposed vehicular access from the L1235,
  - Proposed pedestrian only access from the existing field access (R391),
  - Proposed wastewater treatment system and all associated ancillary services,
  - Landscaping proposals to integrate, promote and enhance biodiversity.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. The Planning Authority refused permission on the 10<sup>th</sup> of November 2024, for the following reasons:

*“1. It is considered that the proposed development providing for tourism accommodation located on an unserviced rural site on the outskirts of Dysart, the proposed development is considered to be ad hoc and an unsustainable form of development in this rural area that provides for accommodation with no sustainable connection to any existing tourism asset and no footpaths serving the site. Moreover, the proposed site is far removed from services including retail and social facilities and accordingly, the proposed development is therefore considered to be contrary to policy objectives CPO 6.25 and CPO 6.27 of the Westmeath County Development Plan 2021-2027 which seeks to encourage tourist related developments to locate within existing serviced settlements and at suitable locations. Furthermore, the proposed development would contribute to the encroachment of random rural development in the area, would militate against the preservation of the rural environment and would set an undesirable precedent for other similar inappropriate development in the vicinity. Accordingly, the proposed development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

*2. In the absence of sufficient details submitted to the contrary together with incorrect reference to a sewer located to the southwest of the site to serve the proposed development and in applying the precautionary principle in identifying operational phase pathways for likely significant effects which includes hydrological connection from the site to Lough Ennell which may result in indirect effects and pollution of ground water, it is considered that the proposed development may pose a risk of significant effects on the conservation objectives and integrity of Lough Ennell SPA (Natura 2000 site). The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the EU Habitats Directive and CPO 12.7 of the Westmeath County Development Plan 2021-2027 and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area”.*

### **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

- 3.2.1. Planning Report dated 7<sup>th</sup> November 2024 has been provided.
- 3.2.2. This planning application was assessed under the Westmeath County Development Plan, 2021 – 2027.
- 3.2.3. The planners report considered that the “main issue arising in the subject application relates to the suitability of the site for the development as proposed, impact on existing residential amenity and compliance with development plan policies and provisions relating to tourist accommodation” and concluded that permission be refused for the reasons noted in Section 3.1.1 above.
- 3.2.4. Other Technical Reports
- Fire Officer: Report received noting - Fire safety certificate required for the proposed Communal Building No objections to this application subject to adequate access and water being provided for use by the Fire & Rescue Service.
  - District Engineer: Report received requesting Further information with regard to lighting.

### **3.3. Prescribed Bodies**

- Failte Ireland: Report received noting - from a tourism perspective Fáilte Ireland is supportive of the proposed development in line with all proper planning, environmental and sustainability requirements being met.

### **3.4. Third Party Observations**

- 3.4.1. Twenty One (21) third party submissions were received. 11 no. of the third party submissions were in favour of the proposed development. 10 no. of the third party submission objected to the proposed development, the main issues raised within the objections can be summarised as follows:
- Non-compliance with the Development Plan.
  - Principle of Development – the site is zoned agricultural and is not designated for tourism or commercial. Overdevelopment and inadequate services.
  - Proposal is unjustified.

- Adverse impact upon residential amenity.
- The transient nature of the proposed tourist pods does not contribute to the long-term housing needs of the area.
- Traffic and Road Safety.
- Poor Public Transport Connectivity.
- Environmental and Water Contamination Risks.
- Landscape and Visual Impact.
- Impact on Community Services.
- Depreciate Property values for nearby residential dwellings.
- Wastewater & Appropriate Assessment. There is a direct hydrological connection to the site and Lough Ennell SAC/SPA and Stage 2 NIS is required.
- This is not a tourist area and has no tourist attractions.
- The proposed is not located near either of Westmeath's tourism "critical mass centres" (Athlone and Mullingar), has no services, and has no direct connection with the greenway or canal apart from on a very busy road which is dangerous to cycle on with a series of blind dips and turns.
- In recent years the only B&B in the area closed due to lack of clients. Clearly this is not an area that tourists are attracted to.
- Concern what the facility would end up being repurposed for if the proposed tourism use fails.
- Proposed development would significantly affect the way of life in the village; this is a small rural locale with a closely knit community which is not suitable for tourism.
- Proximity to Church and national school.
- Development will lead to anti-social behaviour and negatively impact upon residential amenity.

- Development too small and doesn't have the facilities to adequately stimulate a tourist while staying here.

## 4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. None pertaining to the appeal site.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The Westmeath County Development Plan 2021-2027 is the relevant development plan. The site is located within a rural residential area.

- 5.1.2. Relevant Development Plan Policies and Objectives:

- General Tourism Development Policy Objectives

CPO 6.2 Promote the development and strengthening of the overall value of Westmeath as a tourist destination by encouraging the enhancement and development of sustainable and high-quality visitor attractions, activities and infrastructure, enabling an increase in the overall capacity and long-term development of the county's tourism industry, subject to appropriate siting and design criteria and the protection of environmentally sensitive areas.

CPO 6.9 Continue to support the development and expansion of tourism-related enterprise including immersive visitor attractions, services and accommodation and food and craft businesses, particularly those offering a visitor experience, such as tastings, tours and demonstrations.

CPO 6.10 Encourage local industry and community engagement with all relevant Fáilte Ireland and Tourism Ireland initiatives to maximise benefit to the county and continue to work with Fáilte Ireland to build our visitor offering in line with established regional experience brands.

CPO 6.16 Promote sustainable tourism in ways that positively enhance the environment and liaise with tourism providers to encourage the provision of "eco-tourism" schemes including the development of a "Circular Economy" approach to tourism.

- Tourism Infrastructure and Visitor Services Policy Objectives

CPO 6.25 Promote tourism-related developments in existing settlements within the Settlement Hierarchy, subject to existing carrying capacity.

CPO 6.27 Facilitate the development of high-quality tourist accommodation such as hotels, hostels, B&B's / guesthouses, caravan and camping etc. at suitable locations, in both urban and rural settings throughout the county, subject to ensuring a high standard of design, layout, landscape and environmental protection, the provision of adequate infrastructure and compliance with best practice planning considerations.

CPO 6.29 Encourage that certain tourism accommodation developments comply with Fáilte Ireland quality standards, in particular caravan and camping facilities, to ensure such developments can contribute to the development of the tourism sector to their maximum potential.

CPO 8.70 Support the re-route and upgrade of the Westmeath Way walking trail, bringing it offroad and connecting to the Old Rail Trail at Dysart, ensuring its status as an accredited National Waymarked way.

CPO 16.52 Structures proposed should generally comprise a high-quality design with sensitive siting and design so as not to interfere with the visual setting of sensitive visual attractions. Justification for proposal provided by reference to anticipated demand. Adequate signage, and interpretation panels, to inform and enhance the visitor experience and assist in proper site management. In terms of sustainable tourism and recreation, facilities should be located within existing structures, or in buildings of character requiring renovation or in traditional farmhouses, where possible and if appropriate. Where new buildings are proposed, they should be modest in scale, sensitively located and designed having regard to existing buildings, topography and landscaped and be adequately serviced and suitably managed.

CPO 12.7 Assess any plan or project in accordance with Article 6 of the Habitats Directive to determine whether the plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on the site either individually or cumulatively upon the integrity, conservation objectives and qualifying interest of any Natura 2000 Site.

- Landscape Character



The application site falls within two designated landscape character areas namely, 'South Central Hills' and 'Lough Ennell & South Eastern Corridor'.

- 5.1.3. "LCA Area 8 South Central Hills - This Character Area includes the hilly pasture land that exists to the east of Ballymore, stretching almost as far as Lough Ennell, north as far as the Royal Canal Corridor and is bounded to the south by an area predominantly characterised by esker systems. The area is typified by smooth, gentle hills and undulating pastures, with occasional northwest, south-east ridges. The highest point within this area is 200 metres, which is at Knockastia, Coolatore, a volcanic outcrop just south of the Hill of Uisneach, which also has the steepest slopes in the Landscape Character area. This hilltop allows panoramic views across neighbouring counties and the approach to the hill, particularly from the Ballymore Road offers impressive opportunities to appreciate its scale. The Character Area also includes part of a system of eskers at Streamstown, which are displayed though a series of low ridges traversing the landscape in a northerly direction, resulting in a rural feel to these local roads as the land rises on either side. The area contains a number of small villages and clustered settlements but has remained quite rural in nature.

LCA area 10 Lough Ennell and South East Corridor - This Character Area comprises pasture land of mixed productivity. Lough Ennell is situated to the western side of this Landscape Character Area (LCA) and is designated as an Area of High Amenity, SPA and SAC. A number of preserved views are listed from the R446 between Tyrrellspass and Rochfortbridge. The area around Lough Ennell and particularly to the south of the lake is characterised by scrub land with a mixture of marsh, bog and poor pasture land. There is also a large tract of bog to the east of Rochfortbridge and Milltownpass along the county boundary. The bog areas in this LCA are mainly exploited but some have been left intact. This area has a large number of old demesnes, which are easily recognisable in the landscape with the existence of fine mature hardwood trees and estate walls in some cases. Settlements within this landscape have developed mainly along the main road network. These include Kinnegad, Milltownpass, Rochfortbridge, and Tyrrellspass along the former N6. Recreational areas have been developed on the shores of Lough Ennell including Ladestown, Lilliput and Tudenham. The M6 traverses the southern part of the LCA.

The N52 By-Pass has also added to the transport corridor around Mullingar”.

## **5.2. Water Framework Directive**

- 5.2.1. The Water Framework Directive (WFD) Directive 2000/60/EC focuses on ensuring good qualitative and quantitative health, i.e., on reducing and removing pollution and on ensuring that there is enough water to support wildlife at the same time as human needs.
- 5.2.2. The key objectives of the WFD are set out in Article 4 of the Directive. It requires Member States to use their River Basin Management Plans (RBMPs) and Programmes of Measures (PoMs) to protect and, where necessary, restore water bodies in order to reach good status, and to prevent deterioration. Good status means both good chemical and good ecological status. It establishes a framework for the protection of all inland surface waters, transitional waters, coastal waters and groundwaters.

## **5.3. Natural Heritage Designations**

- 5.3.1. The subject site is not located within or adjacent to any European Site. The closest European Sites, part of the Natura 2000 Network, are:
- Lough Ennell Special Area of Conservation (SAC).
  - Lough Ennell Special Protection Area (SPA).

## **5.4. EIA Screening**

- 5.4.1. I refer the Coimisiún to the completed Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendix A.
- 5.4.2. Having regard to the nature, size, and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations, I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, therefore, is not required.

## **6.0 The Appeal**

### **6.1. Grounds of Appeal**

6.1.1. A detailed first party appeal has been received by the applicant's agent against the decision of Westmeath County Council to refuse permission under Reg. Ref. 2460339. The appeal includes a detailed report on the local authority decision and can be summarised as follows: -

- The proposed development is not contrary to Policy Objectives CPO 6.25, and CPO 6.27 of the Development Plan as it relates to the interrelated matters of the site suitability and the principle of tourist development at this location.
- The appellant highlights that there is overriding policy support for tourism development, as additional tourist accommodation in urban and rural locations.
- The application is in alignment with local, regional and national planning policies as relate to tourism and rural development in particular the Development Plan, which supports the sustainable growth of the tourism sector as a key driver of rural economic development in the county.
- The decision does not reflect the core strategy cross-cutting theme of Tourism being central to the rural enterprise objectives, tourism objectives, enterprise and employment objectives.
- The decision does not reflect the national, regional, and ministerial objectives of the regenerative benefits of investing, financial and promoting tourism accommodation.
- The proposal is supported by the Development Plan, by expanding accommodation options, encouraging visitor dwelling type in the county and providing an eco-friendly/sustainable tourism experience in tandem with existing and planned active travel tourism routes and destinations in the surrounding area.
- The decision of the planning authority respectfully contravenes the overriding policy objectives in support of the proposals.

- Dysart is an appropriate location for tourist accommodation which is strategically located near key greenways and outdoor attractions.
- The proposed development will complement the existing pattern of development in Dysart.
- The proposal would not disrupt the rural character of the local area and is supported by the necessary existing or proposed infrastructure.
- The proposal is not ad hoc, out of character or random and is presented as a low impact, high quality and attractive contribution to the area.
- Any potential constraints as that exist in relation to the existing site conditions, i.e. topography or visibility are presented as being appropriately considered and mitigated by the proposed development, landscaping and screening vegetation.
- The appellant questions the extent that viewing the development would represent an adverse impact on visual amenity.
- The proposed development will not have an adverse effect on amenity in the area.
- Any noise, illumination or human activity taking place on the site during the operation of the proposed development would not present an adverse impact on residential amenity in the area. Conditions can be attached with additional details to be agreed to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority to ensure same.
- No submissions raising concern were made from An Taisce or Department Applications Unit in terms of the impact of the proposed development on the conservation objectives of the Lough Ennell SPA or any other Natura 2000 Site.
- The site specific conservation objectives and associated qualifying interests for the Lough Ennell SAC or SPA have been appropriately considered in the Screening for Appropriate Assessment which has been amended to rectify the previous incorrect reference to a sewer located to the southwest of the site – included as Appendix B of the appeal submission.

- Wastewater, storm, and surface water infrastructure submitted as part of the planning application has been designed to ensure the proposed development will not lead to deterioration of water quality in Lough Ennell, alternation of hydrological regimes or an impact on protected species or habitats associated with the SAC and SPA designations.
- The appellant notes that no issue was raised in the planners' report or engineering report in relation to road and traffic safety grounds.
- It is confirmed that lighting will be installed that meets the required levels and details can be agreed by way of a condition.
- The landscaping plan has introduced vegetal screening where possible to reduce the impact of lighting.
- The appellant confirms that an appropriate fire safety certification will be acquired in accordance with the Building Regulations.

## **6.2. Planning Authority Response**

- 6.2.1. No response received from Westmeath County Council.

## **6.3. Observations**

- 6.3.1. Ten (10) no. observations have been received. Eight (8) no observations object to the proposed development. The issues raised have been summarised as follows:
- The appeal is unfair and unbalanced showing no regard for Dysart Residents or concerns raised in the planners' report.
  - Pedestrian safety due to lack of footpaths.
  - There is no alternative to deal with empty cabins.
  - The development will be of little benefit to employment in the area.
  - Dysart cannot be seen as a tourist area.
  - Traffic congestion due to location directly adjacent to Dysart church car park and school.
  - Anti-social behaviour associated with the development.

- The site is very low waterlogged area, which could cause pollutants and contaminate the local wells and rivers.
- No on site security available which would cause serious disturbances.
- There is an incorrect declaration about the existence of sewer facilities in Dysart Village.
- Dysart is an unserviced village.
- Concerns regarding the justification of the proposed development.
- Suitability of the site for development.
- Concerns regarding the objectivity in the submission made by the Mullingar Chamber of Commerce in support of the application.
- Concerns raised in relation to the site characterisation report.
- Impact negatively on adjoining residential amenity, privacy and security.
- There is very little support for this development in the Dysart area.
- How can the discharge of wastewater be managed and contained on this site.
- The land should be retained as agriculture.
- The lack of assessment of potential impacts on the water quality of Lough Ennell from the proposed development is in conflict with the aims of the Water Action Plan 2024.
- The potential impacts on water environment of Lough Ennell SAC/SPA have not been assessed, contrary to requirements of the EU Habitats and Birds Directives.
- Inappropriate use of rural area and overdevelopment.
- Many of the supporters of the development are not located in the area.
- The site is prone to flooding and has a direct link to the Dysart river.
- There is a hydromorphological link between this site and the Dysart River and this has to be considered in the context of the area being a SAC.

- The proposed development, with a direct link to the river could/would impact negatively on the river.
- The site characterisation form, submitted with the application, shows that the ground is unsuitable due to high water table, poor drainage, etc.
- The alleged drafting error referenced in the appeal is very misleading and there has to be accountability and proper due diligence.
- There are numerous wells in the area that could be contaminated by the development.
- The future re-purposing of this accommodation to non-tourism related uses is worrying.
- The references to the Kilbeggan to Mullingar Greenway are premature.
- The Westmeath way is closed and overgrown in the Dysart area.
- There is no reference to the presence of the old 'mass path' which runs along the south-west Boundary.

6.3.2. Two observations have been received in support of the application. The issues raised have been summarised as follows:

- The application has the potential to significantly contribute to the development of sustainable and eco-conscious tourism.
- Aligns with regional and national tourism strategies.
- Precedent set by similar projects in the region.
- The role of ethical tours and sustainable tourism.
- Positive contribution to the local economy and environment.
- The provision of hot food in the adjoining public house to serve the development.
- Villages need people to survive.
- There is a local link bus providing access to Mullingar.

## **7.0 Assessment**

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the first party appeal (the subject matter of this appeal), the observations received, the site inspection and having regard to the relevant policies, objectives, and guidance, I am satisfied that the main issues to be considered are those raised in the grounds of appeal, and no other substantive issues arise. The main issues in determining this appeal are as follows:

- I. Principle of Development/Site Location
- II. Impact on residential amenity/visual impact/road network
- III. Waste Water Treatment,
- IV. Other Matters,
- V. Water Framework Directive, and
- VI. Appropriate Assessment.

This assessment represents my de novo consideration of all planning issues material to the proposed development.

### **7.2. Principle of Development/Site Location**

- 7.2.1. The planning authority refused permission on the basis that the proposed development located on an unserviced rural site, with no sustainable connection to any existing tourism asset, and as such would be contrary to policy objectives CPO 6.25 and CPO 6.27 of the Development Plan. It was further considered that the proposed development would contribute to the encroachment of random rural development in the area. I further note that the observations received on the appeal consider that the site is not suitable for this type of inappropriate development.
- 7.2.2. The appellant refutes the planning authority reason for refusal and considers that the policy objectives do not preclude or prevent tourism related development outside of existing settlements, which has been demonstrated by numerous other relevant policy objectives in the Development Plan. Support for the proposed development is also lent to the submission from Failte Ireland. It is considered that the proposed development aligns with a place-centred and regenerative approach to tourism. The location benefits from its location to a number of attractions and active travel routes



in the area. It is presented that the proposed development is not contrary to Policy Objectives CPO 6.25 and CPO 6.27.

7.2.3. Having regard to the principle of development, as outlined in the Westmeath County Development Plan, the Plan *“recognises that the provision of accommodation such as hotels, guesthouses, hostels, caravan and camping sites are essential to enable growth in the tourism sector. The Council shall support the development of tourism in the county by encouraging the provision of a wide range of tourist accommodation types and restricting development that would be likely to reduce the capacity of the resource or have a detrimental impact on the local environment. In general, such developments shall be encouraged to locate within or in close proximity to existing towns and villages where they can avail of existing public services, commercial and community facilities”*. I note that Objectives CPO 6.25 and CPO 6.27 serve the guiding policy for tourism accommodation developments in the County. These policy objectives underscore the importance of strategically locating tourist accommodation within settlements equipped with existing infrastructure to support such developments.

7.2.4. Following my site inspection and having regard to the site location, I share the concerns of the planning authority regarding the suitability of the proposed development in relation to available amenities. The site is located on the outskirts of the rural village of Dysart, which currently comprises a church, a national school and a public house. The settlement type in the area comprises predominately one-off houses. While the site is located adjacent to a village, it is evident that the that the proposed site lacks proximity to essential facilities such as retail and social facilities. This also raises concerns in respect to the dependency on car usage, which may in turn undermine the viability of the development and offering minimal economic benefit the existing rural area.

Conclusion:

7.2.5. While I note the appellants argument in respect to the overriding policy support for tourism development in the Development Plan, based on the aforementioned factors, it is my opinion that the proposed development fails to adhere to the objectives outlined in CPO 6.25 and CPO 6.27 of the Westmeath County Development Plan, 2001-2027, and permission should be refused in this instance.

### 7.3. Impact on residential Amenity/ Visual Impact/ Road Network

- 7.3.1. Concerns have been raised in relation to the potential impact of the proposed development on the adjoining residential amenity, in particular noise, visual amenity, security issues in respect to the users of the facility and issues like anti-social behaviour.

#### Residential Amenity and Visual Impact

- 7.3.2. The location of the proposed development within a rural setting adjoining residential dwellings is noted, however, the proposed cabins are located in a linear form running south to north and are set back from all adjoining site boundaries by 5.7 metres to 28.5 metres, respectfully. Regard is also had to the overall landholding associated with the proposed development and the position of the proposed structure within the lands. As such, I am satisfied that the proposal will not detract from adjoining residential amenity in respect of potential overlooking or overshadowing impacts.
- 7.3.3. In terms of noise, again I note the separation distances to the adjoining residential dwellings and the location and layout of the proposed development. The appellant considers that any noise generated by the site will be mitigated by the occasional nature of tourist accommodation occupancy and that not all the proposed units are likely to be in full occupation at all times. I do not consider that the proposal would result in an unacceptable disturbance to adjoining residential dwellings in relation to noise. Notwithstanding, in the event of a grant of permission, I would recommend the inclusion of a condition in respect to noise during construction and noise management within the proposed site by way of a site management plan.
- 7.3.4. In relation to the visual impact, the appellant has stated that it is unclear why the planning authority considers the proposal to represent an '*adverse impact*'. The appellant considers that the proposal makes use of a high quality design, layout and landscaping and would represent a positive contribution to the landscape. The proposed structures are all single storey in nature with the proposed chalets to a maximum height of 4.8 metres and the proposed communal building extending to a height of 5.75 metres. In terms of finishes the proposed structures will comprise of timber cladding and corrugated metal cladding, with associated timber decking and large windows. A design statement also accompanies the planning application.

- 7.3.5. There are no protected views being interfered with by the proposed development. I do consider that the design of the proposed development exhibits some sensitivity towards their rural environment in terms of height, form and materials. I also note the linear layout of the proposed development, which will in my opinion assist in its visual dominance when viewed from the adjoining roads. The existing hedgerows will also be retained. From the perspective of visual amenity, and based on the information submitted with the application, it is my assessment that the finished chalet and communal building structures and associated infrastructure are unlikely to result in a significant negative impact on the visual amenity of neighbouring properties or the rural area overall.
- 7.3.6. I note the concerns expressed regarding anti-social behaviour associated with the users of the facility. However, I am satisfied that adequate consideration has been given to designing the proposal could be managed accordingly to rule out anti-social behaviour. Notwithstanding, issues in relation to antisocial behaviour are not a matter for An Coimisiún Pleanála.

#### Road Network

- 7.3.7. Concerns have been raised in the observations in respect to pedestrian safety and traffic congestion due to the existing infrastructure and site location. Having regard to the increase in the level of traffic entering and leaving the site, as a result of the proposed development, I consider the potential additional traffic movements to be significant in this rural area. The proposed vehicular entrance to the site is off the L1235, which is a quite rural road with low trafficked access and egress points to domestic dwellings and agricultural lands. As such, I do consider the additional traffic movements that will be generated by this development may cause a significant nuisance to the amenity and enjoyment of the area. The substandard nature of the road in terms of width and alignment and lack of footpaths also presents a significant constraint. This limitation, coupled with the car centric nature of the development at distance removed from basic amenities, suggests that the proposed development is not appropriately suited to its surroundings.
- 7.3.8. Moreover, the proposed pedestrian entrance to the site via the existing gate to the R391 is of concern. While there is an existing footpath on the opposite side of the site along the R391, at the point of proposed pedestrian entrance, there is no

dedicated footpath to the application site from the road, with the existing hedge indicated to be retained at this location. As such, I have concerns in respect to pedestrian safety at this site location. I also reiterate the lack of pedestrian footpaths on the L1235. Therefore, the inadequacies of the existing road network serving the site in my opinion render it unsuitable for accommodating the traffic and pedestrian demands of the proposed development, highlighting the potential adverse effects on the existing residential amenity and may potentially impact on traffic and pedestrian safety.

Conclusion:

- 7.3.9. In conclusion, the layout and the design approach applied to the tourism accommodation demonstrates that the proposal will harmonise with its surroundings sensitively. The proposed strategic placement of the chalets and communal facility building will mitigate potential negative visual impacts on neighbouring residential amenities. While acknowledging the appellants' concerns regarding noise disturbance, I find that the proposal is unlikely to result in a significant level of impact in this regard.
- 7.3.10. However, concerns persist regarding the heightened traffic levels and the capacity of the road network to accommodate the anticipated increase in traffic. The substandard width and alignment of the road pose substantial challenges to accommodating the additional traffic load generated by the development. Moreover the lack of pedestrian facilities in the area would be a concern. As outlined in section 7.2, I considered the development location unsuitable, primarily due to its remote rural setting and the predominantly car-centric nature of the proposed development. Consequently, I recommend refusal of the application based on these grounds.

**7.4. Waste Water Treatment**

- 7.4.1. Concerns have been raised in the observations in relation to the proposed wastewater treatment system. The Site Characterisation Report submitted with the application identifies that the subject site is located in an area with wet nature of the soil, poor drainage and high water table, with an impure limestone bedrock type. A ground protection response to R1 is noted. Accordingly, I note the suitability of the site for a treatment system (subject to normal good practice, i.e. system selection,

construction, operation and maintenance). The applicant's Site Characterisation Report identifies that there is no Groundwater Protection Scheme in the area.

7.4.2. The trial hole depth referenced in the Site Characterisation Report was 1.6 metres. Bedrock was not encountered; the water table was encountered at 1.1m. The soil conditions found in the trial hole are described as comprising clay/silt, with gravels and cobbles. Percolation test holes were dug and pre-soaked. The average T-Value was 49.16min/25mm. The average P-Value was 44.58 min/25mm.

7.4.3. The applicant proposes to install a 20PE BAF package treatment plant (pumped discharge) be fully compliant with national standard NSAI S.R.66-2015 and International Standard IS EN12566-3:2005 on the proposed site. Based on the findings and recommendations of the Site Characterization Report, the applicant proposes to construct a raised sand polishing filter in the area adjacent to soil test location. The polishing filter should be constructed after the secondary package wastewater treatment system but before discharging into ground water. Willow bed 200msq shall surround proposed raised sand filter to improve soakage at the proposed filter. The underlay distribution gravel should be no smaller than 300msq. Separation distances for placing the WWTS and effluent disposal area are such, that any excavation work required for the wastewater treatment and disposal system does not undermine adjacent features, such as buildings, roads, or walls and therefore complies with the EPA code of practice.

7.4.4. I note points raised in the observation with respect to the potential hydrological connection to the site and Lough Ennell SAC and Lough Ennell SPA. I note the Water Framework Directive assessment in Section 7.8 and the Appropriate Assessment screening (Appendix B) below. I also note that the proposed development will adhere to the EPA Wastewater Treatment Manuals for Small Communities, Business, Leisure Centres, and Hotels, with a maximum design population of 20 persons. The accommodation comprises a 5 no chalets for tourism accommodation, which will be seasonal. Additionally, a community facility building is proposed on site.

7.4.5. Having regard to the detail submitted with regard to site suitability, I am of the opinion that the development is unlikely to pose any adverse impact on groundwater

quality at this location, provided that correct installation procedures are followed, and ongoing maintenance is carried out.

#### **7.5. Other Matters:**

##### Archaeological Heritage:

- 7.5.1. Reference is made in the observation to the presence of an “old mass path”, which is located to the southwest boundary of the site. I note that an Archaeological Heritage Impact Assessment accompanies the planning application, which included a study area within 1km of the subject site. There are no known recorded monuments listed within the Record of Monuments and Places or in the Sites and Monuments Record relating to the appeal site.

##### Use of the structures:

- 7.5.2. In respect to the use of the development, I note that in the event of a grant of permission, a condition could be included which limits the use of the structures. In any event, any issues raised in relation to any unauthorised use of the structures is a matter of enforcement, which falls under the jurisdiction of the planning authority.

#### **7.6. Water Framework Directive**

##### Introduction:

- 7.6.1. The Dysart Stream (IE\_SH\_25D050400) is located to the east (at a distance of approx.. 255.7 m) of the site. This stream connects into the Brosna\_040 (IE\_SH\_25B090200), which is some 1.8km from the site, which flows into Lough Ennell.
- 7.6.2. The proposed development comprises of the construction 5 no. chalet units (tourism facility) and communal facilities building, with associated wastewater treatment system and all associated ancillary services and works on lands at Castletown Road, Rathnamuddagh, Dysart, Co. Westmeath.
- 7.6.3. I have assessed the residential development on Castletown Road, Rathnamuddagh, Dysart, Co. Westmeath and have 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.

7.6.4. I have undertaken a WFD Impact Assessment Stage 1: Screening and which is included in Appendix C after my report. This assessment considered the impact of the development on the:

- Dysart Stream
- Brosna River

7.6.5. The impact from the development was considered in terms of the construction and operational phases. Through the use of best practice P at the construction phase and through the use of SuDS and Wastewater Treatment System compliant with standards to treat wastewater from the site during the operation phase, all potential impacts can be screened out.

Conclusion:

7.6.6. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, 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 and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

**7.7. Appropriate Assessment**

I note that permission was refused by the local authority for two reasons including the *“incorrect reference to a sewer located to the southwest of the site to serve the proposed development and in applying the precautionary principle in identifying operational phase pathways for likely significant effects which includes hydrological connection from the site to Lough Ennell which may result in indirect effects and pollution of ground water”*. It was considered therefore *“that the proposed development may pose a risk of significant effects on the conservation objectives and integrity of Lough Ennell SPA (Natura 2000 site)”*.

I note the issues raised in the observations in respect to the potential impact of the proposed development which have also been taking into account during the screening assessment.

As part of the first party appeal, a Screening for Appropriate Assessment was submitted. As such I refer the Coimisiún to Appendix B - AA Screening Determination of this report, and the submitted screening report which was reviewed as part of my assessment of same.

## **7.8. Screening Determination Conclusion**

- 7.8.1. I am satisfied the potential for significant effects, as a result of the proposed development 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 (stage 2) under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 is not required.
- 7.8.2. There is no terrestrial or direct hydrological or groundwater pathway between the development site and any Natura 2000 site.
- 7.8.3. I am further satisfied the potential for significant effects, as a result of surface and foul waters generated during the construction and operational stages, on the qualifying interests any Natura 2000 sites can be excluded.
- 7.8.4. No habitat fragmentation to any Natura 2000 site is predicted and there is no potential for impacts on the qualifying interests of Natura 2000 sites due to noise and other disturbance impacts during construction and operational phases given the level of separation between the sites.
- 7.8.5. It is evident from the information before the Coimisiún that on the basis of the nature and scale of the proposed development on the lands, the nature of the receiving environment, the distances to the nearest European sites and the hydrological pathway considerations, submissions on file, observations the information submitted as part of the appellants Appropriate Assessment Screening report that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect on any European Site in view of the conservation objectives of such sites, and that a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment is not, therefore, required.
- 7.8.6. In reaching my screening assessment conclusion, no account was taken of measures that could in any way be considered to be mitigation measures intended to avoid or reduce potentially harmful effects of the project on any European Site. In this project, no measures have been especially designed to protect any European



Site and even if they had been, which they have not, European Sites located downstream are removed from the subject lands and when combined with the interplay of a dilution affect such potential impacts would be insignificant. I am satisfied that no mitigation measures have been included in the development proposal specifically in relation to any potential impact to a Natura 2000 site.

## **8.0 Recommendation**

- 8.1. I recommend that planning permission be refused for the development subject to the following reasons and considerations.

## **9.0 Reasons and Considerations**

It is considered that the proposed development providing for tourism accommodation located on a rural site remote from services, including retail and social facilities, with no sustainable connection to any existing tourism asset, accessed via a rural local road of substandard width and alignment with no footpaths serving the site does not comply with Policy Objectives CPO 6.25 and CPO 6.27 of the Westmeath County Development Plan 2021-2027, which seeks to encourage tourist related developments to locate within existing serviced settlements and at suitable locations. The proposed location does not accord with these criteria. Furthermore, the proposal as set out would contribute to the encroachment of random rural development in the area and would be contrary to development plan Policy Objective CPO 6.27 in terms of siting of tourist accommodation. The proposed development 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.*

---

Emma Nevin  
Planning Inspector

17<sup>th</sup> July 2025

## Appendix A - Form 1

### Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	ABP-321397-24
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Erection of 5 chalet units and a communal facilities building to provide sustainable tourist accommodation. A proposed wastewater treatment system and all associated ancillary services and works.
<b>Development Address</b>	Castletown Road, Rathnamuddagh, Dysart, Co. Westmeath
	<b>In all cases check box /or leave blank</b>
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>  (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,  - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.  <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.  <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed	N/A

<p>type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p><b>No Screening required.</b></p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p><b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b></p>	N/A
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p><b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b></p>	<p>Class 10 Infrastructure Projects (b) (i)</p> <p>Proposed development for 5 no. tourism associated residential units and ancillary community building, therefore sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required.</p>

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 17<sup>th</sup> July 2025

## Appendix A - Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

<b>Case Reference</b>	ABP-321397-24
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Erection of 5 chalet units and a communal facilities building to provide sustainable tourist accommodation. A proposed wastewater treatment system and all associated ancillary services and works.
<b>Development Address</b>	Castletown Road, Rathnamuddagh, Dysart, Co. Westmeath
<b>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</b>	
<b>Characteristics of proposed development</b>  (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>The development involves the construction of tourism accommodation and ancillary community building, wastewater treatment system and percolation area along with site entrance and boundary treatments, all on land located in a rural area.</p> <p>During the construction phase, the proposed development would generate waste during excavation and construction.</p> <p>However, given the moderate size of the proposed development, I do not consider that the level of waste generated would be significant in the local, regional, or national context.</p>
<b>Location of development</b>  (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>The site is not located in or immediately adjacent to any European site.</p>
<b>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</b>  (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters,	<p>Localised construction impacts will be temporary. The proposed development would not give rise to waste, pollution or nuisances beyond what would normally be deemed acceptable.</p>

magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	N/A
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	N/A

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 17<sup>th</sup> July 2025

## Appendix B – Appropriate Assessment Screening Determination

### Screening for Appropriate Assessment Screening Determination

#### 1: Description of the project

I have considered the proposed development at Castletown Road, Rathnamuddagh, Dysart, Co. Westmeath in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

In brief the development comprises the erection of 5 chalet units and a communal facilities building to provide sustainable tourist accommodation. A proposed wastewater treatment system and all associated ancillary services and works.

**There are no European sites in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development site. Table 1 of the AA screening report establishes six SACs and three SPAs were identified within a ca 15km radius of the Site.**

Name	Site Code	Distance from Site (approx.)
Lough Ennell SAC	000685	1.5km
Lough Owel SAC	000688	9.5km
Scragh Bog SAC	000692	13.8km
Split Hills and Long Hills Esker SAC	001831	8.3km
Wooddown Bog SAC	002205	13km
Ballymore Fen SAC	002313	11.6km
Lough Ennell SPA	004044	1.5km
Lough Iron SPA	004046	9km
Lough Owel SPA	004047	9.5km

The closest European site to the proposed development is the Lough Ennell SPA (site code: 004044) and the Lough Ennell SAC (site code: 000685) at 1.5km.

As part of the First Party Appeal, An Appropriate Assessment Screening report has been submitted with the application on behalf of the applicant (prepared by Dulra is Duchas), and the objective information presented in that report informs this screening determination. The applicant's report is dated December 2024.

The subject site with a stated gross area of 0.58 hectares, comprises an almost rectangular shaped area of land located within the townland of Rathnamuddagh within the unserviced rural settlement of Dysart. The site is relatively flat and bounded by mature roadside hedgerows along the northern boundary (R319) and along the boundary eastern boundary, the western boundary remains undefined and the southern boundary addressing the L-1235 comprises low scrub hedging. An open drain bounds the site along the eastern and southern boundary of the site. There are no environmental designations pertaining to the application site.

#### Submissions and Observations

I refer the Coimisiún to section 7.0 of the main report.

## **2. Potential impact mechanisms from the project**

### Zone of Influence

All of the European sites present in the vicinity of the proposed development are shown on Table 1 (List of Conservation Areas within 15km of the proposed development site) of the AA screening report submitted. A description of each area is also provided. The and the QIs/SCIs of the European sites in the vicinity of the proposed development are provided in the Screening Report.

The sites considered within the Stage 1 Screening and the distances from the development site are summarised below. Given the distance of the development from the identified sites coupled with intervening screening and topography and the lack of clear hydrological connection no direct or indirect impacts are envisaged on the Ballymore Fen, Split Hills and Long Hill Esker, Wooddown Bog, Scragh Bog, Lough Iron and Lough Owel and therefore these are not considered further in the screening assessment. I concur with this assertion of the submitted screening report.

As such Lough Ennell SPA and Lough Ennell SAC are considered as follows:

Name of Site	Site Code	Qualifying Interests	Approximate Distance from Site Boundary	Potential Connection



Lough Ennell SPA	(004044)	Hard oligo-mesotrophic waters with benthic vegetation of Chara spp. Alkaline fens	1.5km	Indirect connection via ground water and surface water
Lough Ennell SAC	(000685)	Pocharard (Aythya farina) Tufted Duck (Aythya fuligula) Coot (Fulica atra) Wetland and Waterbirds	1.5km	Indirect connection via ground water and surface water

**The likely effects of the proposed development on European sites have been appraised using a source-pathway-receptor model.**

In carrying out my assessment I have had regard to the nature and scale of the project, the distance from the site to Natura 2000 sites, and any potential pathways which may exist from the development site to a Natura 2000 site, aided in part by the EPA Appropriate Assessment Tool ([www.epa.ie](http://www.epa.ie)). Site synopsis and conservation objectives for each of these Natura 2000 sites are available on the NPWS website. In particular the attributes and targets of these sites are of assistance in screening for AA in respect of this project. I have also visited the site.

#### Habitat Impact

The site is not within or directly adjoining any Natura 2000 sites. Lough Ennell SAC & SPA is the closest Natura 2000 sites to the proposed development. There is an 'indirect' Source-Pathway linkage between the proposed development site and the SAC with the ground water/surface water, however I note that the proposed development will not lead to the discharge of untreated wastewater or surface water from the proposed development. Wastewater generated post construction will comply with National and International Standards. Surface and storm water will

be managed through the use of attenuation, SuDS measures on site. All surface water will be treated and discharged in a controlled manner to the drain on the southern boundary when necessary. Potable water will be mains sourced and will not lead to the abstraction of water from ground or surface water sources. No potential impact is foreseen. Accordingly, I do not consider that there is potential for any direct impacts such as habitat loss / modification, direct emissions, or species mortality/disturbance.

There are no Annex I habitats present within the proposed development site or immediate environs. The proposed development site is primarily a greenfield site. Some hedgerows and low scrub hedgerows were noted on site. These were primarily located along the northern and eastern boundary. Low scrub is to the western boundary, which is undefined. No species of conservation importance or their resting or breeding places were noted.

#### Water Quality

There are no watercourses present on site. All surface water will be treated and discharged in a controlled manner to the drain on the southern boundary when necessary.

#### Conclusion on the extent of the Zone of Influence

The development is for a relatively small scale residential tourism development and given the nature of the works within the applicants existing site and outside the Natura 2000 sites, it is not considered likely that the proposed development will interfere with any of the key relationships of any Natura 2000 site. There is no terrestrial or direct hydrological or groundwater pathway between the development site and any Natura 2000 site. It is considered that there will be no long-term residual impacts from the proposed works upon the key relationships that define any Natura 2000 sites.

### **3. European Sites at risk**

I am satisfied that no risks to the conservation objectives of the Lough Ennell SPA (004044) and Lough Ennell SAC (site code 00685) or any Natura 2000 sites are considered likely due one or more of the following:

- Lack of direct connectivity between the proposed works areas and the designated areas. There will be no loss of habitat within any Natura 2000 site as a result of the proposed works. It is not anticipated that the loss of any species of conservation interest will occur as a result of the proposed works due to injury or mortality.
- Significant buffer between the proposed works area and the designated. No significant risk

of disruption to any Natura 2000 sites are likely during this project.

- No habitat fragmentation to any Natura 2000 site is predicted.
- There will be no additional emissions of water from the site. Wastewater will be treated on site and therefore, no emissions are predicted that will impact upon any Natura 2000 site.

Based on a consideration of the likely impacts arising from the proposed works and a review of their significance in terms of the conservation interests and objectives of the Natura 2000 Sites screened, no significant impacts have been identified on the Natura 2000 sites as a result of the proposed development.

I refer the Coimisiún to 'Finding of no significant effects', and 'Conclusion', of the AA screening report. I agree with the conclusions presented therein.

#### **4. Where relevant, likely significant effects on the European site(s) in-combination with other plans and projects'**

##### In combination or Cumulative Effects

The applicant's Appropriate Assessment Screening Report has considered cumulative impacts.

The report notes that the proposed development will not be undertaken in conjunction with other development.

It is reasonable to conclude that on the basis of the information on the file, which I considered adequate in order to issue a screening determination, that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to have a significant effect on Lough Ennell SPA (004044) and Lough Ennell SAC (site code 00685) or any European site, in view of the sites' conservation objectives.

#### **Overall Conclusion- Screening Determination**

I 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 (stage 2), under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 is not required.

**There is no terrestrial or direct hydrological or groundwater pathway between the development site and any Natura 2000 site.**

I am further satisfied the potential for significant effects, as a result of surface and foul waters generated during the construction and operational stages, on the qualifying interests any Natura 2000 sites can be excluded having regard to the following:

- Treated wastewater will be discharged to ground with the River Brosna catchment via the proposed wastewater treatment systems, which will be installed to treat wastewater and will comply with the required standards.
- Surface and storm water management measures are proposed to ensure that all surface water generated on site will be treated when necessary, discharged to the drain on the southern boundary in a controlled manner.
- All other works will be undertaken in accordance with the relevant reports.

No habitat fragmentation to any Natura 2000 site is predicted and there is no potential for impacts on the qualifying interests of Natura 2000 sites due to noise and other disturbance impacts during construction and operational phases given the level of separation between the sites.

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

## Appendix C: WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING

### Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality

<b>An Bord Pleanála ref. no.</b>	ABP-321397-24	<b>Townland, address</b>	Castletown Road Rathnamuddagh, Dysart Co. Westmeath
<b>Description of project</b>	The erection of 5 no. chalet units and a communal facilities building to provide sustainable tourist accommodation totalling 516 sqm to facilitate the accommodation demands of visiting tourists, the provision of associated visitor parking (9 no.), secure cycle parking (20 no.) accessed from a new proposed vehicular access (L1235), a proposed pedestrian only access from the existing field access (R391), a proposed wastewater treatment system and all associated ancillary services, above and below ground and landscaping proposals to integrate, promote and enhance biodiversity.		
<b>Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,</b>	Site is cleared of all structures and consists of a greenfield site.		
<b>Proposed surface water details</b>	Surface water is proposed to be managed via porous Asphalt – system A – total infiltration, Pond with permanent pool of water, 300 litres water butts for garden use, and SuDS planters.		
<b>Proposed water supply source &amp; available capacity</b>	Water supply proposed via Public Water Supply, i.e. Mullingar Regional Public Water Supply which has an Orange – ‘Potential Capacity Available’ rating. LoS improvement is required.		

Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues		Wastewater Treatment System proposed on site				
Others?		N/A				
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 (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)
e.g. lake, river, transitional and coastal waters, groundwater body, artificial (e.g. canal) or heavily modified body.	255.7m - To the eastern boundary of the site	Dysart Stream (Lough Ennell)_010 (IE_SH_25D050400 )	Moderate	At Risk	Ag, HYMO	Surface water run-off

		c.1.82km southeast of site	Brosna_040 (IE_SH_25B090200 )	Moderate	At Risk	HYMO	Surface water run-off
<b>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.</b>							
<b>CONSTRUCTION PHASE</b>							
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	<b>Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.</b>
1.	Site clearance & Construction	Dysart Stream (IE_SH_25D05 0400)	Indirect impact via Potential hydrological pathway	Water Pollution	Use of Standard Construction Practice	No	Screen out at this stage.
2.	Site clearance & Construction	Brosna_040 (IE_SH_25B09 0200)	Indirect impact via Potential hydrological pathway	Water Pollution	Use of Standard Construction Practice	No	Screen out at this stage.

3.	Foul Drainage during construction phase of the development	Dysart Stream (IE_SH_25D05 0400)	Indirect impact via Potential hydrological pathway	Water Pollution	Installation of WWTS will be undertaken in accordance with relevant reports.	No	Screen out at this stage.
4.	Foul Drainage during construction phase of the development	Brosna_040 (IE_SH_25B09 0200)	Indirect impact via Potential hydrological pathway	Water Pollution	Installation of WWTS will be undertaken in accordance with relevant reports.  Treated wastewater will be discharged to ground within the Brosna Catchment.	No	Screen out at this stage.
OPERATIONAL PHASE							



1.	Surface Water Run-off	Dysart Stream (IE_SH_25D05 0400)	Indirect impact via Potential hydrological pathway	Water Pollution	Several SuDS features incorporated into development	No	Screen out at this stage.
2.	Surface Water Run-off	Brosna_040 (IE_SH_25B09 0200)	Indirect impact via Potential hydrological pathway	Water Pollution	Several SuDS features incorporated into development	No	Screen out at this stage.
3.	Foul Drainage	Dysart Stream (IE_SH_25D05 0400)	Indirect impact via ground water	Water Pollution	Treated wastewater will be discharged to ground within the Brosna Catchment.	No	Screen out at this stage.
4.	Foul Drainage	Brosna_040 (IE_SH_25B09 0200)	Indirect impact via ground water	Water Pollution	Treated wastewater will be discharged to ground within	No	Screen out at this stage.

					the Brosna Catchment.		
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
1.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

