



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-322155-25

Development	3 no. 3-bedroom, detached bungalow dwelling houses and all associated siteworks.
Location	Coxtown, Dunmore East, Co. Waterford
Planning Authority	Waterford City and County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2460437
Applicant(s)	Bernadette Hurley
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Woodstown Bay Shellfish Ltd.
Observer(s)	Derek & Dearbhla Monaghan Michael & Hillary Griffin
Date of Site Inspection	21 st April 2025
Inspector	Jennifer McQuaid

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	9
3.4. Third Party Observations	10
4.0 Planning History.....	10
5.0 Policy Context.....	12
5.1. Development Plan.....	12
5.2. National and Regional Policy	15
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations	16
5.4. EIA Screening	16
5.6. Water Framework Directive.....	17
6.0 The Appeal	18
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	18
6.2. Applicant Response	20
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	22
6.4. Observations.....	22
6.5. Further Responses	24
7.0 Assessment	24
8.0 AA Screening.....	37
9.0 Recommendation.....	38

10.0	Reasons and Considerations.....	38
11.0	Conditions	38
	Appendix A: Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening	48
	Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination.....	50
	Appendix 2: Water Framework Directive Screening	52

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located in the townland of Coxtown and within the development boundary of Dunmore East, Co. Waterford. The site is located approximately 800 metres to the southwest of the Dunmore East Harbour along Convent Road and approximately 12km from Waterford City. The site area is 1.6ha and is relatively rectangular in shape. The site is located between detached dwellings and located approximately 250 metres from the coastline.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development consists of:

- 3 no. detached dwellings
- 1 no. domestic garage
- All ancillary site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Grant subject to 21 conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

Initial planning report

- Dunmore East is classed as an “urban town” (class3B) as per CDP, the zoning is for new residential development, the principle of development is considered acceptable. Development Objective D06 relates to the subject site, it is considered that the proposal as submitted respects the pattern of development in the area.
- Density is slightly lower than the recommendation defined within section 6.0 of the Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines.

- Water and wastewater capacity confirmed by Confirmation of Feasibility issued by Uisce Eireann.
- Surface water will be disposed of via soakaways and permeable paving to parking areas. There are no surface water measures indicated to deal with surface water from the road and no details of site investigations provided.
- An internal access to the adjoining lands can be facilitated, however, there are concerns regarding the width and footpaths required to serve a larger number of dwellings. The planner states there is little benefit in providing a connection to the adjoining lands subject to independent access being acceptable. Roads Section have no concerns regarding the access location.
- A 2-metre-wide footpath should be provided to the front of the site, and an ecological report can be provided in relation to the existing roadside boundary.
- No details provided in relation to how the bin collection area will be managed owing to the location.

Further information Report

- A 2-metre-wide cycle path is not required, a 2-metre-wide footpath will be provided whereby the existing sod and stone boundary will be retained. There is no footpath on the opposite side of the road and the applicant shall be conditioned to provide a 2-metre-wide footpath.
- No ecological report was submitted but it is highlighted that it was submitted as part of a previous application under planning reference 18798 and an ecological report was submitted with the adjoining site under planning reference 2460466 and it was determined on balance the removal of the boundary was required to provide the required footpath width.
- Surface water can be discharged directly from the site to the public network. Drainage has been provided via gullies to ensure freestanding water is not formed on the roadways or footpaths.
- The shared internal road provides sufficient pedestrian connection to each house as per DMURS. Road's section states the shared surface area should

be denoted by a change of level (i.e., Ramped upon entrance to the shared surface area, and a change of colour should also be provided using buff or red SMA (using coloured chips and clear binder – coloured binder not acceptable). The details to be agreed prior to commencement.

- A continuous footpath should be provided across the access point from the public road to allow pedestrian (and future cyclist) priority at the junction. The lack of pedestrian crossing was highlighted in the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit. Details to be agreed prior to commencement.
- Stage 1 Road Safety Audit highlighted potential conflict for 2 vehicles travelling in opposing directions at the access point at the location of the S-bend. Swept paths for the largest types of vehicles that are likely to access or egress the site have not been provided and therefore cannot be assessed.
- Bin collection point will be provided at the entrance, and bins will be stored within the curtilage of each site. An appropriate condition shall be attached in relation to bin collection.
- No street lighting proposed as the widen footpath and cycle path are not being provided to the roadside boundary and no footpath provided within the site. However, street lighting is required within the site as the shared surface will serve vehicular and pedestrian movements. A condition shall be attached.
- The proposed boundary treatment is not acceptable and a solid block wall 1.8/2 metres high shall be provided within the site boundaries of the currently proposed development.
- Clarification of further information sought in relation to the concerns from Roads Section.

Clarification of Further Information Report.

- A revised site layout plan indicating a 2-metre-wide footpath to the front of the subject site is acceptable. An appropriate condition shall be attached to agree the final details with Roads Section.
- The revised swept path analysis is acceptable.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Roads: Further information requested in relation to drainage details, provision of a new 2-metre-wide footpath, pedestrian connectivity shall be provided within the site, the proposed kerbs are not acceptable, provide an Auto track assessment for Fire Tender Vehicles & Refuse Collection Vehicles.

Further information received: No cycle path is required, a 2-metre-wide footpath is proposed, the sightlines are acceptable. Surface water details agreed with Water Services section. A revised drainage drawing submitted which provides gullies to positively drain the road and footpath areas. The details of the shared surface shall be submitted prior to commencement. Refusal recommended based on the constrained nature of the access point from the public road and the potential vehicle-to-vehicle conflicts at the proposed S bend and access road. Furthermore, swept paths for the largest types of vehicles that are likely to access or egress the site have not been provided and therefore cannot be assessed. No public lighting submitted.

Clarification of Further Information: A 2-metre-wide footpath has been shown across the front boundary along with additional details of the proposed pedestrian crossing and signage. The swept path analysis submitted shows that 2 cars can pass safely at the entrance and has been submitted for fire tender vehicles and refuse collection vehicles. A public lighting plan has been submitted.

- Water Services: No report on file, the planner has stated that they spoke with Water Services and onsite SuDs are not warranted in this instance, direct connection to surface water drainage network in the area.

3.2.3. Conditions

Condition 2: The developer shall set up a Management Company to provide for the proper operation and maintenance of the bin collection point as identified on “proposed site layout” Drawing No. PP-1.01B submitted to the Planning Authority on the 11th February 2025.

Reason: In the interest of the proper planning and development of the area.

Condition 3: Prior to the commencement of development, the following details shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority: -

- (a) The roadside boundary shall be setback to provide a 2-metre-wide footpath to the front of the site. Prior to the commencement of development, the final layout and design specifications for the roadside boundary setback to provide a 2-metre-wide footpath to the front of the site shall be agreed with the Roads Section, Waterford City & County Council. A copy of the agreed revised details and written confirmation from the Roads Section, Waterford City & County Council shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. The agreed roadside setback and footpath provision shall be carried out by the developer to the satisfaction of the District Engineer, Roads Section, Waterford City & County Council.
- (b) The final layout and design specifications for the roadside boundary setback as per Condition No. 2(a) shall include full details public lighting to the roadside, and the relocation of existing utility poles to the roadside boundary if deemed necessary by Roads Section, Waterford City & County Council. If existing utility poles are to be relocated that is subject to the written agreement of the service provider. Unless otherwise agreed in writing with Roads Section, Waterford City & County Council public lighting to the public roadside shall be carried out by the developer to the satisfaction of the District Engineer, Roads Section, Waterford City & County Council.
- (c) The shared surface estate road to the east of the Site No. 3 shall be extended to the north such that the shared surface roadway abuts the northern site boundary.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed revised details.

Reason: in the interests of public safety and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Condition 19: The developer shall implement the boundary treatments proposed in the submitted site layout/documentation received by the Planning Authority on the 3rd December 2024 subject to the following:

- (a) The existing roadside boundary with the Coxtown Road (southern Boundary) shall be removed. The removal of the boundary shall only be undertaken during the time period between 1st September to the 31st March.
- i. A 1.1-metre-high boundary wall with natural stone finish to the public roadside shall be constructed to the Coxtown Road boundary between points E-D, D-C and B-A as identified on site layout plan Drawing No. PP-1.01A received by the Planning Authority on the 17th December 2024.
- (b) A 1.8-metre-high blockwork boundary wall (plastered on the public side) shall be constructed to the western boundary between points E-F (1.8m high from the ground level of the adjoining lands to the west) and between points F-G, G-H and H-A as identified on site layout plan Drawing No. PP-1.01A received by the Planning Authority on the 17th December 2024.

Prior to the commencement of development, a revised boundary treatment plan shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority indicating point (b).

- (c) Prior to the commencement of development, a method statement prepared by a suitably qualified, chartered and indemnified structural engineer outlining the boundary treatment works and ground works so as to ensure the site stability of the ground, adjoining road and properties are not negatively impacted upon during the construction and occupation of the development permitted herein. The development works shall be carried out in accordance with the prepared method statement, and all works as provided for in the method statement shall be supervised by competent person/person(s).

Reason: In the interest of clarity, the protection of amenities, the environment and public safety and for the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- None

3.4. Third Party Observations

A number of third-party observations were received. The following comments were made:

- House types – suitable for attic conversion. The proposal is out of character for the area. Overlooking. Boundary treatment.
- Density – overdevelopment.
- Development should be assessed in accordance with Planning and Development Act, 2000 as amended. Development is not in accordance with Development Management Standards (Volume 2) of the Waterford City & County Development Plan 2022-2028 or Development objectives for the area.
- Obligations under EIAR and AA screening (impact on SPA and no bat survey) and the Habitat Directive. No EIAR.
- Material Contravention of Water Directive and surface water and wastewater management in particular ENV01 to allow additional sewerage loading to Dunmore East sewerage system.
- Traffic Issues with regards too many entrances, sightlines are incorrect. Inadequate Footpath and cycle path. Road capacity
- Planning history – previous refusals.
- Landowner – no proof of ownership, no wayleaves indicated on maps.
- Consideration of adjacent proposal under planning reference 2460466.
- Construction impacts
- Flooding

4.0 Planning History

ABP-313873-22 (PA: 22269): Permission refused for 3 no. dwellings for the following reasons:

1. As shown on the Land Use Zoning Map in Volume 4 of the Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-2028, the subject site is on land zoned “New

Residential” and Specific Development Objective DMD06 (Objective D06) provides that regard be had to the topography and the established pattern of development in the vicinity. The Board considered that the height, design and layout of the proposed development and the provision of two-storey houses on this elevated site with views to the sea within the coastal landscape area of Dunmore East would be contrary to Specific Development DMD06 (Objective D06), and to Housing Policy Objective H02 of the development plan. Having regard to Specific Development Objective DMD06 (Objective D06) and to Housing Policy Objective H02, the proposed development would be piecemeal, and it has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Board that the proposed development would be integrated and connected to the surrounding area in which it is located. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The proposed development would result in the creation of a new vehicular entrance and increase in traffic movements to and from the site, adjacent to the existing entrance and access road to the west onto this busy local road. In view of the configuration of the proposed access and proximity to the existing access, it has not been demonstrated in the documentation submitted, to the satisfaction of the Board, that the proposed development would not lead to proliferation of entrances and to traffic hazard for road users. In addition, it has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Board that it would not adversely impact on access to the future development of the residentially zoned land to the east of the site. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Adjoining site:

ABP-321807-25 (PA: 2460466): Permission granted for 40 no. houses and all associated site works.

ABP-304962-19 (PA: 18798): Permission refused for dwelling.

Having regard to:

- The location of the site on R1 zoned and serviced land within the development boundary of Dunmore East.
- The density of 1.27 dwellings units per hectare proposed, which is below the density figure of 20 units per hectare set out in the Waterford County Development Plan 2011-2017 for R1 (medium density) zoned land, and significantly below both the density ranges of 30-40+ dwellings per hectare in a centrally located site and 20-35 units per hectare in an edge-of-centre site as set out in Chapter 6 (Small Towns and Villages) of the “Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (Cities, Towns & Villages)”, 2009, and
- The conflict between the low density proposed and certain National Policy Objectives (NPO) set out in Project Ireland 2040 National Planning Framework, such as NPO 18a and 33, in this regard,

It is considered that the proposed development would not be of sufficiently high density to provide for an acceptable efficiency in serviced land usage, and that the low density proposed would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

06154: Permission refused for 32 dwellings in summary for:

- Premature pending the construction and commissioning of a new public sanitation services system in Dunmore East, being prejudicial to public health.
- Design and layout and inadequate quality of public open space would seriously injure the residential amenity of future occupiers and the amenities of the area.

79887: Permission refused for 22 dwellings.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Waterford County Development Plan 2022-2028

The subject site is zoned as R1, and the objective is to provide for new residential development in tandem with the provision of the necessary social and physical infrastructure.

Appendix 2 of the CDP outlines general policy objectives for Waterford County and individual settlements.

DMDO6 relates to the subject site and the objective is that any development proposed on this site shall be required to have regard to the topography of the site and shall have an appropriate/sympathetic approach to design which utilises the existing contours and respects the established pattern of development in the vicinity.

Volume 1 Housing Policies and Objectives

H01: To promote compact urban growth through the consolidation and development of new residential units on infill/brownfield sites.

H02: In granting planning permission, to seek to ensure new residential development:

- Is appropriate in terms of type, character, scale, form and density to that location.
- Is serviceable by appropriate supporting social, economic and physical infrastructure.
- Is serviceable by public transport and sustainable modes such as walking and cycling.
- Is integrated and connected to the surrounding area in which it is located; and,
- Is designed in accordance with the applicable guidance and standards of the time (these are listed).

H04: This seeks to promote and facilitate sustainable and liveable compact urban growth through the thoughtful consolidation and of infill/brownfield sites in a way which promotes appropriate levels of compactness while delivering healthier and greener urban spaces and residential amenities.

A number of additional points support integrated and sustainable residential development.

H17: This seeks to encourage the establishment of attractive, inclusive and sustainable residential communities in existing built-up areas and new emerging areas including by:

- Ensuring a suitable variety and mix of housing and apartment types, and sizes/tenures is provided in individual developments to meet the lifecycle adaptation of dwellings and the differing needs and requirements of people and families.

This supports housing mix and integrated and sustainable residential development.

H18: This requires that all new residential development incorporates measures to enhance climate change.

A number of measures are referred to and this includes regard to utilising SuDs.

H20: Where new development is proposed, particularly on smaller suburban infill sites (< 1ha in area) this seeks to ensure that the residential amenity of adjacent residential properties in terms of privacy and the availability of daylight and sunlight is not adversely affected.

This includes to support lower density type of development at these locations. To require that new development in more established residential areas respect and retain, where possible, existing unique features which add to the residential amenity and character of the area.

Volume 2 Development Management relates to standards for residential development.

DM04 includes Applications will be required to adhere to the guidance contained in the “Urban Design Manual – A Best Practice Guide” (Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, 2009)

Criteria also include: the overall character and scale of the settlement, infrastructure capacity such as water/wastewater and surface water disposal available, areas susceptible to flooding, car parking, traffic safety and pedestrian movements, the protection of residential amenity of existing adjacent dwellings in the area etc.

DM05: Supports increases in residential densities in appropriate sustainable locations.

DM06: Supports variety in house/dwelling types.

Section 3.4.2 refers to General Residential Development Design Standards.

Table 3.1 provides the criteria for New Residential Development in Urban Areas.

DM09 relates to estate naming.

Section 4.7 refers to Off-street Parking in Residential Areas

DM10: criteria for drive-ins/front garden parking.

Section 7.0 refers to Parking Standards.

Table 7.1 refers to car parking standards with reference to dwelling as 1 space per 1-2 bedrooms, 2 spaces per 3 bed +, for every 4 residential units provided with only 1 space, 1 visitor space shall be provided in addition.

DM 40 relates to bicycle parking criteria.

Table 7.3 relates to Bicycle Parking Standards for residential developments.

DM 41 relates to providing cycle parking for residential areas.

Section 8.6 refers to Sightline Requirements in accordance with DMURS.

Section 8.7 refers to Sightline Provisions for clear unobstructed sightlines.

Section 8.8 refers to DMURS.

Policy DM 47 refers to urban areas where developers shall have regard to best practices standards as set out in Design Manual for Urban Roads & Streets (DMURS).

Section 8.9 refers to Hedgerow Protection

DM 48 refers to protection of hedgerows.

5.2. National and Regional Policy

- Project Ireland 2040: National Planning Framework, 2018

- Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region, 2019
- Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets, 2019 ('DMURS')
- Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas – Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2009
- Urban Design Manual: A Best Practice Guide, 2009
- Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines, 2007

Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities

5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

The subject site is not located within a designated site. The nearest sites are identified as follows:

- Dunmore East Cliffs pNHA (site code: 000664) is located c. 300metres east of the subject site.
- Seas off Wexford SPA (site code: 004237) is located c.1.4km south & east of the subject site.
- Hook Head SAC (site code: 000764) located c. 4km east of the site on the other side of the bay.
- River Barrow and River Nore SAC (site code: 0021262) is located c. 3.6km northeast.
- Tramore Back Strand SPA (site code: 004027) is located c.5km to the west of the subject site.

5.4. **EIA Screening**

- 5.5. 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.

5.6. Water Framework Directive

- 5.6.1. The subject site is located within Dunmore East town and on zoned lands within the settlement boundary. The nearest waterbody is Knockacurrin stream located 50 metres south of the subject site. The proposed development comprises 3 no dwellings and all associated site works.

The grounds of appeal raised concerns that insufficient information submitted demonstrated that the proposed development would not directly, indirectly or adversely affect the water quality in the surrounding marine environment, namely the River Barrow SAC, River Nore SAC, the Hook Head SAC and the Tramore Back Strand SPA. A full Water Framework Directive assessment should have been carried out. Waterford Harbour is an at-risk waterbody, combined with the absence of any monitoring by Irish Water of sewage overflows in the town must be considered.

The Planning Authority note that there are no high-status objective water bodies found within 1km of the proposed site.

I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seeks 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. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Scale and size of the proposed development of 3 no. dwellings on a site size of 0.2474ha within an urban setting.
- Distance to the nearest European site at over 1.4km to Seas off Wexford SPA.
- The lack of connections to any watercourse or on-site stream.

- On-site surface water will be disposed off via soakaways which will be installed in accordance with BRE 365 standards.
- The proposal will be connected to public water and public sewer and Uisce Eireann have stated that there is sufficient capacity at the Dunmore East Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Taking into account WFD screening report, 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.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal have been received from a local business in Dunmore East. The concerns raised are:

- Landowner: No letter of consent from the registered owner submitted with the planning application.
- Planning History: Piecemeal development, previous history ABP-313873-22 considered that a coordinated development of this residential land bank close to the centre of Dunmore East would be preferable to the piecemeal approach of the application and permission was refused.
- Traffic: access point and traffic hazards highlighted in Board previous refusal ABP-313873-22. Road's engineer recommended refusal due to the potential conflict for 2 vehicles travelling in opposing directions at the access point at the location of the S-bend. The proposal should have been refused, and no cumulative assessment was undertaken.
- Material Contravention: The proposal material contravenes policy ENV01 of the Waterford City and County Development Plan in which the council should achieve the objectives of the Water Framework Directive. EU Bathing Water

Directive (2006/7/EC): The aims and objectives of the Bathing Water Directive places strict guidelines on local authorities to ensure compliance with standards set by EU Legislation. The overall aim is to protect the environment and human health. Due to insufficient sewage infrastructure to support the proposal, climate change and increased rainfall has resulted in sewage overflows occurring on a regular basis. This is a material contravention of Policy ENV01 of the CDP.

- Water Framework Directive: Insufficient information submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development would not directly, indirectly or adversely affect the water quality in the surrounding marine environment, namely the River Barrow SAC, River Nore SAC, the Hook Head SAC and the Tramore Back Strand SPA. A full Water Framework Directive assessment should have been carried out. Waterford Harbour is an at-risk waterbody, combined with the absence of any monitoring by Irish Water of sewage overflows in the town must be considered.
- Appropriate Assessment: the AA carried out by the Planning Authority is vague and insufficient and not robust enough to remove all reasonable scientific doubt as to the potential negative effects of the proposed development on the nearby habitats and waters.
- Environmental Impact Assessment: No EIA submitted and no information on the likelihood of risk to habitats and species arising from the proposed development. The board has responsibilities under the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) and the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive (2011/92/EU) as amended by 2014/52/EU) to refuse permission for a development where it may cause a negative impact on the Habitats and Environment. No cumulative assessment was undertaken.
- Surface Water: No provision for SuDs features, applicant proposes to discharge storm water to the public storm water network. The proposal is not in compliance with Waterford City and County Council Development Plan.
- Wastewater: Condition no. 8 requests the applicant to consult with Uisce Eireann and Waterford City and County Council Water Services Drainage and Water Engineers regarding compliance with water network, water metering,

storm and foul drainage measures to serve the development. This should have been requested at further information stage to allow transparent public participation.

6.2. Applicant Response

The applicant has made the following comments:

- Solicitor response stating the applicant is the owner of the property.
- Site access amended with the acquisition of 3.5m land parcel to the western boundary to permit relocation of access point to eastern boundary. A new entrance is not created rather replacement with a new safer access point. The submitted TTS Report, Traffic Counts at Convent Road and RSA Assessment confirm the suitability of the approach undertaken. Consultation was carried out with Road's section of WCC. An independent engineer's report confirms that both entrances are consistent with best practice. A potential future access to the adjacent lands has been provided in accordance with policy objective H02.
- Condition No. 3(c): The shared surface estate road to the east of Site No. 3 shall be extended to the north such that the shared surface roadway abuts the northern site boundary. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed revised details. The applicant states this requirement offers little practical benefit and request the Board to amend the condition as extending the shared surface roadway to the northern boundary provides no functional access benefit and likelihood of any future development occurring on the northern property is considered extremely low. A pedestrian link could be accommodated and more appropriate.
- The proposal complies with policy objectives H02, DMD06 & DMD07.
- Residential density reflects the surrounding area at under 15 units per hectare. Public open space is not required, given the scale of the proposal, the site design and layout respond to the NW-SE slope.

- Planning history: Significant amendments were made to address considerations of access, design/height, and site layout of the previous refusal.
- Water Framework Directive: in regard to the potential chlorine and bleaches being used by UE in an unregulated manner is not considered to be a planning matter but relevance for the appropriate environmental authorities and Uisce Eireann. The site is not a protected site, and no works are proposed on a waterbody.
- Habitats Assessment: The Planning Authority found that the proposal will not give rise to significant impacts. No requirement for an AA.
- Uisce Eireann have provided a statement of feasibility of connection for the proposed development and conditions 7&8 confirm that all works will be carried out in compliance with Uisce Eireann Codes of Practice. A new wastewater treatment plant to the south of the site was constructed by Uisce Eireann.
- EU Bathing Water Directive: similar concerns to AA, WFD and EIA, no impacts arising from the proposed development.
- EIA: no requirements for an EIAR. The design will not impact on heritage and landscape issues. The scale and design have been evolved to ensure compatibility with the character of the area.
- Consultation: OPR Practice Note PN03 Planning Conditions (2022) section 3.10 Conditions Requiring Details of a Development to be Agreed with parties other than the Planning Authority – conditions should not require the agreement of details with bodies other than the planning authority... The only exception relates to Irish Water where it is necessary to enter into connection agreement(s) for connection to water supply and/or wastewater network.
- Habitats Directive: OPR Practice Note PN01 (Appropriate Assessment Screening for Development Management, March 2021) PN01, Section 2.0 states that the screening determination must be based on scientific information relevant to the likely effects on the conservation objectives of the relevant European site. The proposed development is a small scale of 3

houses with no spatial or ecological receptor connection to a designated Natura 2000 site. The competent authority also screened out the need for an AA.

- Applicant requested amendments to condition 2 in regard to setting up a Management Company to provide for the proper operation and maintenance of the bin collection point as identified on “proposed site layout” Drawing No. PP1.01B submitted to the Planning Authority on the 11th February 2025: The applicant feels this is inappropriate given the scale and nature of the development and could be integrated into the overall estate Management Company. It is envisaged that no area to be taken in charge by the Council. Applicant requests an amendment to this condition.
- Applicant requires alternative treatment for condition 19 which requires the removal of the existing roadside boundary fronting Convent Road and the construction of a new boundary wall. In addition, a new 1.8-metre-high blockwork boundary wall (plastered to the public side on the western, northern and eastern boundaries). The applicant requests consideration of alternative boundary treatment such as retains the existing sod and stone boundary fronting Convent Road and manage vegetation overgrowth to achieve the required footpath width, replace the required 1.8m blockwork boundary wall with a natural boundary treatment. This approach ensure compliance with planning policies, protects the area’s natural character, and supports sustainable development principles.
- Surface water: regarding stormwater or foul discharge, the agent fully engaged with Waterford City and County Council and Uisce Eireann.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- None

6.4. Observations

Observations have been received from local residents. The concerns raised are:

- **Overlooking:** Boundary shared with House type B to the north and west, the proposed height is 7.24m within 1.3m of the boundary. The attic space and Velux windows will overlook the garden space. Request removal or relocation of the Velux windows. House type A is located to the front of an observer's house at 12 metre separation, and this will be visually obtrusive and overbearing.
- **Design: Scale, height and character.** The discordant and uncharacteristic appearance will be visually prominent which is surrounded by mainly single storey dwellings. The proposal will significantly and negatively impact the residential amenity of the adjacent dwellings and character of the area. The dwelling heights have not been altered from previous decision. The separate garage could be used as a separate self-contained unit.
- **Planning History:** Under planning reference 22269, permission was refused for houses over 7 metres as they would be over-dominant and out of keeping with the predominantly single storey houses. The site is elevated, and the proposal would negatively impact on the residential and scenic amenity. The proposal is contrary to objective D01, D011 of the CDP. The board had similar concerns under planning reference ABP-313873-22. The current planning report does not address the An Bord Pleanála refusal reasons.
- **Development Contributions:** the attic space is suitable for liveable area and is exempt from development contributions as presented in the planning report.
- **Principle of Development:** The proposal contravenes D06 objectives which shall be required to have regard to the topography of the site and shall have an appropriate/sympathetic approach to design which utilises the existing contours and respects the established pattern of development in the vicinity. Objective H02 shall ensure new development is appropriate in terms of type, character, scale and form, shall be integrated within the surrounding area. H18 relates to climate resilience in housing and requires that all new residential development incorporates climate resilience measures. H20 ensures that new residential development maintains the residential amenity of adjacent properties in terms of privacy. Place 05 ensures that development proposals are cognisant of the need for proper consideration of context,

connectivity, inclusivity, variety, efficiency, distinctiveness, layout, public realm, adaptability, privacy and amenity, parking, way finding and detailed design.

- Surface Water: the CDP requires various forms of surface water attenuation/SuDs, none are proposed, and applicant received an agreement for surface water discharged directly from the site to the public network. Any surface water should be attenuated on site and discharged to greenfield run-off rates only.

6.5. Further Responses

- None

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Planning History
- Design, Layout.
- Traffic Impact
- Material Contravention
- Other Issues – Landowner, Water Services, EU Bathing Directive, Development Contributions
- Conditions
- Appropriate Assessment

7.2. Principle of Development

- 7.3. The subject site is located in Dunmore East town on lands zoned as residential and Specific Development Objective DMD06 relates specifically to this site. DMD06 states development proposed on this site shall have regard to the topography of the site and shall have an appropriate/sympathetic approach to design which utilises the existing contours and respects the established pattern of development in the vicinity.
- 7.4. The grounds of appeal state the proposal contravene objective D06, H02, H18, H20 and objective Place 05. Previously, An Bord Pleanála recommended a refusal under reference 313873-22 as the proposal was contrary to objective D06.
- 7.5. I have reviewed DO6 which relates to the subject site and the adjacent site (under separate ownership and separate planning reference ABP-321807-25 (PA: 2460466) and I will assess the proposed development in relation to DO6 which states development shall have regard to the topography of the site, appropriate/sympathetic approach to design which utilises the existing contours and respects the established pattern of development in the vicinity.
- 7.6. The proposed development consists of 3 no. dwellings on an elevated site which slopes from 43.3m above sea level (asl) at the top northwest corner to 40.3m above sea level at the southeast corner. The proposed dwellings have finished floor levels of House 1 – 41.35m asl, House 2 – 42.55m asl and House 3 – 43.45m asl and overall height of 7 metres. There are existing dwellings to the northwest, north, east and to the south along Convent Road, these consist of single storey and storey and half type dwellings. There are two dwellings located directly northwest of the subject site, the nearest dwelling is located 12.6 metres northwest of House 01, the ground floor level is noted as 43.98m asl and a ridge height of 48.5m asl. The proposed dwelling is located at a lower ground level of 41.25m asl and a ridge height level of 48.44m asl. Therefore, although, the proposed dwelling is slightly higher than the existing dwelling, the ridge heights are similar due to the existing contours. In relation to the second dwelling located northwest of the subject site, this dwelling is two storey with an overall ridge height of 53.66m asl, the separation distance is over 22metres and located at an angle to the proposed development and the ridge height of the proposed House 03 is 50.52m asl. It is in my opinion that given the similar

ridge height levels, the proposed dwelling locations and overall height is similar to the existing dwellings and similar character for the area.

- 7.7. The proposed development to the southeast consists of 40 no. dwellings on an elevated site which slopes from a height of 44.9m asl at the top northwest corner to 34.04m asl at the southeast corner. The proposed dwellings are a mixture of house types including two storey (ridge height of 7.2m) storey and half (ridge height of 7.7m to 7.1m) to bungalows with varying ridge heights of 6m to 5.4m). The varying dwelling types are mixed throughout the site to reflect the existing contours and the adjacent existing properties. The bungalow type dwellings are located along the northwestern boundary and are located at a lower ground floor level of 39.4m asl to 43.65m asl. It is in my opinion, that the applicant has considered the existing contours and placed the proposed dwelling on a lower contour than the existing bungalow which is located at a higher contour. The ridge heights are similar. Therefore, I consider the proposed site layout, dwelling designs and types utilise the existing contours on site and respect the established pattern of development in the area and is in accordance with DOD06.

In regard to objective H02, which relates to appropriate standards for new residential developments, I consider that the proposed development is appropriate in terms of type, character, form and is similar to the existing character of the area which contains a mixture of bungalows, storey and half to two storey dwellings as noted in the section above. In regard to scale and density, the proposal is for 3 no. dwelling which equates to approximately 13 unit per hectare, the density is low for a town development, but the density reflects the pattern of development in the area and therefore, I consider that the density and scale is acceptable given the location. In addition, the site is located on zoned lands within the urban area of Dunmore East and is supported by social, economic and physical infrastructure. The site is served by a public footpath located at the front of the site with pedestrian access to the town centre. The proposed site is integrated and connected to the surrounding area by way of proposed pedestrian access points.

- 7.8. In relation to H18 which requires all new residential development to incorporate the measures to enhance climate resilience. I note the applicant has submitted details under section 7.03 of the Design Statement which outlines sustainability design concepts both passive and active design to reduce the energy demand of the

proposed development. Therefore, I consider the proposed development is in compliance with objective H18 of the CDP.

7.9. H20 ensures that new residential development maintains the residential amenity of adjacent properties in terms of privacy, and the availability of daylight and sunlight is not adversely affected. I will further discuss this in section 7.22; however, the proposed development is located approximately 12 metres from the nearest existing single storey dwelling and there are no windows proposed on the northwestern elevation. In this regard, I consider the proposed development complies with objective H20 of the CDP.

7.10. Objective Place 05 ensures that development proposals are cognisant of the need for proper consideration of context, connectivity, inclusivity, variety, efficiency, distinctiveness, layout, public realm, adaptability, privacy and amenity, parking, way finding and detailed design. I consider that the proposed development has considered the surrounding area by providing connectivity and that respects the privacy and amenity of the surrounding dwellings.

7.11. Having regard to the policy objective of DMO6, H02, H18, H20 and Place 05, I consider the proposed development complies with the objectives, as the site proposal and layout has regard to the topography of the site and has provided an appropriate/sympathetic approach to design which utilises the existing contours and respects the established pattern of development in the vicinity. In addition, having regard zoning for R1 – New Residential whereby the objective is to provide for new residential development in tandem with the provision of the necessary social and physical infrastructure, I consider the proposal is acceptable as it provides for new residential development in tandem with a new improved 2-metre-wide footpath.

7.12. **Planning History**

7.13. Permission was previously refused on the subject site for two reasons under planning reference ABP-313873-22. The reasons being that the board considered the height, design and layout of the proposed development and provision of two-storey houses on an elevated site with views to the sea within the coastal landscape area would be contrary to Specific Development DMD06 and Housing Policy Objective H02. It was also considered that the proposed development would be piece-meal, and it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would

be integrated and connected to the surrounding are. The second refusal reason stated in view of the configuration of a new vehicular entrance and increase in traffic movements to and from the site adjacent to the existing entrance and access road to the west onto this busy local road, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not lead to proliferation of entrances and to traffic hazard for road users. In addition, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed entrance would not adversely impact on access to the future development of the residentially zoned land to the east of the site.

- 7.14. The grounds of appeal state the proposal is piecemeal development and that previous history ABP-313873-22 considered that a coordinated development of this residential land bank close to the centre of Dunmore East would be preferable to the piecemeal approach of the application and permission was refused.
- 7.15. The observation submitted outlined under planning reference 22269, permission was refused for houses over 7 metres as they would be over-dominant and out of keeping with the predominantly single storey houses. The site is elevated, and the proposal would negatively impact on the residential and scenic amenity. The proposal is contrary to objective D01, D011 of the CDP. The board had similar concerns under planning reference ABP-313873-22. The current planning report does not address the An Bord Pleanála refusal reasons.
- 7.16. The applicant responded stating that significant amendments were made to address the refusal reasons of access, design/height, and site layout.
- 7.17. In regard to refusal reason one, I have addressed this in section 7.2 & 7.22. The dwellings were reduced in height and scale and the site's topographical constraints have been considered. In relation to policy objective H20, the proposal does not overlook any surrounding dwelling due to their bungalow style and separation distances proposed and no windows are proposed on the eastern or western elevations.
- 7.18. In relation to refusal reason two, the existing field gate entrance and a 3.5-metre-wide strip of right of way on the western boundary has been acquired by the applicant and therefore, the original field entrance can be removed, and a new site access is proposed closer to the eastern boundary. The new entrance has been assessed under a Traffic and Transport Statement Report (TTS), traffic counts were

carried out on the main road, and a Road Safety Audit (RSA) conducted by a TII approved team of two independent senior auditors. See section 7.28 for further information.

7.19. Refusal reason number three relates to policy objective H02 whereby integration with the surrounding area is required. The applicant has consulted with the adjoining third party landowner and with the Planning Authority and it was deemed that a vehicular connection was not required with the adjacent property as a new entrance will be provided for this site approximately 70 metres from the subject site's proposed entrance. A pedestrian access will be provided to the undeveloped site along the northern boundary of the subject site. I consider that the response is acceptable, and it is not piecemeal, as both sites will be developed and have considered the layout of both sites.

7.20. Having regard to the previous refusal reason under planning reference ABP-313873-22, I consider that the applicant has addressed the refusal reasons in this current application.

7.21. Design, Overlooking

7.22. There are two dwellings located directly northwest of the subject site, the nearest dwelling is located 12.6 metres northwest of House 01 and the second dwelling is located over 22 metres northwest of House 03. The adjacent proposed development to the east is located between 14 and 18 metres from the subject site.

7.23. The grounds of appeal state overlooking will be an issue as the boundary shared with House type B to the north and west is within 1.3m of their boundary. The attic space and rooflights will overlook the garden space. It is requested to remove or relocate the rooflights. House type A is located to the front of an observer's house at 12 metre separation, and this will be visually obtrusive and overbearing. The scale, height and character will have a discordant and uncharacteristic appearance on the landscape and will be visually prominent were surrounded by mainly single storey dwellings. The proposal will significantly and negatively impact the residential amenity of the adjacent dwellings and character of the area. The dwelling heights have not been altered from previous decision. The separate garage could be used as a separate self-contained unit.

- 7.24. The applicant has responded and states the residential density reflects the surrounding area at under 15 units per hectare. Public open space is not required, given the scale of the proposal, the site design and layout respond to the NW-SE slope.
- 7.25. I have assessed the location of the proposed dwellings in relation to the surrounding existing dwellings. House 01 is located 12.6 metre east of the existing bungalow to the west and over 14 metres from the proposed dwelling to the east. House 02 is located over 5 metres from the boundary of the existing bungalow to the west and over 14 metres from dwelling building line and over 18 metres to the proposed dwelling to the east. House 03 is located over 22 metres from the existing dwelling to the southwest and northwest. I note no roof lights, or first floor windows are proposed on the western or eastern elevations, therefore I do not consider that overlooking of the existing and proposed dwelling will be an issue. Also, given the separation distance and the proposed heights of the proposed dwellings I do not consider that overbearing will be an issue.
- 7.26. I have assessed the proposed house designs and layout, I consider the proposed bungalows with an overall height of 7 metres and floor area of 136sqm & 168sqm on a site area of 0.2474ha, which gives a density of approximately 13 units per hectares is in character with the existing dwellings and retains the existing pattern of development in the area.
- 7.27. Having regard to the proposed separation distance, the proposed house types and the topography of the site, I consider the proposed development is acceptable and will not create overlooking or overbearance to the existing dwellings. The proposal is in keeping with the character of the area due to the house types and the proposed low density on site.
- 7.28. **Traffic Impact**
- 7.29. The proposed development consists of one exit/entry point along Convent Road. The applicant submitted a Traffic and Transport Statement Report (TTS), carried out traffic counts on the main road, along with a Road Safety Audit. The proposed entrance has indicated sightlines of 59 metres in both directions at a setback of 2.4 metres has been provided. A 2-metre-wide footpath is proposed for the entire length of the front of the site boundary along Convent Road.

- 7.30. The grounds of appeal states that the access point and traffic hazards were highlighted in the Board previous refusal ABP-313873-22. The road is not suitable for additional traffic and potential for increased traffic for the adjacent proposed development. Road's section recommended refusal based on the constrained nature of the access point from the public road and the potential vehicle to vehicle conflicts along the internal access route. The proposal should have been refused, and no cumulative assessment was undertaken.
- 7.31. The applicant has responded and stated the site access amended with the acquisition of 3.5m land parcel strip to the western boundary has permitted the relocation of access point to eastern boundary. A new entrance is not created rather replacement with a new safer access point. The submitted TTS Report, Traffic Counts at Convent Road and RSA Assessment confirm the suitability of the approach undertaken. Consultation was carried out with Road's section of WCC. An independent engineer's report confirms that both entrances are consistent with best practice. A potential future access to the adjacent lands has been provided in accordance with policy objective H02.
- 7.32. In regard to the sightlines provided at the proposed entrance, the sightlines of 59 metres are in accordance with the required sightlines as per DMURS where forward visibility of 59 metres is acceptable for 60kmph speed limit. Therefore, I consider the proposed sight lines are in accordance with DMURS guidance and are considered acceptable.
- 7.33. I note concerns were raised in relation to the previous refusal ABP-313873-22 where a new entrance is proposed adjacent to two number existing vehicular entrances at Coxtown Road, one of which directly adjoins the current proposed entrance, and if permitted give rise to a traffic hazard. The applicant has addressed this refusal reason and has acquired a 3.5 metres strip of land to the west, thereby extinguishing the existing Right of Way from the field gate into the proposed site. This ROW was located side-by-side (parallel) with an existing "third party" access lane which currently serves the two existing dwellings immediately to the west of the site. The field gate entrance will be removed, and a new single entrance will be provided to the site along the eastern boundary. I consider that the proposed replacement of the entrance is acceptable.

- 7.34. The appellant raised concerns in relation to the cumulative impact onto Convent Road and that this road is already busy. No concerns were raised by the Road's section in Waterford City and County Council. I also note the applicant submitted traffic counts in the Traffic and Transport Assessment, it is expected that the development trips are estimated to be approximately 1 arrival and 1 departure during peak hours which are considered significantly low and will have negligible (near zero) impact on Convent Road. PICADY software was used to analyse the capacity impact of the proposed development traffic using future 2040 traffic flows and the results indicate that the junction will operate in a safe and efficient manner, at only 18% capacity, well below maximum allowable capacity (85%) with negligible impact on Convent Road. Therefore, I do not consider the proposed development of 3 no. additional dwelling along Convent Road will result in capacity issues along Convent Road. No issues were raised regarding the proposed development of 40 no. dwellings on the adjacent site under planning reference ABP-321807-25 (PA: 2460466).
- 7.35. Given the location of the site within the development boundary of Dunmore East and the speed limits within a town, I do not consider the additional traffic associated with the proposed development will negatively impact the existing traffic along Convent Road.
- 7.36. The appellants noted potential future connectivity between the proposed development and the adjacent site planning reference: ABP-321807-25 (PA: 2460466) (granted). The site layout plan submitted, indicates a possible access connection along the eastern boundary, however, this was not deemed necessary under planning reference ABP-321807-25 (PA: 2460466). Under Condition 2(c): the applicant is requested to extend the shared surface estate road to the east of Site No. 3 northwards so that the roadway abuts the northern site boundary in order to provide future potential access. I note an alternative access is also provided to the northeastern site and therefore I do not consider an additional vehicular entrance is required, the applicant shall provide a pedestrian access point between the two sites.
- 7.37. The internal access road width was increased to ensure two opposing cars can pass each other with ease near the entrance, a swept path analysis was submitted to demonstrate same, and it is considered acceptable. I note the Roads engineer recommended refusal if the proposal were to consider vehicular access for the

adjoining site, however, it was later determined that a vehicular access is not required to the adjacent site. Therefore, in my opinion, I consider the internal access road width and entrance point are acceptable.

7.38. Having regard to the site location along Convent Road and the proposed sightlines provided in compliance with DMURS requirements and the assessments provided as part of the planning application, I do not consider the proposed access will have a negative impact on the traffic in the vicinity of the subject site. The proposed development is in compliance with DM01 as it is necessary to setback the existing hedgerow and boundary wall in order to provide an adequate and safe pedestrian footpath.

7.39. Material Contravention

7.40. The grounds of appeal have raised concerns that the proposal may materially contravene policy ENV01 which states it is a policy of the council to achieve the objectives of the Water Framework Directive (2006/113/EC).

7.41. I will consider ENV01, this policy seeks the achievement of the objectives of the regulatory framework for environmental protection and management, including compliance with EU Directives – including the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC, as amended), the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC), the Birds Directive (2009/147/EC), the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive (2011/92/EU, as amended by 2014/52/EC) and the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (2001/42/EC) – and relevant transposing Regulations through the implementation of the Development Plan. The proposed development has been considered in the context of the EU Directives; I have carried out an Appropriate Assessment Screening (Section 8.0) and it has been concluded that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant impact individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

7.42. In regard to the EIA Directive, I have carried out an EIA Screening, (Section 5.4) and I have concluded; having regard to the limited nature and scale of development and the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity of the site, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. I have also had regard to the Water Framework Directive (section 5.6), the groundwater status is noted as good at the subject site, the

applicant is proposing a connection to public water and public sewer, surface water will be discharged to public drainage system and will be treated through various SuDs measures implemented on site prior to discharge. Therefore, I have concluded that the proposed development will not have a negative impact on the water quality of the subject site or the surrounding area. In addition, as the discharge water will be treated, there will be no negative impact on Dunmore Harbour (status: Moderate).

7.43. In regard to the SEA Directive, this process is carried out by the Planning Authority prior to the adoption of a plan or programme. An SEA Statement is included in Appendix 19c of the Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-2028. It is in my opinion that the proposed development has been considered having regard to ENV01, and I have found that the proposed development will not negatively impact the environment and therefore does not materially contravene ENV01 of the CDP.

7.44. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not materially contravene the Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-2028. In this regard, I consider that the Board may consider a grant of permission under Section 37(2)(a) of the Planning and Development Act. 2000 as amended.

7.45. **Other Issues**

7.46. Landowner

7.47. The grounds of appeal state no letter of consent from the registered owner submitted with the planning application.

7.48. The applicant has responded and has submitted a response from a solicitor stating the applicant is the owner of the property along with folio and maps details.

7.49. I am satisfied that the applicant has provided sufficient evidence of their legal intent to make an application. Any further legal dispute is considered a civil matter and are outside the scope of the planning appeal. In any case, this is a matter to be resolved between the parties, having regard to the provisions of s.34(13) of the 2000 Planning and Development Act.

7.50. Development Contributions

7.51. I note concerns were raised that the correct development contributions would not be applied if the attic space is suitable for habitable area. The drawing submitted indicated the attic space will be used as attic space and not for habitable use.

Therefore, I consider that the appropriate development contributions can be applied and are subject to the ground floor area of each dwelling.

7.52. Water Services

- 7.53. The grounds of appeal noted that there is no provision for SuDs features, applicant proposes to discharge storm water to the public storm water network. The proposal is not in compliance with Waterford City and County Council Development Plan. Condition no. 8 of the planning permission requests the applicant to consult with Uisce Eireann and Waterford City and County Council Water Services Drainage and Water Engineers regarding compliance with water network, water metering, storm and foul drainage measures to serve the development. This should have been requested at further information stage to allow transparent public participation.
- 7.54. The applicant responded stating Uisce Eireann have provided a statement of feasibility of connection for the proposed development and conditions 7 & 8 confirm that all works will be carried out in compliance with Uisce Eireann Codes of Practice. A new wastewater treatment plant to the south of the site was constructed by Uisce Eireann. OPR Practice Note PN03 Planning Conditions (2022) section 3.10 outlines conditions requiring details of a development to be agreed with parties other than the Planning Authority can be applied.
- 7.55. I have reviewed the letter from Uisce Eireann submitted with the planning application which states feasible connection is possible without infrastructure upgrade. It is standard practice for an applicant/developer to finalise details of a connection prior to commencement with Water Services section of a council and with Uisce Eireann.
- 7.56. In relation to surface water treatment, I note the applicant proposes onsite soakaway designed in accordance with BRE 365 standards. Water Services Section did not raise any concerns in relation to surface water.
- 7.57. **Conditions.**
- 7.58. In the appeal response from the applicant, a number of concerns were raised in relation to the conditions applied by Waterford City and County Council. The concerns relate to Condition 2, 3(c) and 19.
- 7.59. Condition 2 requests the developer shall set up a Management Company to provide for the proper operation and maintenance of the bin collection point. The applicant

feels this is inappropriate given the scale and nature of the development and could be integrated into the overall estate Management Company. It is envisaged that no area to be taken in charge by the Council. I note the concerns raised by the applicant, the development consists of 3 no. dwellings, and it would be envisaged that each dwelling will take responsibility for their own bin. I note a collection point is proposed to the front of House 01. I consider given the small-scale nature of the development, that an overall estate management condition can be applied and a specific condition relating to the operation and maintenance of the bin collection point is not necessary.

- 7.60. Condition No. 3(c) requests that the shared surface estate road to the east of Site No. 3 shall be extended to the north such that the shared surface roadway abuts the northern site boundary. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed revised details. The applicant states this requirement offers little practical benefit and request the Board to amend the condition as extending the shared surface roadway to the northern boundary provides no functional access benefit and likelihood of any future development occurring on the northern property is considered extremely low. A pedestrian link could be accommodated and more appropriate. I have reviewed the site in question which is located to the north of the subject site, this area appears to be the private garden associated with the existing two storey dwelling, I note that vehicular access can be provided to this site via the existing laneway which serves the two existing dwellings. In this regard I do not consider that an additional potential access is required through the proposed development to the northern site. A pedestrian link is sufficient and shall be conditioned accordingly.
- 7.61. In regard to condition 19 which requires the removal of the existing roadside boundary fronting Convent Road and the construction of a new boundary wall. In addition, a new 1.8-metre-high blockwork boundary wall (plastered to the public side on the western, northern and eastern boundaries). The applicant requests consideration of alternative boundary treatment such as retaining the existing sod and stone boundary fronting Convent Road and manage vegetation overgrowth to achieve the required footpath width, replace the required 1.8m blockwork boundary wall with a natural boundary treatment. I have reviewed the existing boundary treatments, in relation to the proposed 2-metre-wide footpath proposed along Coxtown road, this hedgerow and sod and stone wall shall be set back in order to

provide a 2-metre footpath in accordance with the recently approved adjacent site to the east under planning reference ABP-321807-25 (PA: 2460466). The regular maintenance may not be sufficient and given the overgrowth onto the footpath, I consider it is safer to remove the stone wall and set back along the footpath. In relation to the required 1.8m blockwork boundary to the west, north and east, I consider this is a reasonable request from the Planning Authority in order to protect privacy and ensure defined boundaries between properties.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The proposed site is not located within a designated site, Seas off Wexford SPA (site code: 004237) is located c.1.4km south & east of the subject site.

The proposed development comprises of three number dwellings and all associated site works. The appellants raised concerns in relation to the AA screening carried out by the Planning Authority stating it was vague and insufficient and not robust enough to remove all reasonable scientific doubt as to the potential negative effects of the proposed development on the nearby habitats and waters.

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.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Scale and size of the proposed development of 3 no. dwellings on a site size of 0.2474ha within an urban setting.
- Distance to the nearest European site at over 1.4km to Seas off Wexford SPA.
- The lack of connections to any watercourse or on-site stream.
- On-site surface water will be disposed of via soakaways which will be installed in accordance with BRE 365 standards.

- The proposal will be connected to public water and public sewer and Uisce Eireann have stated that there is sufficient capacity at the Dunmore East Wastewater Treatment Plant.

I conclude, on the basis of objective information, 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. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1. I recommend that permission should be granted, subject to conditions as set out below.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 10.1. Having regard to the location of the subject site within Dunmore East town and zoned as “R1” as per Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-2028, and in particular the compliance with DMD06 policy objective for the subject site. The proposed development is in compliance with ENV01 and generally in compliance with the policies and objective of the CDP and DMURS, it is considered that the development would not seriously affect the traffic safety of the area or the visual amenity of the area or negatively impact the character of the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 31st day of July 2024, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with

the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. Prior to the commencement of development, the following details shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority: -
 - (a) The roadside boundary shall be setback to provide a 2-metre-wide footpath to the front of the site. Prior to the commencement of development, the final layout and design specifications for the roadside boundary setback to provide a 2-metre-wide footpath to the front of the site shall be agreed with the Roads Section, Waterford City & County Council. A copy of the agreed revised details and written confirmation from the Roads Section, Waterford City & County Council shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. The agreed roadside setback and footpath provision shall be carried out by the developer to the satisfaction of the District Engineer, Roads Section, Waterford City & County Council.
 - (b) The final layout and design specifications for the roadside boundary setback as per Condition No. 3(a) shall include full details public lighting to the roadside, and the relocation of existing utility poles to the roadside boundary if deemed necessary by Roads Section, Waterford City & County Council. If existing utility poles are to be relocated that is subject to the written agreement of the service provider. Unless otherwise agreed in writing with Roads Section, Waterford City & County Council public lighting to the public roadside shall be carried out by the developer to the satisfaction of the District Engineer, Roads Section, Waterford City & County Council.
 - (c) The shared surface estate road to the east of the Site No. 3 shall be extended to the north such that the shared pedestrian access abuts the northern site boundary. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed revised details.

Reason: in the interests of public safety and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. Prior to the commencement of development, a revised boundary treatment plan shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority indicating the following:

(a) The existing roadside boundary with the Coxtown Road (southern Boundary) shall be removed. The removal of the boundary shall only be undertaken during the time period between 1st September to the 31st March.

i. A 1.1-metre-high boundary wall with natural stone finish to the public roadside shall be constructed to the Coxtown Road boundary between points E-D, D-C and B-A as identified on site layout plan Drawing No. PP-1.01A received by the Planning Authority on the 17th December 2024.

(b) A 1.8-metre-high blockwork boundary wall (plastered on the public side) shall be constructed to the western boundary between points E-F (1.8m high from the ground level of the adjoining lands to the west) and between points F-G, G-H and H-A as identified on site layout plan Drawing No. PP-1.01A received by the Planning Authority on the 17th December 2024.

(c) Prior to the commencement of development, a method statement prepared by a suitably qualified, chartered and indemnified structural engineer outlining the boundary treatment works and ground works so as to ensure the site stability of the ground, adjoining road and properties are not negatively impacted upon during the construction and occupation of the development permitted herein. The development works shall be carried out in accordance with the prepared method statement, and all works as provided for in the method statement shall be supervised by competent person/person(s).

Reason: In the interest of clarity, the protection of amenities, the environment and public safety and for the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

4. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed dwellings shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Roof colour shall be blue-black, black, dark brown or dark grey in colour only.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure an appropriate high standard of development.

5. Prior to commencement, the applicant/development shall agree in writing with the Planning Authority for written approval,
 - (a) A detailed construction traffic management plan shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. The plan shall include details of arrangements for routes for construction traffic, parking during the construction phase, the location of the compound for storage of plant and machinery and the location for storage of deliveries to the site.
 - (b) The developer shall be responsible for the provision of a traffic yield sign and the application of appropriate markings at road junctions. The locations of the signs and any road to be agreed.
 - (c) Full details of all roads, footpath, cycle path, raised junctions, tactile paving materials and finishes.
 - (d) A wheel wash shall be employed at the entrance to the site for the duration of construction on site and shall be used by construction traffic exiting the site. The public roads used by construction traffic associated with the development permitted herein, shall be maintained free from debris generated/originated from the site/development works.

Reason: In the interest of traffic safety.

6. The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of public health

7. Silt traps shall be provided on all surface water drainage channels. Details in this regard shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: To prevent water pollution.

8. Prior to commencement of development, a Resource Waste Management Plan (RWMP) as set out in the EPA's Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects (2021) shall be prepared and submitted to the planning authority for written agreement. The RWMP shall include specific proposals as to how the RWMP will be measured and monitored for effectiveness. All records (including for waste and all resources) pursuant to the agreed RWMP shall be made available for inspection at the site office at all times.

Reason: In the interest of reducing waste and encouraging recycling.

9. A Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The CEMP shall include but not be limited to construction phase controls for dust, noise and vibration, waste management, protection of soils, groundwaters, and surface waters, site housekeeping, emergency response planning, site environmental policy, and project roles and responsibilities.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenities, public health and safety and environmental protection.

10. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.

11. The management and maintenance of the proposed development following its completion shall be the responsibility of a legally constituted management company. A management scheme providing adequate measures for the future maintenance of public open spaces, roads and communal areas shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: To provide for the satisfactory future maintenance of this development in the interest of residential amenity.

12. All site development works, with the exception of the laying of the final dressing to the road surface, shall be completed prior to the commencement of construction of any of the dwelling units.

Reason: To ensure the timely provision of infrastructural works for the development.

13. No advertisement or advertisement structure (other than those shown on the drawings submitted with the application) shall be erected or displayed on the building (or within the curtilage of the site) in such a manner as to be visible from outside the building, unless authorised by a further grant of planning permission.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

14. All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity

15. The landscaping scheme shown on drawing number PP-1.01A, as submitted to the planning authority on the 17th day of December 2024 shall be carried out within the first planting season following substantial completion of external construction works.

All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from the completion of the development or until the development is taken in charge by the local authority, whichever is the sooner, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.

16. Proposals for an estate/street name, house numbering scheme and associated signage shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, all estate and street signs, and house numbers, shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme. The proposed name(s) shall be based on local historical or topographical features, or other alternatives acceptable to the planning authority. No advertisements/marketing signage relating to the name(s) of the development shall be erected until the developer has obtained the planning authority's written agreement to the proposed name(s).

Reason: In the interest of urban legibility and to ensure the use of locally appropriate placenames for new residential areas.

17. Public lighting shall be provided in accordance with a scheme which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The scheme shall include lighting along pedestrian routes through open spaces and shall take account of trees within

the drawing. Such lighting shall be provided prior to the making available for occupation of any residential unit.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and public safety.

18. (a) Prior to the commencement of the development as permitted, the applicant or any person with an interest in the land shall enter into an agreement with the planning authority (such agreement must specify the number and location of each house or duplex unit), pursuant to Section 47 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, that restricts all relevant residential units permitted, to first occupation by individual purchasers i.e. those not being a corporate entity, and/or by those eligible for the occupation of social and/or affordable housing, including cost rental housing.

(b) An agreement pursuant to Section 47 shall be applicable for the period of duration of the planning permission, except where after not less than two years from the date of completion of each specified housing unit, it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the planning authority that it has not been possible to transact each of the residential units for use by individual purchasers and/or to those eligible for the occupation of social and/or affordable housing, including cost rental housing.

(c) The determination of the planning authority as required in (b) shall be subject to receipt by the planning and housing authority of satisfactory documentary evidence from the applicant or any person with an interest in the land regarding the sales and marketing of the specified housing units, in which case the planning authority shall confirm in writing to the applicant or any person with an interest in the land that the Section 47 agreement has been terminated and that the requirement of this planning condition has been discharged in respect of each specified housing unit.

Reason: To restrict new housing development to use by persons of a particular class or description in order to ensure an adequate choice and supply of housing, including affordable housing, in the common

good.

19. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreement (s) with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.

20. Prior to commencement, the applicant/development shall agree in writing with the Uisce Eireann for written approval in relation to relocation of sewer vent located to the front boundary of the site (the location of the sewer vent shall be setback to enable footpath widening). No development shall commence until such a time as Uisce Eireann has consented to the relocation of the sewer vent.

Reason: To provide adequate water and wastewater facilities.

21. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer, or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance

with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

22. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or other security to secure the provision and satisfactory completion and maintenance until taken in charge by the local authority of roads, footpaths, watermains, drains, public open space and other services required in connection with the development, coupled with an agreement empowering the local authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory completion or maintenance of any part of the development. The form and amount of the security shall be as agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion and maintenance of the development until taken in charge.

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.

Jennifer McQuaid
Planning Inspector

1st July 2025

Appendix A: Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-322155-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of 3 no. dwelling and all associated site works.
Development Address	Coxtown, Dunmore East, Co. Waterford.
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (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.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
<input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
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?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

<p>development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	<p>Schedule 5, Part 2, Class 10b(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units.</p>

<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)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</p>
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ABP-322155-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of 3 no. dwelling and all associated site works.
Development Address	Coxtown, Dunmore East, Co. Waterford.
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (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).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal consists of 3 no. dwelling within Dunmore East town on zoned lands. • The development will consist of typical construction and related activities and site works. Earthworks are required; however, it is not envisaged that the works will result in the production of significant waste, emissions or pollutants. • Surface water will be discharged to public sewer/drain. Wastewater will be discharged to public sewer with modest increase in loading. Subject to compliance with the relevant standards this will not result in pollution.
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>Given the urban nature of this site with connection to public services, there are no significant sensitivities in the immediate area.</p> <p>The subject site is not located within a designated site, the closest are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dunmore East Cliffs pNHA (site code: 000664) is located c. 300metres east of the subject site. • Seas off Wexford SPA (site code: 004237) is located c.1.4km south & east of the subject site. • Hook Head SAC (site code: 000764) located c. 4km east of the site on the other side of the bay. • River Barrow and River Nore SAC (site code: 0021262) is located c. 3.6km northeast.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tramore Back Strand SPA (site code: 004027) is located c.5km to the west of the subject site. <p>My Appropriate Assessment Screening concludes that the proposed development would not likely have a significant effect on any European Site.</p> <p>The subject site is located outside any flood risk area for coastal and fluvial flooding.</p>
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site size measures 0.2474ha. The size of the development is not exceptional in the context of an urban infill environment. There are existing adjacent dwellings to the proposed site. While there were issues raised in the appeal concerning the layout and design, I do not consider them to be of a magnitude to warrant an EIA given that such matters can be addressed under normal planning considerations. The proposal is a relatively small development in the urban context. There is no real likelihood of significant cumulative effects within the existing and permitted projects in the area.
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.

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

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

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix 2: Water Framework Directive Screening

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING**Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality**

An Bord Pleanála ref. no.	ABP-322155-25	Townland, address	Coxtown, Dunmore East, Co. Waterford.
Description of project		Construction of three number dwellings and all associated site works.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		The site is located within the urban area of Dunmore East town; the site is zoned and connection to public water and public sewer is possible. On site soakaways are proposed to deal with surface water on site and a connection to public drainage system is possible. The site is elevated and will require some cut and fill, however, is it not considered significant. There are no water features on site or adjacent the subject site. The site is not within a flood zone area.	
Proposed surface water details		Surface water will be disposed of onsite soakaways.	
Proposed water supply source & available capacity		Public water available. Road Opening Licence required for connection.	

Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues		Public Sewer. Road Opening Licence required.				
Others?						
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.	The site is 50metres North of the Knockacurri n_10 stream and 350m west of Dunmore	The site is in the Colligan-Mahon (ID 17) and sub catchment Monloun_SC_010	Groundwater status is described as Good (period for GW 2016-2021). The bedrock is described as	Groundwater is described as Not at Risk.	None identified	Potential surface water run-off

		East (Waterford) harbour.	Groundwater Body is Dunmore East (code: IE_SW_G_057)	poorly productive bedrock.			
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' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.
1.	Surface	Knockacurri n_10 stream	Possibly existing drainage ditches	Siltation, pH (Concrete), hydrocarbon spillages	Standard constructio n practice CEMP	No - due to distance to watercourse	Screened out
2.	Ground	Dunmore East (code:	Pathways exists but poor drainage characteristics	Spillages	Standard constructio	No	Screened Out

		IE_SW_G_057)			n practice CEMP		
3.	Coastal	Waterford Harbour	Possibly existing drainage ditches	Siltation, pH (Concrete), hydrocarbon spillages	Standard construction practice CEMP	No – due to distance to coast.	Screened out
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
3.	Surface	Knockacurri n_10 stream	Possibly existing drainage ditches	hydrocarbon spillages	Suds features	No	Screened out
4.	Ground	Dunmore East (code: IE_SW_G_057)	Pathways exists but poor drainage characteristics	Spillages	SuDs features	No	Screened Out
5.	Coastal	Waterford Harbour	Possibly existing drainage ditches	hydrocarbon spillages	Suds features	No	Screened out
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
5.	N/A						

