



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-322767-25

---

<b>Development</b>	Construction of a warehouse and two-storey office building together with associated site works. The application is accompanied by a Natura Impact Statement (NIS).
<b>Location</b>	Drinagh North, Drinagh, Co. Wexford.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Wexford County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	20241394
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Store-All Logistics Limited
<b>Type of Application</b>	Planning permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant permission with conditions
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Ann Nolan
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	01 <sup>st</sup> September 2025
<b>Inspector</b>	Sarah O'Mahony

# Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description .....	4
2.0 Proposed Development .....	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	5
3.1. Further Information .....	5
3.2. Decision .....	6
3.3. Planning Authority Reports .....	7
3.4. Prescribed Bodies .....	9
3.5. Third Party Observations .....	9
4.0 Planning History.....	9
5.0 Policy Context.....	10
5.1. Development Plan.....	10
5.2. Wexford LAP .....	15
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations .....	15
5.4. Built Heritage .....	15
5.5. EIA Screening .....	17
6.0 The Appeal .....	17
6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	17
6.2. Applicant Response .....	18
6.3. Further Responses .....	20
7.0 Assessment.....	21
7.2. Principle of Development .....	21
7.3. Traffic.....	24
7.4. Visual Impact .....	24

7.5. Archaeology .....	26
8.0 Appropriate Assessment.....	27
9.0 Water Framework Directive .....	28
9.1. Screening.....	28
9.2. Conclusion .....	29
10.0 Recommendation .....	29
11.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	29
12.0 Conditions .....	29
Appendix 1 – EIA Screening	
Appendix 2 – Appropriate Assessment	
Appendix 3 – Water Framework Directive Screening	

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The 3.62ha site is situated 2km south of Wexford town on a site situated between the R730 Rosslare Road and the foreshore with the Irish Sea. The area is characterised by a mix of agricultural land and light industrial employment land uses.
- 1.2. The entrance to the site is via an agricultural style access with a wide dished footpath from the R730 in the southwest of the site. This entrance is situated immediately northeast of a signalised junction on the R730 with an entrance to IDA lands west of the site servicing a number of employment and manufacturing facilities.
- 1.3. The site comprises part of a larger field utilised for tillage purposes with boundaries comprising a mix of hedgerows, post and rail fencing and paladin fencing. The landform rises gently from a low point of 8.6mOD in the northwest to a high point along the southern boundary of 12.81mOD before falling again to the southeast where contours are 10.02-10.12mOD along the eastern boundary of the site.
- 1.4. There is an electricity overhead cable (OHL) carried through the site on a series of timber poles on a north to south axis. There is one pole situated approximately in the centre of the field and another along the southern boundary. There is also an underground surface water pipe crossing the site from southwest to northeast.
- 1.5. There is one dwelling and farmyard situated close to the eastern boundary of the site with its access laneway situated along the northern boundary. The dwelling itself is 100m east of the site however a minor portion of the site intersects with the access laneway at the north. The dwelling is also a protected structure with the reference number WBC0303. There is a light industrial property adjacent to the southern boundary which sells and services HGVs while the adjoining land to the north of the domestic laneway is also in similar light industrial use.
- 1.6. There is a 0.7ha lagoon/pond situated 220m east of the site which is the closest and largest in a series of such water features situated to the east and southeast of the site. The Rosslare/Wexford railway track is situated immediately east of the lagoon and the foreshore immediately east of the tracks resulting in a separation distance of 300m between the site and the Slaney River Valley Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Wexford Harbour and Slobbs Special Protection Area (SPA).

## 2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Planning permission is sought for development which comprises the following:

- A single storey warehouse (5,748m<sup>2</sup>) storage and dispatch of goods,
- Two-storey office building (138m<sup>2</sup> x 2),
- 300m access road with 6no. vehicular entrance points providing access to the site and adjoining lands,
- Car park and circulation yard,
- Connection to public water utilities, and
- All ancillary site works including 2 no. entrances, security gates and fencing, signage, stormwater management, lighting, concrete paving, boundary treatments, landscaping and associated site works.

2.2. the following documentation was submitted with the application:

- Planning Statement
- Screening for Appropriate Assessment
- Natura Impact Statement
- Surface Water Management and Drainage Impact Assessment
- Archaeological Assessment
- Noise Sensitivity Technical Note
- Traffic and Transport Assessment, and
- Lighting Design Report

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Further Information

3.1.1. 4no. items of further information were sought as follows:

1. Archaeology Impact Assessment including geophysical survey and test trenching.

2. Landscaping proposals to the west and around the stormwater retention basins. Revised elevational finishes to break down the mass of the warehouse building.
  3. Clarification of how the proposed solar panels can contribute to meeting overall energy demands.
  4. Revised road layout to comply with Wexford County Council standards and that portrayed in a concurrent application for access and infrastructure on the same site.
- 3.1.2. The response included revised landscaping and revised elevational treatments which were deemed acceptable.
- 3.1.3. The Archaeological Impact Assessment identified a previously unknown circular enclosure type feature southeast of the site and outside of the works area as well as a fulacht fia situated within the site. A proposed surface water drainage pipe was re-routed in order to avoid interacting with this feature. A recommendation to provide buffer zones around both features was proposed however the extent of the buffer zones was unclear. As outlined below, the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage (DoHLGH) recommended a clarification of further information however the Planning Authority decided to grant permission subject to conditions requiring such clarification.
- 3.1.4. With regard to renewable energy, the further information response outlines predictions that the proposed solar panels would provide 44% of electricity needs for the proposed development, saving 28,322kg of CO<sub>2</sub>. It also suggests that this percentage could increase at a later point when battery storage technology has improved.
- 3.1.5. With regard to the road layout, a revised layout was submitted which was deemed acceptable by the Planning Authority.

## 3.2. **Decision**

- 3.2.1. Wexford County Council issued a notification to grant permission on 21<sup>st</sup> May 2025 subject to 14no. conditions including nos. 2 and 7 as follows:

*“2. Unless as otherwise agreed by the Planning Authority, within 2 months of the final grant of permission, a revised drawing at 1:500 scale shall be submitted for the agreement of the Planning Authority which clearly shows:*

- The position of the archaeological features as identified in the Archaeological Reports submitted.*
- A 15m buffer zone to the circular enclosure and landscaping/boundary treatments as appropriate to identify/protect this part of the site.*
- The position of the fulacht fia and any resultant alterations to services to avoid this feature.*

*Development shall take place in accordance with the agreed masterplan.*

*REASON: In the interests of clarity, visual amenity and protection of archaeological heritage.”*

*7. The applicant is required to employ a qualified archaeologist to monitor, under licence, all ground works associated with the development. The archaeologist shall be furnished with a clear programme of works outlining the types, location and chronology of ground works associated with the development.*

*Should archaeological material be found during the course of monitoring, the archaeologist may have work on the site stopped, pending a decision as to how best to deal with the archaeology. The developer shall be prepared to be advised by the Planning and Heritage Division of the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage with regard to any necessary mitigating action (e.g. preservation in situ, or excavation) and should facilitate the archaeologist in recording any material found.*

*REASON: In the interests of conservation and preservation of archaeological material.”*

### **3.3. Planning Authority Reports**

#### **3.3.1. Planning Reports**

- There are two case planner's reports, one recommending further information and the latter assessing it.
- The Planners report recommendation to grant permission is consistent with the notification of decision which issued.
- Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Appropriate Assessment (AA) issues were screened out.
- The report noted the site was previously zoned for industrial purposes in the now expired Wexford LAP. It also noted that adjoining developments are primarily commercial in nature and that the suitability of the site for a warehouse type development was accepted during pre-planning discussions. Additional commentary was added by the Senior Executive Planner agreeing and stating there is a reasonable expectation that the new Wexford Town plan will continue to facilitate industrial growth in this area.
- It noted the CFI request from the DoHLGH as well as ambiguity in drawings regarding the buffer zone. It also noted that the features of archaeological interest are situated outside of proposed "'built' above-ground development". It recommended conditions be attached similar to the concurrent application.
- Regarding the initial Roads Department recommendation to refuse permission, a note from the Senior Executive Planner is included in the Case Planners first report referencing this and stating that following a discussion with the Senior Planner, the Planning Authority is satisfied that the application can proceed. The Case Planner's narrative states "*The level of traffic generation is not considered to give rise to public safety or congestion concerns on the R730.*"

### 3.3.2. Other Technical Reports

- Environment Section: Report received setting out standard conditions.
- Fire Officer: A Fire Safety Certificate Application is required in accordance with Building Regulations.
- Coastal Engineer: No response.
- Roads Section: Two reports received. The former recommended a refusal as the development was considered premature pending a decision of a concurrent

application on the site for access and infrastructural works as outlined later. The latter, following receipt of further information recommended that permission be granted and outlined conditions to be attached.

### 3.4. **Prescribed Bodies**

- Uisce Éireann: No response. A Confirmation of Feasibility is however submitted with the application documents.
- Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage: Two reports received, the former recommended further information requesting that archaeological testing be undertaken. The latter report, following receipt of the further information response and archaeological report, recommended a clarification of further information (CFI) be sought. The CFI requested clarification of the proposed layout and archaeological buffer zone as well as agreeing with recommendations set out in the assessment report that topsoil stripping is supervised by a licensed Archaeologist.
- Geological Survey Ireland: No response.

### 3.5. **Third Party Observations**

3.5.1. Two submissions were received from the following:

1. Ann Nolan
2. Noel Nolan, representing Nolan Warehousing and Logistics

3.5.2. The submissions objected to the development and raised the following concerns:

- Visual Impact
- Traffic Impact

## 4.0 **Planning History**

The following is a concurrent live application which partially overlaps with the subject site:

- WCC Ref. 20240792 (ACP Ref. PL26.322458): Planning permission sought by Paula and Philip Stafford for the construction of a new entrance and access road to

service 4 no. industrial zoned sites, modifications to the existing signalised junction on R730 Rosslare Road. Access road to include for footpath, on carriage cycle lane to each side of the carriageway. Proposed services in the access road to include a new surface water drainage network, foul sewer connection, potable water network, telecom network and all ancillary site works. The proposed works will include for a new entrance wall, boundary treatments, signage with all associated works including landscaping. The application will be accompanied by a Natura Impact Statement (NIS). A notification to grant permission was issued by the Local Authority which was appealed by a third party to An Coimisiún Pleanála on 06<sup>th</sup> May 2025. No decision has been made to date.

- 20062888: Planning permission refused to Gerard and Philip Stafford to construct site development works for 11no. commercial/light industrial units including new vehicular entrance, access road and all associated site works. The application site included a protected structure. Permission was refused for 2no. reasons as follows:

1. *The proposed development would be premature pending the determination by the Planning Authority of a road network for the area.*
2. *Insufficient information has been submitted as part of this application on issues such as the proposed use, impact of the proposed development on the protected structure and monument, landscaping. The proposed development will therefore be contrary to proper planning and development.*

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1. The site is governed by the policies and provisions contained in the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 (referred to hereafter as the CDP). The objectives outlined below are particularly noted:

- Objective CS01: To implement the Core Strategy Guiding Principles and Development Approach and to ensure that required infrastructure and services are provided by infrastructure providers, either in advance or in tandem with development, to achieve this implementation.

- Objective CS06: To promote and facilitate the economic development of the Eastern Economic Corridor as an inter-urban regional economic driver, in particular, in Gorey Town, Enniscorthy Town, Wexford Town and Rosslare Harbour and Kilrane and the Europort.
- Objective CS10: To adopt a presumption in favour of development that can generate more jobs and activities within existing towns and villages in order to reduce the distances that people have to commute from home to work such as remote working hubs and subject to development complying with appropriate planning standards and achieving targeted growth.
- Objective CS13: To recognise the shared critical mass of population, strategic assets and economic potential of inter-urban networks working in collaborative partnerships as regionally significant drivers of growth and support investment in infrastructure and initiatives to sustainably deliver improved multi-modal transport connectivity and high speed, high quality digital connectivity between them.
- Objective CS19: To ensure the Key Towns of Wexford Town and Gorey Town continue to be drivers of economic growth and prosperity for the region, the county and their Municipal Districts by maximising their strategic location advantages to attract employment and population growth, developing their services and functions and protecting and enhancing their town centres, public realm and heritage and environmental quality making the towns high quality sustainable places to work, live and visit.
- Objective WT01: To strengthen the role of Wexford Town as a self-sustaining regional economic driver located on the Eastern Economic Corridor by leveraging this strategic location and accessibility to Rosslare Europort and building upon its inherent strengths including digital connectivity, skills, innovation and enterprise, tourism, culture and retail services.
- Objective ED01: To facilitate sustainable economic development, increase and improve job opportunities and ensure that County Wexford provides an outstanding business environment.
- Objective ED09: To support a positive presumption in favour of locating appropriate employment where it would address unemployment blackspots, support

sectoral and location-based strengths and synergies with existing employers and; take advantage of 'ready to go' property solutions.

- Objective ED34: To facilitate the development of enterprises related to the identified pillars for growth at appropriate locations and facilitate the provision of facilities and infrastructure which will enable clustering and specialisation in the county as set out in Section 6.7 (locations for economic development).
- Objective ED45: To direct commercial development to the settlements identified in the Settlement Hierarchy. Economic development proposals will be permitted within settlements on suitably zoned land or within towns and villages defined within the Core Strategy / Settlement Hierarchy, subject to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. Exceptions to the objective will be permitted in accordance with those outlined in this chapter, Chapter 7 Tourism Development, Chapter 12 Coastal Zone Management and Marine Spatial Planning, Chapter 14 Recreation and Open Space Strategy, Volume 8 Retail Strategy and Volume 10 Energy Strategy of the Plan.
- Objective ED48: To ensure that commercial development is located in the optimal location depending on whether it is 'people intensive' (customer and employee), 'land or space' intensive or is tied to a particular resource or dependent on a particular type of infrastructure (that is connection to the grid network which cannot be accommodated in the Settlement Hierarchy) and where such uses are compliant with the other location specific objectives of this Plan and land use zoning of the Local Area Plans.
- ED51: To ensure that, where economic development uses bound sensitive uses such as residences, natural and built heritage assets or community and education uses, that an appropriate buffer is maintained to protect the sensitive use.
- Objective ED60 – Wexford Town: It is the objective of the Council to:
  - Develop the Trinity Wharf lands as a Strategic Employment Location for the town and the county, and to maximise the economic development opportunities that this development will bring forward for the town, both directly and indirectly.

- Maximise the economic development opportunities offered by the strategic location of the town on the Eastern Economic Corridor.
  - Further develop and expand the presence of the Financial Services, Life Science and ICT industries in the town.
  - Further develop manufacturing industries in the town.
  - Maximise the tourism potential of the town through the development of the Wexford Town 'Maritime Town' brand, the planned greenways and the vibrant arts and cultural scene in the town.
  - Focus on the regeneration of key sites in the town including the regeneration of the Commercial Quay and Monck Street area.
- Objective TS42: To provide and maintain a safe, efficient and sustainable roads network in the county, to secure improvements to the road network and to balance the needs of all users placing pedestrians, cyclists and public transport at the top of the hierarchy of users.
  - Objective CZM01: To ensure the sustainable development of the county's coastal areas and the maritime area for the long-term benefit of coastal communities and the economic well-being of these areas and the county whilst protecting and enhancing environmental quality and managing and restoring biodiversity.
  - Objective CZM25: To have regard to the potential impacts of climate change in the future land use plans and the assessment of planning applications in the coastal zone and maritime area.
  - Objective CZM43: To adopt a presumption against development which would have inappropriate impacts on the seascape and landscape of the coastal area.
  - Objective AH02: To recognise the importance of monuments and sites and protect the character and integrity of these monuments and sites where appropriate. The Council will consult the National Monuments Service where a development is proposed that may impact on an archaeological monument and/or site.
  - Objective BH01: To protect the architectural heritage of County Wexford and to include structures considered to be of special architectural, historical, archaeological,

artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical interest in the Record of Protected Structures.

5.1.2. Volume 2 of the CDP is a development management manual I note the provisions therein including section 5.2 regarding 'Industry and Warehouse Developments' as follows:

These developments will be required to present a high-quality appearance, assisted by landscaping and careful placing of advertisement structures and should have regard to the following:

- Individual buildings should exhibit a high quality of modern architectural design and finish, including the use of colour.
- Buildings >500m<sup>2</sup> in floor area are required to provide south-facing solar panels.
- In the case of two or more industrial/warehouse units, a uniform design will be required for boundary treatments, roof profiles and building lines and signage.
- Areas between the building(s) and the road boundary may include car parking spaces provided that adequate screen planting is incorporated into the design proposal. Adequate provision shall be made on site for the parking of vehicles, storage and stacking spaces. Storage and stacking areas shall be located to the rear of building, or where such facilities can only be provided to the side, provision for screening shall be made.
- The front building line shall be as determined in consultation with the Planning Authority and, where required, the existing roadside boundary shall be set back, subject to appropriate boundary treatments for the particular location being proposed.
- The proposed use shall not be injurious to the residential amenity of adjoining properties.
- A landscaped buffer zone (minimum 10-15 metres wide) will be a requirement of planning permissions for any industrial/warehousing development where it adjoins another land use zoning or where it may impact on the amenities of adjoining land uses.

- In the case of proposals in the countryside, there are satisfactory measures to assist integration into the landscape.

## 5.2. Wexford LAP

5.2.1. A note on the Wexford County Council website states that the Wexford Town and Environs Development Plan 2009-2015 (as extended) has expired. A pre-draft consultation to inform the preparation of a new Wexford Local Area Plan (LAP) was undertaken in 2023 however no draft LAP has been published to date.

5.2.2. The land use zoning for the site under the expired Plan was for 'Industrial, Commercial and Related Uses' which had the following objective:

*“• In the case of proposals in the countryside, there are satisfactory measures to assist integration into the landscape.”*

- It further states:

*“• In the case of proposals in the countryside, there are satisfactory measures to assist integration into the landscape.”*

5.2.3. The zoning map identified the site as a 'gateway site' and also that there was a requirement to provide a developer-led road through the site from the regional road at the west, towards the east and north.

## 5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

5.3.1. The site is situated 300m west of the Slaney River Valley Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Wexford Harbour and Slobs Special Protection Area (SPA) and proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA).

## 5.4. Built Heritage

5.4.1. There are no recorded archaeological features on the site however there is a recorded monument referred to as a castle situated 140m east of the site with the reference number WX042-012----. The description attached to the record on the National Monuments Service historical environment viewer states there are no visible remains at ground level. This record is situated within the curtilage of the dwelling situated east of the site.

5.4.2. The dwelling in question is a protected structure (ref. WBC0303) and is also included on the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH) (ref. 15704269). It is an occupied two-storey farmhouse with dormer attic stated to date to 1842-1901. The following description and appraisal are provided on the NIAH website:

#### Description

Detached three-bay two-storey farmhouse with dormer attic, occupied 1901, on an L-shaped plan with four-bay two-storey side (south) elevation centred on two-bay two-storey pedimented breakfront. Renovated, 2003. Replacement hipped slate roof on an L-shaped plan with clay ridge tiles, cement rendered chimney stacks having stepped capping supporting terracotta pots, rooflights, and uPVC rainwater goods on rendered eaves. Diamond-detailed replacement slate hung walls with rusticated cement rendered piers to corners supporting cement rendered band to eaves. Segmental-headed central door opening with cut-granite threshold, timber doorcase with pilasters on padstones supporting cornice, and rendered surround having concave reveals framing glazed timber panelled double doors having fanlight. Square-headed window openings (ground floor) with cut-granite sills, and concealed dressings framing replacement four-over-eight timber sash windows having interlocking Y-tracery glazing bars. Square-headed window openings (first floor) with cut-granite sills, and concealed dressings framing replacement eight-over-eight timber sash windows. Interior including (ground floor): central hall retaining carved timber surrounds to door openings framing timber panelled doors; and carved timber surrounds to door openings to remainder framing timber panelled doors with timber panelled shutters to window openings. Set in relandscaped grounds.

#### Appraisal:

A farmhouse representing an integral component of the nineteenth-century domestic built heritage of the environs of Wexford with the architectural value of the composition, one rooted firmly in the prevailing late Georgian fashion, suggested by such attributes as the compact plan form centred on a restrained doorcase showing a simple fanlight; and the diminishing in scale of the openings on each floor producing a graduated visual impression. Having been well maintained, the elementary form and massing survive intact together with

quantities of the original or sympathetically replicated fabric, both to the exterior and to the interior, including a slate hung surface finish widely regarded as an increasingly endangered hallmark of the architectural heritage of County Wexford.

- 5.4.3. There is also a cluster of SMR records in the adjoining townland to the north referring to barrows, a graveyard, a bronze age house, fulacht fia and ringforts etc.

## 5.5. EIA Screening

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

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

One appeal was received from Ann Nolan objecting to the development on the following grounds:

- The site is not zoned and would be better remaining as farmland or else developed in a manner more appropriate to its coastal setting.
- The notification of permission to grant planning permission is premature pending the decision of the concurrent application. Specific reference made to a Roads Department report suggesting the proposal is premature in its design and layout and it would be appropriate to defer issuing a decision pending the decision of the concurrent application.
- Traffic impacts due to the existing volume of traffic in the area. The TTA concludes that the existing signalised junction is at capacity, operating with existing

queues and delays and that further queues and delays would occur in future scenarios.

- The proposed warehouse does not meet the high-quality appearance required by Section 5.2 of the CDP and is out of context and character with the surrounding landscape. The further information response providing revised external finishes is insufficient to address the reduced bulk as requested and further revised proposals should be sought.
- Proposed archaeological mitigation measures are insufficient to protect the features identified on the site and further details should have been sought by the Local Authority instead of attaching condition no. 2.

## 6.2. Applicant Response

- The concurrent application has common works to this proposal in the form of the proposed access and infrastructure. The third-party appeal on that application was made by the same appellant in this case and raises the same grounds.
- At the time of lodging the concurrent application, the intention to lodge this subject application was clearly outlined to the Planning Authority. The appeal significantly delays construction of the critical infrastructure required to support the neighbouring Danone Nutricia plant and the Board is requested to note how the applicant endeavoured to accommodate all third-party concerns at every step of the process. The grounds of appeal are unfounded and have already been addressed by the Planning Authority.
- The lack of any zoning or LAP for the lands does not preclude reaching a decision as the development must comply with the CDP and core strategy therein as well as demonstrating compatibility with the established land uses and urban form. In this context objectives WT01 and WT05 support the development, the predominant land use is industrial/commercial including similar warehousing, the N25 and R730 provide good quality access and no impacts have been identified which may affect the sites coastal setting as alluded to by the appellant. References are made to the Case Planner's report which considered the principle of development to be acceptable.

- With regard to alleged prematurity on the basis of no decision being made yet on the concurrent application, the response considers any delay to the decision status of that application is due to the appellants appeal to that decision. References to the Roads Department initial report recommending a refusal of permission fail to acknowledge the later report recommending a grant of permission. The validity of the application has been accepted by the Local Authority who also determined its suitability with regards to transportation matters.
- An additional TTA response is submitted which reiterates how there would be no significant impact on the local road network or capacity of the adjacent signalised junction. Additionally, the proposed cycle path has been designed in accordance with the Cycle Design Manual.
- With regard to visual impact, the response contends that the elevational changes submitted with the further information response address the concerns of the planning authority as noted in the Case Planner's report. It also submitted sample images of similar structures including the recently completed Nolan Warehousing and Logistics building situated 125m north of the site. The applicant considers this building sets a precedence given its similarities to the site and proposed development. It also suggests that condition nos. 5 and 6 further safeguard visual amenity. These conditions require a landscaping scheme to be implemented and all external materials and finishes to be agreed with the Planning Authority in advance.
- The response suggests that impacts to the landscape were also considered in the Archaeological Impact Assessment which concluded that no impact would arise due to the extent of existing similar developments in the area. It outlines the context of the area including that the adjoining public road is not a scenic route with any special character status and there are no scenic views or prospect associated with the immediate area.
- With regard to archaeology and the adequacy of conditions to protect the circular enclosure, the Board are invited to note that this feature and its buffer are situated outside of the site and that the appropriate mitigation measures are proposed which the Planning Authority agreed with. All surveying and reporting was carried out by licenced and competent professionals and concludes that they will protect the likely archaeological resource from any potential negative impact. It is difficult to

understand the appellants basis that the mitigation measures are inadequate given the DHLGH has a specific development control function in the protection of built heritage and has had oversight of the application. Condition no. 7 requires further reporting to the DHLGH and Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.

### 6.3. Further Responses

The appellant submitted a response to the applicant's response to the appeal. The appellant's response is summarised below.

- Suggestions that a decision should be made for commercial reasons denies natural justice and attempts to address the appellants concerns.
- The response ignores the fact that the site is unzoned. The appellant again suggests that the development is premature pending preparation of a local area plan for Wexford and permission for a development of this scale should only be granted on foot of an appropriate zoning. The landowners did not make any observation requesting re-zoning in the preparation of the Wexford CDP.
- Permission has not yet been granted for the concurrent application. A change in the red line facilitates an assessment of the individual site only and not for the entire development as proposed in the concurrent application and therefore there are concerns regarding the design and any decision is premature pending a decision on the concurrent application.
- Additional traffic studies did not form part of the application and therefore were not assessed by the Local Authority and should be irrelevant. The report is inconsistent but also suggests a 1hour morning peak where congestion would be experienced. It is unclear if the traffic model relates to the current or future scenarios. The additional traffic report should therefore not be considered as part of the appeal as it is incomplete and uncontested.
- Regarding visual impact, the sample images of similar developments are not reflective of the site-specific characteristics of this subject site. The examples also all relate to zoned lands. What remains relevant is that the visual impact of the proposed development is inappropriate given its proximity to the public road as well as its coastal setting.

## 7.0 Assessment

7.1.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the report/s 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
- Traffic
- Visual Impact
- Archaeology

## 7.2. Principle of Development

7.2.1. The site is situated on lands which were previously zoned for light industrial, commercial and related purposes under the now expired Wexford Town and Environs Development Plan 2009-2015. The current Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 does not include land use zonings for Wexford Town and its surrounding area, with the intention that a Wexford Town and Environs Local Area Plan (LAP) would be adopted within the lifetime of the CDP and include land use zonings for the area. I note pre-draft LAP consultation was held however no draft plan has been published to date for Wexford town and there is no current specific zoning objective for the subject site in place.

7.2.2. I do not agree that the principle of development is premature based solely on the absence of a zoning objective or LAP for the site. There is a current CDP and relevant national policies in place which will aid in assessing the application on its own merits, as is the case for any other proposal on un-zoned lands. In this context, I note overarching core strategy objectives which all support the proposed development including CS01, CL06 and CS10, as well as economic development objectives ED01, ED09, ED34, ED45 and ED60, the latter of which is specific to economic development in Wexford town and, inter alia seeks to:

- *Maximise the economic development opportunities offered by the strategic location of the town on the Eastern Economic Corridor.*
- *Further develop and expand the presence of the Financial Services, Life Science and ICT industries in the town.*
- *Further develop manufacturing industries in the town.*

7.2.3. Core strategy objective WT01 also relates specifically to Wexford town and seeks to strengthen its as a self-sustaining regional economic driver located on the Eastern Economic Corridor by leveraging this strategic location and accessibility to Rosslare Europort while Objectives CS13 and CS19 seek to benefit from efficiencies in existing populations, assets and collaborative partnerships by maximising their strategic locations in attracting employment.

7.2.4. The proposed development does not comprise any of the specific industry types outlined above in ED60, however given the clear relationship and synergies demonstrated in the application documents between it and the Danone Nutricia facility which falls within the categories of life sciences and manufacturing, I consider the development is supported by Objective ED60 as well as CS13 and CS19.

7.2.5. Objective ED48 seeks to ensure that commercial development is appropriately located, depending on its characteristics, where such uses are compliant with the CDP and relevant zonings. In my opinion, having regard to the established light industrial and business characteristics of the area as well as proximity to rail and road infrastructure, the proposed site is acceptable for a warehouse and logistics development. Further to this conclusion, when regard is given to documentation submitted with the application outlining a rationale for the development based on its proximity to and relationship with the Danone Nutricia facility, I consider the 2km separation distance between the two sites to be acceptable and likely to result in increased efficiencies and an overall lower number of HGVs on the wider public road network.

7.2.6. Lastly, section 5.2 of the Development Management Manual sets out specific criteria relevant to warehousing proposals including requirements such as a high-quality appearance, provision of solar panels, landscaping and maintaining residential amenity etc. In my opinion the proposed development has met these criteria and therefore the principle of development is established.

- 7.2.7. I note the appellant's suggestion that the land should remain as farmland or else be developed in a manner more appropriate to its coastal setting and in this regard I note the provisions of Objective CZM01 which seeks to ensure the sustainable development of the coastal zone. Having regard to the location of the site in a serviced urban setting with good quality access and potential for future rail connectivity, I consider its development for warehousing and logistics is appropriate and would benefit from synergies given its proximity to the Danone Nutricia Plant. The land was previously zoned for such uses which, in my view, is an appropriate and efficient land use. I do not consider that the development would impact on the coastal setting of the site but would consolidate existing urban development in the area. The topic of visual impact is discussed later below however in terms of its connection to land use and potential amenity purposes, I do not consider the site suitable for amenity purposes given its existing location within a light industrial/commercial/employment zone, a requirement to cross the railway tracks to access the coast itself and the lack of other amenity related services or infrastructure in the area. In my view, the use of the land is best served by reflecting the surrounding light industrial/commercial/employment uses and maximising interrelated efficiencies. I also consider the proposed layout which provides access to adjacent land represents proper planning by future proofing the landholding while the provision of solar panels complies with the requirements of objective CZM25.
- 7.2.8. I also note Objective CZM43 which seeks to adopt a presumption against development which would have inappropriate impacts on the seascape and landscape of the coastal area however as outlined above I do not consider this development to be inappropriate for the site.
- 7.2.9. Lastly regarding the principle of development, I note the appellant suggests the proposal is premature pending a decision on the concurrent application. The appeal quotes such a recommendation from the Roads Department in their initial report. A second report was however issued following receipt of the further information which did not object to the development. I agree with the Planning Authority and do not consider there is any prematurity concerns as both applications are independent of each other. This subject proposal is not reliant on a positive outcome from the appeal on the concurrent application and vice versa.

### **7.3. Traffic**

- 7.3.1. The appellant contends there would be a significant impact to traffic flows in the area and that additional reporting provided with the appeal should be discounted as the Planning Authority did not comment. I note that the applicant's response and the additional traffic report was circulated to the Planning Authority and therefore am satisfied that they were given an opportunity to comment.
- 7.3.2. With regard to provision of new roads Objective TS42 seeks to provide and maintain a safe, efficient and sustainable roads network in the county, to secure improvements to the road network and to balance the needs of all users placing pedestrians, cyclists and public transport at the top of the hierarchy of users. I consider the road design as submitted with the application, with a 2m wide footpath and 2m wide cycle path meets this objective.
- 7.3.3. With regard to traffic flows, in my view the traffic report clearly demonstrates how the existing junction would operate satisfactorily in a number of future year scenarios. Traffic flows are unaffected during the PM peak while some delays are identified in one 15min scenario during the AM peak using the worst-case scenario. The reporting outlines differences between various traffic modelling software and how traffic is managed with both software types. I note and accept the conclusions outlined therein that delays identified in the worst-case scenario would likely be accommodated and managed efficiently by the existing software operating at the signalised junction itself, thereby negating any potential delays.
- 7.3.4. In my opinion, having regard to the likely scale of traffic generated from the proposed development, together with the data and conclusions outlined in the TTA, I consider that the development is unlikely to result in a significant impact to traffic and transportation related matters in the area. I also note that the Roads Department of the Local Authority issued a final report recommending that permission is granted.

### **7.4. Visual Impact**

- 7.4.1. The proposed development comprises a total floorspace of 6,024m<sup>2</sup>, the majority of which is one large warehouse with a footprint of 82m x 75m and a total height of 16m. The warehouse will comprise a series of three pitches and two valleys to accommodate the total span of the structure. The two-storey office block situated at

the south will be finished with a flat roof reaching 8.7m in height. External materials and finishes comprise insulated metal cladding panels in a range of greys and blues with some horizontal banding on the office block and darker corner panels on the warehouse to break down the bulk of the structure.

- 7.4.2. The appellant suggests this does not represent the high-quality appearance required by Section 5.2 of the CDP, is out of context and character with the surrounding landscape and is insufficient to reduce the bulking effect of the building. The appellants response to the applicant's response further suggests that the sample images represent developments permitted on zoned lands are all site specific. It contends that what remains relevant is that the visual impact of the proposed development is inappropriate given its proximity to the public road as well as its coastal setting.
- 7.4.3. The nature of warehouse buildings requires bulky structures with a large floorplan to enable storage of goods on racking and minimal windows in order to maximise wall space and provision of specialist storage conditions. In this context, the design of any such structure is unlikely to have much variation from one to the next, as demonstrated by the sample images provided, or likely to result in very high-quality architecture such as that seen in civic and commercial buildings such as the Gallagher Insurance building immediately west of the site. In this regard I accept the principle for the shape and design of the structure. I also accept the efforts made by the applicant in the further information response to reduce the bulking effect of the building.
- 7.4.4. The appellant suggests that the sample images refer to structures on zoned lands and are therefore irrelevant to this case which will impact on the coastal zone. I agree that each site should be assessed on its own merits and that to a degree, the sample images are irrelevant. However, regard should also be had to the context of the site and established development in the area. In this case, sensitive features include the nearby protected structure and coastline while appropriate reference images from which to draw inspiration for any proposed design could include the Nolan Warehousing and Logistics site, the Waters Technology Ireland facility situated southwest of the site on the LDA landbank and the Flavour Manufacturing Wexford facility also situated southwest of the site within the IDA landbank. Each of

these structures utilises similar panels of cladding in different colours and patterns to break down the singular large mass of building.

- 7.4.5. The structure will be situated close to the coastline however it will not be visible from any known amenity area, public walkway, scenic route or affect any protected view or prospect and in this regard would not contravene Objective CZM43. I consider the development would help to consolidate the built up area and reinforce an emerging separation line from the coastline. Much of the building will be screened from the coast by existing landscaping surrounding the adjoining dwelling/protected structure while the 350m separation from the coastline would also help to reduce its impact.
- 7.4.6. With regard to impacts to the protected structure, I note the provisions of Objective BH01 which seek to protect architectural heritage and consider the proposed separation distance of 50m between the proposed new structure and curtilage of the protected structure, together with existing mature trees surrounding the curtilage of the dwelling and proposed landscaping including a berm and hedgerow, is sufficient to protect the architectural integrity of the protected structure and that there would be little intervisibility between the structures.
- 7.4.7. In my opinion, the proposed building design is acceptable to the context of the site and will not detract from the adjacent protected structure or the nearby coastline. I also consider it unlikely that the proposed design would result in any significant negative impact on the visual amenity of the area or on the character of the landscape.

## 7.5. **Archaeology**

- 7.5.1. As outlined above the applicant carried out geophysical surveys and test trenching which identified a circular enclosure outside but close to the southeastern boundary of the site while a fulacht fia was also identified within the site. Mitigation measures were not explicitly clear and the DoHLGH recommended a clarification of further information however the Planning Authority decided to grant permission subject to 2no. conditions requiring further agreement on mitigation measures prior to the commencement of development.
- 7.5.2. The appellant suggests this approach is insufficient to protect the features identified on the site and further details should have been sought by the Local Authority

instead of attaching condition no. 2. I disagree however having regard to the extent of the interaction between the known features and the site. The circular enclosure is situated entirely outside of the site while the fulacht fia is situated in a green area which will not be affected by the proposed works.

7.5.3. I note the provisions of Objective AH02 which seeks to recognise the importance of monuments and sites and protect the character and integrity of these monuments and sites where appropriate. In my view the conditions outlined by the Planning Authority would serve to ensure the requirements of Objective AH02 are upheld and archaeology is protected.

## **8.0 Appropriate Assessment**

8.1. Appropriate Assessment Conclusion: Integrity Test

8.1.1. In screening the need for Appropriate Assessment, it was determined that the proposed development could result in significant effects on the following European sites in view of the conservation objectives of those sites and that Appropriate Assessment under the provisions of S177U was required:

- Slaney River Valley SAC
- Wexford Harbour and Slobbs SPA
- Raven Point Nature Reserve SAC
- The Raven SPA, and
- Seas off Wexford SPA

8.1.2. Following an examination, analysis and evaluation of the NIS all associated material submitted, I consider that adverse effects on site integrity of the 5no. European sites can be excluded in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and that no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of such effects.

8.1.3. My conclusion is based on the following:

- Detailed assessment of construction and operational impacts.
- The conservation interest features considered in the AA.

- The proposed development will not affect the attainment of conservation objectives for the European sites or prevent or delay the restoration of favourable conservation condition.
- Effectiveness of mitigation measures proposed and adoption of a CEMP.

## 9.0 Water Framework Directive

### 9.1. Screening

- 9.1.1. The subject site is located on agricultural land south of Wexford, in a peri-urban area. The Lower Slaney Estuary transitional waterbody (IE\_SE\_040\_0200) is situated 300m east of the site while the Wexford Harbour coastal waterbody (IE\_SE\_040\_0000) is situated another 300m to the east but essentially forming one connected waterbody. There is a stream situated on adjacent land to the north referred to as the Rathaspick\_010 which flows north and northeast and discharges into the estuary 500m northeast and downstream of the site. There is an unnamed .7ha lagoon/pond situated 220m east of the site which is the closest and largest in a series of such water features situated to the east and southeast of the site. The groundwater body is referred to as the Fardystown aquifer which has moderate vulnerability. The site is situated in the Slaney and Wexford Harbour catchment area and the Forth commons sub-catchment.
- 9.1.2. The proposed development seeks to construct 1 no. warehouse, offices, access road and associated site development works including storm water detention basins. The outfall from the surface water network will discharge into the Rathaspick stream.
- 9.1.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.1.4. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. 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.

## 9.2. Conclusion

9.2.1. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The urban infill nature and modest scale of the works.
- The location of the site removed from any waterbodies and lack of any hydrological connectivity.
- Connection to existing public water services.

## 10.0 Recommendation

I recommend that planning permission is granted in accordance with the conditions set out below.

## 11.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the location of the site within the 'existing built up area' of Wexford on serviced lands, the provisions of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028, specifically Objectives CS06, CS19, WT01 and ED60, the established pattern of commercial and light industrial development in the area, the nature and scale of the proposed development, the proximity of the site to a protected structure, the coast and the presence of archaeology on the site, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not result in the creation of a traffic hazard, would not seriously injure the visual amenity or archaeological resource of the area and would not impact on the setting or character of the nearby protected structure. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 12.0 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 28 <sup>th</sup> day of March 2025, except as may otherwise be required in
----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The mitigation measures contained in the submitted Natura Impact Statement (NIS), shall be implemented.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the integrity of European Sites.</p>
3.	<p>The following shall be complied with:</p> <p>(a) All mitigation measures in relation to archaeology and cultural heritage as set out in the Archaeological Assessment by Maurice F. Hurley dated February 2025 submitted as Further Information to the Planning Authority shall be implemented in full, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the conditions of this permission. The planning authority and the National Monuments Service shall be furnished with a final archaeological report describing the results of any archaeological investigative work/ excavation required, following the completion of all archaeological work on site and any necessary post-excavation specialist analysis. All resulting and associated archaeological costs shall be borne by the developer.</p> <p>(b) Within 2 months of the grant of permission a revised drawing at 1:500 scale shall be submitted for the agreement of the Planning Authority which clearly shows the position of the archaeological features as identified in the reports received and the 15m buffer/ exclusion zone around the circular enclosure. This shall include appropriate landscaping and boundary treatments.</p> <p>(c) The developer shall engage a suitably qualified (licensed eligible) archaeologist to monitor (licensed under the National Monuments</p>

	<p>Acts) all site clearance works, topsoil stripping, groundworks, and/or the implementation of agreed preservation in-situ measures associated with the development, following consultation with the Local Authority Archaeologist or the National Monument Service (NMS). Prior to the commencement of such works the archaeologist shall consult with and forward to the Local Authority archaeologist or the NMS as appropriate a method statement for written agreement. The use of appropriate tools and/or machinery to ensure the preservation and recording of any surviving archaeological remains shall be necessary. Should archaeological remains be identified during the course of archaeological monitoring, all works shall cease in the area of archaeological interest pending a decision of the planning authority, in consultation with the National Monuments Service, regarding appropriate mitigation (preservation in-situ/excavation).</p> <p>(d) The developer shall facilitate the archaeologist in recording any remains identified. Any further archaeological mitigation requirements specified by the planning authority, following consultation with the National Monuments Service, shall be complied with by the developer.</p> <p>(e) Following the completion of all archaeological work on site and any necessary post-excavation specialist analysis, the planning authority and the National Monuments Service shall be furnished with a final archaeological report describing the results of the monitoring and any subsequent required archaeological investigative work/excavation required. All resulting and associated archaeological costs shall be borne by the developer.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the continued preservation either in situ or by record of places, caves, sites, features or other objects of archaeological interest.</p>
4.	<p>Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed structures including boundary treatments shall be</p>

	<p>submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure an appropriate high standard of development.</p>
5.	<p>The landscaping scheme shown on drawing nos. 24/MORCE/DM/R/001 and 24/MORCE/DM/R/002, as submitted to the planning authority on the 11<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2024 shall be carried out within the first planting season following substantial completion of external construction works.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.</p>
6.	<p>Upon completion of the development and prior to the taking in charge of the road infrastructure, the developer shall complete Stage 3 and 4 Road Safety Audits, to be carried out by an independent, approved and certified auditor. Recommendations contained in the Road Safety Audit and agreed actions shall be signed off by the audit team and agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of pedestrian and traffic safety.</p>
7.	<p>(a) The access road serving the proposed development including turning bays, junctions, parking areas, footpaths, lighting and kerbs shall comply with the detailed construction standards of the planning authority for such works.</p>

	<p>(b) Details of all locations materials and signage to be used shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of amenity and of traffic and pedestrian safety.</p>
8.	<p>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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.</p>
9.	<p>The attenuation and 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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</p>
10.	<p>The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Location of the site and materials compound(s) including area(s) identified for the storage of construction refuse;</li> <li>(b) Location of areas for construction site offices and staff facilities;</li> <li>(c) Details of site security fencing and hoardings;</li> <li>(d) Details of on-site car parking facilities for site workers during the course of construction;</li> <li>(e) Details of the timing and routing of construction traffic to and from</li> </ul>

	<p>the construction site and associated directional signage, to include proposals to facilitate the delivery of abnormal loads to the site;</p> <p>(f) Measures to obviate queuing of construction traffic on the adjoining road network;</p> <p>(g) Measures to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on the public road network;</p> <p>(h) Alternative arrangements to be put in place for pedestrians and vehicles in the case of the closure of any public road or footpath during the course of site development works;</p> <p>(i) Details of appropriate mitigation measures for noise, dust and vibration, and monitoring of such levels;</p> <p>(j) Containment of all construction-related fuel and oil within specially constructed bunds to ensure that fuel spillages are fully contained. Such bunds shall be roofed to exclude rainwater;</p> <p>(k) Off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste and details of how it is proposed to manage excavated soil;</p> <p>(l) Means to ensure that surface water run-off is controlled such that no silt or other pollutants enter local surface water sewers or drains.</p> <p>(m) A record of daily checks that the works are being undertaken in accordance with the Construction Management Plan shall be available for inspection by the planning authority;</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of amenities, public health and safety and environmental protection</p>
11.	<p>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</p>

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 Coimisiún 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.

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.

---

Sarah O'Mahony  
Planning Inspector

17<sup>th</sup> September 2025

### Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	322767-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Construction of a warehouse and two-storey office building together with associated site works including access road.
<b>Development Address</b>	Drinagh North, Drinagh, Co. Wexford
	<b>In all cases check box /or leave blank</b>
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>  (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,  - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.  <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.  <b>No Screening required.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.  <b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.  <b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b>  <b>OR</b>  <b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b>	Class 10(a) Industrial estate development projects, where the area would exceed 15 hectares.  Threshold = 15ha Subject site area = 3.62ha  Class 10(dd) All private roads which would exceeds 2000 metres in length.  Threshold = 2000m Proposed development = 300m

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

### Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

<b>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</b>	
<b>Characteristics of proposed development</b>	The urban site is serviced and its size is not exceptional in the context of the prevailing plot size in the area for similar developments.

<p>(In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).</p>	<p>A short-term construction phase would be required and the development would not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance due to its scale. The development, by virtue of its type and nature, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. Its operation presents no significant risks to human health.</p> <p>The size and scale of the proposed development is not significantly or exceptionally different to the existing building or developments in the area.</p>
<p><b>Location of development</b></p> <p>(The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).</p>	<p>The subject site is located adjacent to the following ecological, architectural and archaeological sensitive sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Slaney River Valley Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Wexford Harbour and Slobs Special Protection Area (SPA) and proposed Natural Heritage Area</li> <li>- Drinagh House protected structure</li> <li>- Castle, enclosure and fulacht fia</li> </ul> <p>Having regard however to the location of each feature relative to the proposed development, the impact assessments carried out as part of the planning application and the mitigation measures proposed, it is considered that none of these features would trigger the requirement to carry out a full EIA either on their own or in combination.</p> <p>Therefore, it is considered that, having regard to the nature and scale of the development, there is no real likelihood of significant effect on other significant environmental sensitivities in the area.</p> <p>It is not likely to have any cumulative impacts or significant cumulative impacts with other existing or permitted projects.</p>
<p><b>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</b></p> <p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p>	<p>The size of the proposed development is notably below the mandatory thresholds in respect of a Class 10 Infrastructure Projects of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 as amended and no significant impacts are predicted due to the scale of the development.</p> <p>Localised construction impacts will be temporary. The proposed development would not give rise to waste, pollution or nuisances beyond what would normally be deemed acceptable.</p> <p>Having regard to the nature of the proposed development and works constituting development within a peri-urban area, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects,</p>

and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.

**Conclusion**

<b>Likelihood of Significant Effects</b>	<b>Conclusion in respect of EIA</b>
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix 2: AA Screening Determination**  
**Test for likely significant effects**

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects	
<b>Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics</b>	
<b>Brief description of project</b>	Proposed warehouse, offices, access road, connection to public water and wastewater network and SUDS with discharge to adjacent stream.
<b>Brief description of development characteristics and potential mechanisms</b> <b>site and impact</b>	<p>The 3.62 site currently comprises agricultural land and is situated 300m west of the Slaney River Valley Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Wexford Harbour and Slobbs Special Protection Area (SPA).</p> <p>Surface water will be managed via a network of SUDS features including retention and detention basins before discharging to the Rathaspick_010 stream north of the site. The stream flows north and northeast and discharges into the estuary 500m northeast and downstream of the site.</p> <p>Construction is stated to likely take less than two years in one single phase with no decommissioning required at a later date.</p>
<b>Screening report</b>	Y
<b>Natura Impact Statement</b>	Y
<b>Relevant submissions</b>	<p>An observation was made by the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, which states ‘Outlined below are heritage-related observations/recommendations co-ordinated by the Development Applications Unit under the stated heading’.</p> <p>The observation only related to archaeology matters and no nature conservation references were made.</p> <p>No nature concerns were raised in third party submissions or appeals.</p>
<p>Planning application included the following documentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surface Water Management and Drainage Impact Assessment</li> <li>• Noise Sensitivity Technical Note, and</li> <li>• Lighting Design Report</li> </ul>	
<b>Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model</b>	

The list below includes all European sites within the zone of influence east, northeast and southeast of the site, close to Wexford Harbour with an indirect hydrological connection. I note the AA Screening report applied the 15km buffer test however I consider it highly unlikely that any impact would occur to European Sites with a hydrological connection situated such significant distances from the site or to any sites with no ecological connection also situated a significant remove from the site.

European Site (code)	Qualifying interests <sup>1</sup> Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections <sup>2</sup>	Consider further in screening <sup>3</sup> Y/N
Slaney River Valley SAC (000781)	Estuaries habitats Salt meadow habitats Dune habitats Alluvial forests and oak forests Freshwater pearl mussel Sea, brook and river Lamprey Shad, salmon, otter, seal <a href="#">Slaney River Valley SAC   NPWS</a>	300m and 500m downstream.	Indirect via surface water discharge.	Yes – Identified pathway via surface water discharge and close proximity of site to SAC.
Wexford Harbour and Slobs SPA (004076)	Waterbirds including some wintering species x 28 Hen harrier Golden and grey plover <a href="#">Wexford Harbour and Slobs SPA   NPWS</a>	300m and 500m downstream.	Indirect via surface water discharge.	Yes – Identified pathway via surface water discharge and close proximity of site to SPA.
Raven Point Nature Reserve SAC (000710)	8no. habitats including 5no. dune types, mudflats, sandflats, salt meadows and drift lines. <a href="#">Raven Point Nature Reserve   NPWS</a>	6.2km and 6.3km downstream.	Indirect via surface water discharge.	Yes - Identified pathway via surface water discharge and close proximity of site to SAC.
The Raven SPA (004019)	6no. bird species including wintering species. Also, wetland and waterbirds. <a href="#">The Raven SPA   NPWS</a>	4.5km and 4.8km downstream.	Indirect via surface water discharge.	Yes – Identified pathway via surface water discharge and close proximity of site to SPA.

Seas off Wexford SPA (004237)	20no. bird species <a href="#">Seas off Wexford SPA</a> <a href="#">  NPWS</a>	4.3km and 4.6km downstream.	Indirect via surface water discharge.	Yes – Identified pathway via surface water discharge and close proximity of site to SPA.
Long Bank SAC (002161)	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by sea water all the time. <a href="#">Long Bank SAC</a> <a href="#">  NPWS</a>	9.8km and 10.3km downstream.	Indirect via surface water discharge.	No – Separation distance provides a significant dilution factor to any water based contaminant.
Blackwater Bank SAC (002953)	Sandbanks which are slightly covered by sea water all the time, and Harbour Porpoise. <a href="#">Blackwater Bank</a> <a href="#">  NPWS</a>	13km and 13.3km downstream.	Indirect via surface water discharge.	No – Separation distance provides a significant dilution factor to any water based contaminant.
Carnsore Point SAC (002269)	Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide, Reefs, and Harbour Porpoise <a href="#">Carnsore Point SAC</a> <a href="#">  NPWS</a>	10.9km and 12.7km downstream.	Indirect via surface water discharge.	No – Separation distance provides a significant dilution factor to any water based contaminant.

**Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination) on European Sites**

The existing site comprises agricultural land of low ecological value and with no sensitive habitats noted to be present. It is removed from all European sites and therefore there will be no direct effects.

The 300m separation distance between the site and the closest European sites (Slaney River Valley SAC and Wexford Harbour and Sloba SPA) means direct impacts from construction stage surface water impacts are unlikely to occur. The topography of the site however is such that surface water during the construction stage would flow north towards the Rathaspick stream and 500m downstream to discharge to the estuary and harbour. Operational stage surface water is also proposed to discharge to this stream following treatment and attenuation. The surface water design includes standard measures to protect water quality including infiltration trenches, permeable paving, retention basin, detention basin and hydrocarbon interceptors.

A confirmation of feasibility was submitted from Uisce Éireann confirming that connection to the wastewater network is feasible without requiring any infrastructural upgrades by Uisce Éireann.

Deterioration of surface water quality is a potential significant impact during both construction and operational phases with potential effects on both habitats (QI of SAC) or birds (QI of SPA) which may depend on good water quality.

A concurrent planning application relating to much of the same site was lodged shortly prior to this subject application. It relates to the provision of roads and infrastructure on the same site with the same layout proposed as this subject application. Ref. 20240792 and ABP ref. ABP-322458-25 applies and no decision has been issued to date. Both the NIS in this application and submitted with the concurrent application considered both projects and therefore I am satisfied that their in-combination and cumulative effects have been considered. I also not additional projects listed in the AA screening reports regarding in-combination and cumulative effects and am satisfied that it has been considered appropriately.

The matrix below identifies possible significant effects on the European sites in view of the conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other plans and projects).

**AA Screening matrix**

Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
<p><b>Site 1:</b> Slaney River Valley SAC Site Code: 000781.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estuaries</li> <li>• Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide</li> <li>• Atlantic salt meadows</li> <li>• Mediterranean salt meadows</li> <li>• Water courses of plain to montane levels with the Ranunculion fluitantis and Callitricho Batrachion vegetation</li> <li>• Old sessile oak woods with Ilex and Blechnum in the British Isles</li> <li>• Alluvial forests with Alnus glutinosa and Fraxinus excelsior</li> </ul>	<p>The project is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of a European Site.</p> <p><b>Direct:</b> No direct impacts and no risk of habitat loss, fragmentation or any other direct impact.</p> <p><b>Indirect:</b></p> <p>Construction phase; Low risk of surface water runoff from construction Reaching sensitive receptors but could potentially enter estuary/harbour waters.</p> <p>Emissions and particulate matter during the construction phase could also have an indirect impact on qualifying species and/or habitats.</p> <p>Disruption from noise and visual presence during construction phase however the existing urban nature of the site means disturbance from visual presence is not likely to be increased from the current context.</p> <p>No likely spread of invasive species due to the existing urban nature of the</p>	<p>Risk of surface water borne pollutants and particulate matter reaching the SAC resulting in changes to habitat quality arising from deterioration in water quality.</p> <p>Degradation to water quality and subsequent habitat may undermine conservation objectives associated with the qualifying impacts for the site.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Freshwater Pearl Mussel</li> <li>• Sea Lamprey</li> <li>• Brook Lamprey</li> <li>• River Lamprey</li> <li>• Twaite Shad</li> <li>• Salmon</li> <li>• Otter</li> <li>• Harbour Seal</li> </ul>	<p>site and no requirement to import soils.</p> <p>Operational phase: surface water and wastewater will connect into the existing public infrastructure and network serving the site.</p>	
<b>Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone):</b> Yes		
<b>If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?</b> N/A		
<b>Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*</b> Yes		
	<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Effects</b>
<p><b>Site 2:</b> Wexford Harbour and Slobs SPA  Site Code: 004076</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little Grebe</li> <li>• Great Crested Grebe</li> <li>• Cormorant</li> <li>• Grey Heron</li> <li>• Bewick's Swan</li> <li>• Whooper Swan</li> <li>• Light-bellied Brent Goose</li> <li>• Shelduck</li> <li>• Wigeon</li> <li>• Teal</li> <li>• Mallard</li> <li>• Pintail</li> <li>• Scaup</li> <li>• Goldeneye</li> <li>• Red-breasted Merganser</li> <li>• Hen Harrier</li> <li>• Coot</li> <li>• Oystercatcher</li> <li>• Golden Plover</li> <li>• Grey Plover</li> <li>• Lapwing</li> <li>• Knot</li> <li>• Sanderling</li> <li>• Dunlin</li> </ul>	<p>The project is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of a European Site.</p> <p><b>Direct:</b>  No direct impacts and no risk of habitat loss, fragmentation or any other direct impact.</p> <p><b>Indirect impacts:</b>  As above for surface water, pollutants, particulate matter and disturbance in terms of noise during construction and operational phases.</p>	<p>Risk of surface water borne pollutants and particulate matter reaching the SPA resulting in changes to habitat quality arising from deterioration in water quality.</p> <p>Degradation to water quality and subsequent habitat may undermine conservation objectives associated with the qualifying impacts for the site.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Black-tailed Godwit</li> <li>• Bar-tailed Godwit</li> <li>• Curlew</li> <li>• Redshank</li> <li>• Black-headed Gull</li> <li>• Lesser Black-backed Gull</li> <li>• Little Tern</li> <li>• Greenland White-fronted Goose</li> <li>• Wetland and Waterbirds</li> </ul>		
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

**Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone):** Yes

**If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?** N/A

**Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site\***  
Yes

	Impacts	Effects
<p><b>Site 3:</b> The Raven SPA. Site Code: 004019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Red-throated Diver</li> <li>• Cormorant</li> <li>• Common Scoter</li> <li>• Grey Plover</li> <li>• Sanderling</li> <li>• Greenland White-fronted Goose</li> <li>• Wetland and Waterbirds</li> </ul>	<p>The project is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of a European Site.</p> <p><b>Direct:</b> No direct impacts and no risk of habitat loss, fragmentation or any other direct impact.</p> <p><b>Indirect impacts:</b> As above for surface water during construction and operational phases.</p>	<p>Risk of surface water borne pollutants and particulate matter reaching the SPA resulting in changes to habitat quality arising from deterioration in water quality.</p> <p>Degradation to water quality and subsequent habitat may undermine conservation objectives associated with the qualifying impacts for the site.</p>

**Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone):** Yes

**If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?** N/A

**Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site\***  
Yes

	Impacts	Effects
<b>Site 4:</b> Seas of Wexford SPA. Site Code: 004237 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Red-throated Diver</li> <li>• Fulmar</li> <li>• Manx Shearwater</li> <li>• Gannet</li> <li>• Cormorant</li> <li>• Shag</li> <li>• Common Scoter</li> <li>• Mediterranean Gull</li> <li>• Black-headed Gull</li> <li>• Lesser Black-backed Gull</li> <li>• Herring Gull</li> <li>• Kittiwake</li> <li>• Roseate Tern</li> <li>• Common Tern</li> <li>• Arctic Tern</li> <li>• Guillemot</li> <li>• Razorbill</li> <li>• Puffin</li> <li>• Sandwich Tern</li> <li>• Little Tern</li> </ul>	<p>The project is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of a European Site.</p> <p><b>Direct:</b>            No direct impacts and no risk of habitat loss, fragmentation or any other direct impact.</p> <p><b>Indirect impacts:</b>            As above for surface water during construction and operational phases.</p>	<p>Risk of surface water borne pollutants and particulate matter reaching the SPA resulting in changes to habitat quality arising from deterioration in water quality.</p> <p>Degradation to water quality and subsequent habitat may undermine conservation objectives associated with the qualifying impacts for the site.</p>
<b>Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone):</b> Yes		
<b>If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?</b> N/A		
<b>Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*</b> Yes		
	Impacts	Effects
<b>Site 5:</b> Raven Point Nature Reserve.	<p>The project is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of a European Site.</p>	<p>Risk of surface water borne pollutants and particulate matter reaching the SAC resulting in</p>

<p>SAC Site Code: 000710</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide</li> <li>• Annual vegetation of drift lines</li> <li>• Atlantic salt meadows</li> <li>• Embryonic shifting dunes</li> <li>• Shifting dunes along the shoreline with <i>Ammophila arenaria</i> (white dunes)</li> <li>• Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (grey dunes)</li> <li>• Dunes with <i>Salix repens</i> ssp. <i>argentea</i></li> <li>• Humid dune slacks</li> </ul>	<p><b>Direct:</b> No direct impacts and no risk of habitat loss, fragmentation or any other direct impact.</p> <p><b>Indirect impacts:</b> As above for surface water during construction and operational phases.</p>	<p>changes to habitat quality arising from deterioration in water quality.</p> <p>Degradation to water quality and subsequent habitat may undermine conservation objectives associated with the qualifying impacts for the site.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone):** Yes

**If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?** N/A

**Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site\***  
Yes

**Step 4 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site**

Based on the information provided in the screening report and Natura Impact Statement, application documents including drawings and drainage design, site visit and a review of the conservation objectives and supporting documents, I consider that in the absence of mitigation measures beyond best practice construction methods, the proposed development has the potential to result significant effects on the 5no. European sites as follows:

- Slaney River Valley SAC
- Wexford Harbour and Slob SPA
- Raven Point Nature Reserve SAC

- The Raven SPA, and
- Seas off Wexford SPA.

Impacts relate to surface water contamination and disturbance.

An appropriate assessment is required on the basis of the possible effects of the project 'alone'. Further assessment in-combination with other plans and projects is not required at screening stage.

## Screening Determination

### Significant effects cannot be excluded

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that it is not possible to exclude that the proposed development alone, or in combination with other plans and projects, will give rise to significant effects on the 5no. European Site(s) in view of the sites conservation objectives. Appropriate Assessment is required.

This determination is based on:

- The proposed surface water discharges to a stream with associated downstream hydraulic connectivity to 5no. European sites.
- The qualifying interests and conservation objectives of those 5no. European sites.
- The proximity of those sites to the subject site.

## Appropriate Assessment Determination

The requirements of Article 6(3) as related to appropriate assessment of a project under part XAB, sections 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) are considered fully in this section.

Taking account of the preceding screening determination, the following is an appropriate assessment of the implications of the proposed development of a warehouse, access road and associated development in view of the relevant conservation objectives of 5no. European sites based on scientific information provided by the applicant. The 5no. sites comprise the Slaney River Valley SAC, Wexford Harbour and Slobs SPA, The Raven SPA, The Seas of Wexford SPA and Raven Point Nature Reserve SAC.

The information relied upon includes the following:

- Natura Impact Statement prepared by Russell Environmental and Sustainability Services
- Planning application documents including engineering and landscaping proposals
- NPWS website outlining conservation objectives, site synopsis and statutory instruments for protected sites.

- Water Quality data from the EPA online GIS system

I am satisfied that the information provided is adequate to allow for Appropriate Assessment. I am / am not satisfied that all aspects of the project which could result in significant effects are considered and assessed in the NIS and mitigation measures designed to avoid or reduce any adverse effects on site integrity are included and assessed for effectiveness.

**Submissions/observations**

N/A

**Site 1: Slaney River Valley SAC (000781)**

**Summary of Key issues that could give rise to adverse effects (from screening stage): [examples]**

- (i) Water quality degradation (construction and operation)

See Table 2 of the NIS

Qualifying Interest features likely to be affected	Conservation Objectives and Targets and attributes (summary- inserted)	Potential adverse effects	Mitigation measures (summary)  NIS section 4.0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estuaries</li> <li>• Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide</li> <li>• Atlantic salt meadows</li> <li>• Mediterranean salt meadows</li> <li>Annual vegetation of drift lines</li> <li>• Sea Lamprey</li> <li>• Twaite Shad</li> <li>• Salmon</li> <li>• Otter</li> <li>• Harbour Seal</li> </ul>	<p>Maintain / restore favourable conservation condition</p>	<p>Water quality degradation and/ or alteration of habitat quality would undermine conservation objectives.</p>	<p>Best practice pollution control and biosecurity measures.</p> <p>Application of industry standard controls including provision of a silt fence, appropriate timing of works, dust suppression</p> <p>Preparation of a CEMP</p>

- Note: The following QIs were not considered due to their location or habitat upstream
- Water courses of plain to montane levels with the Ranunculus fluitans and Callitriche Batrachion vegetation
  - Old sessile oak woods with Ilex and Blechnum in the British Isles
  - Alluvial forests with Alnus glutinosa and Fraxinus excelsior
  - Freshwater Pearl Mussel
  - Brook Lamprey
  - River Lamprey

The above table is based on the documentation and information provided on the file and I am satisfied that the submitted NIS has identified the relevant attributes and targets of the Qualifying Interests.

**Site 2: Wexford Harbour and Slob SPA (004076)**

**Summary of Key issues that could give rise to adverse effects (from screening stage): [examples]**

**(i) Water quality degradation (construction and operation)**

See Table 3 NIS

Qualifying Interest features likely to be affected	Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary- inserted)	Potential adverse effects	Mitigation measures (summary) NIS Section 4.0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little Grebe</li> <li>• Great Crested Grebe</li> <li>• Cormorant</li> <li>• Grey Heron</li> <li>• Bewick's Swan</li> <li>• Whooper Swan</li> <li>• Light-bellied Brent Goose</li> <li>• Shelduck</li> <li>• Wigeon</li> <li>• Teal</li> <li>• Mallard</li> <li>• Pintail</li> <li>• Scaup</li> <li>• Goldeneye</li> <li>• Red-breasted Merganser</li> <li>• Hen Harrier</li> <li>• Coot</li> <li>• Oystercatcher</li> </ul>	<p>Maintain favourable conservation condition</p>	<p>No QI species were identified on the site and having regard to its use as tillage ground, its semi-urban character, and the availability of similar sites in the area, it is not likely that the site comprises ex-situ feeding grounds.</p> <p>Water quality degradation and/ or alteration of habitat quality would undermine</p>	<p>Best practice pollution control and biosecurity measures.</p> <p>Application of industry standard controls including provision of a silt fence, appropriate timing of works, dust suppression</p> <p>Preparation of a CEMP.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Golden Plover</li> <li>• Grey Plover</li> <li>• Lapwing</li> <li>• Knot</li> <li>• Sanderling</li> <li>• Dunlin</li> <li>• Black-tailed Godwit</li> <li>• Bar-tailed Godwit</li> <li>• Curlew</li> <li>• Redshank</li> <li>• Black-headed Gull</li> <li>• Lesser Black-backed Gull</li> <li>• Little Tern</li> <li>• Greenland White-fronted Goose</li> <li>• Wetland and Waterbirds</li> </ul>		conservation objectives.	
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	--

The above table is based on the documentation and information provided on the file and I am satisfied that the submitted NIS has identified the relevant attributes and targets of the Qualifying Interests.

**Site 3: The Raven SPA (004019)**

**Summary of Key issues that could give rise to adverse effects (from screening stage): [examples]**

**(ii) Water quality degradation (construction and operation)**

**See Table 3 NIS**

Qualifying Interest features likely to be affected	Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary- inserted)	Potential adverse effects	Mitigation measures (summary)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Red-throated Diver</li> <li>• Cormorant</li> <li>• Common Scoter</li> <li>• Grey Plover</li> <li>• Sanderling</li> <li>• Greenland White-fronted Goose</li> <li>• Wetland and Waterbirds</li> </ul>	Maintain favourable conservation condition	No QI species were identified on the site and having regard to its use as tillage ground, its semi-urban character, and the availability of similar sites in the area, it is not likely that the site	<p>Best practice pollution control and biosecurity measures.</p> <p>Application of industry standard controls including provision of a silt fence, appropriate timing of works, dust suppression</p>

		comprises ex-situ feeding grounds.  Water quality degradation and/ or alteration of habitat quality would undermine conservation objectives.	Preparation of a CEMP.
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------

The above table is based on the documentation and information provided on the file and I am satisfied that the submitted NIS has identified the relevant attributes and targets of the Qualifying Interests.

**Site 4: Seas off Wexford SPA (004237)**

**Summary of Key issues that could give rise to adverse effects (from screening stage): [examples]**

**(iii)Water quality degradation (construction and operation)**

See Table 3 NIS

<b>Qualifying Interest features likely to be affected</b>	<b>Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary- inserted)</b>	<b>Potential adverse effects</b>	<b>Mitigation measures (summary)</b>
			NIS section 4.0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Red-throated Diver</li> <li>• Fulmar</li> <li>• Manx Shearwater</li> <li>• Gannet</li> <li>• Cormorant</li> <li>• Shag</li> <li>• Common Scoter</li> <li>• Mediterranean Gull</li> <li>• Black-headed Gull</li> <li>• Lesser Black-backed Gull</li> <li>• Herring Gull</li> <li>• Kittiwake</li> <li>• Roseate Tern</li> <li>• Common Tern</li> <li>• Arctic Tern</li> <li>• Guillemot</li> <li>• Razorbill</li> </ul>	Maintain / restore favourable conservation condition	No QI species were identified on the site and having regard to its use as tillage ground, its semi-urban character, and the availability of similar sites in the area, it is not likely that the site comprises ex-situ feeding grounds.  Water quality degradation and/ or alteration of habitat quality would	Best practice pollution control and biosecurity measures.  Application of industry standard controls including provision of a silt fence, appropriate timing of works, dust suppression  Preparation of a CEMP.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Puffin</li> <li>• Sandwich Tern</li> <li>• Little Tern</li> </ul>		undermine conservation objectives.	
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--

The above table is based on the documentation and information provided on the file and I am satisfied that the submitted NIS has identified the relevant attributes and targets of the Qualifying Interests.

**Site 5: Raven Point Nature Reserve SAC (000710)**

**Summary of Key issues that could give rise to adverse effects (from screening stage): [examples]**

(iv)Water quality degradation (construction and operation)

See Table 2 of the NIS

<b>Qualifying Interest features likely to be affected</b>	<b>Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary- inserted)</b>	<b>Potential adverse effects</b>	<b>Mitigation measures (summary)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide</li> <li>• Annual vegetation of drift lines</li> <li>• Atlantic salt meadows</li> <li>• Embryonic shifting dunes</li> </ul>	Maintain / restore favourable conservation condition	Water quality degradation and/ or alteration of habitat quality would undermine conservation objectives.	<p>NIS section 4.0</p> <p>Best practice pollution control and biosecurity measures.</p> <p>Application of industry standard controls including provision of a silt fence, appropriate timing of works, dust suppression</p> <p>Preparation of a CEMP</p>

Note: The following QIs were not considered due to their location or habitat above the high tide water line where water quality degradation is unlikely to affect them.

- Shifting dunes along the shoreline with *Ammophila arenaria*
- Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation
- Dunes with *Salix repens* ssp. *argentea*
- Humid dune slacks

The above table is based on the documentation and information provided on the file and I am satisfied that the submitted NIS has identified the relevant attributes and targets of the Qualifying Interests.

## **Assessment of issues that could give rise to adverse effects view of conservation objectives**

### **Water quality and status**

Water quality of the Lower Slaney Estuary was classified as eutrophic in the 2018-2020 reporting period while the harbour was classified as intermediate and southwestern Irish sea as unpolluted. The Lower Slaney Estuary and Wexford Harbour were categorised as 'at risk' under the Water Framework Directive while the Southwestern Irish Sea is categorised as 'not at risk'. Under the WFD framework of classification, the Lower Slaney Estuary was classified as having a poor status in the 2016-2021 monitoring period. Wexford harbour had a moderate status and the southwestern Irish Sea had a good status for the same period.

#### **(i) Water quality degradation in SACs**

Good quality water is necessary to maintain the populations of the Annex I habitats and Annex II animal species listed. Water quality degradation is the main risk from unmanaged site works where silt and pollutant laden surface water reaches the estuary and harbour. Decrease in water quality would compromise conservation objectives for Annex 1 habitats and Annex II species listed and increase sedimentation and pollution could alter habitat quality for spawning or nursery grounds. Ecological surveys at the site showed no signs of Otter activity. No operational phase impacts are anticipated.

#### **(ii) Water quality degradation in SPAs**

Good quality water is necessary to maintain the populations of the Annex I species listed. Water quality degradation is the main risk from unmanaged site works where silt and pollutant laden surface water reaches the estuary and harbour. Decrease in water quality would compromise conservation objectives for Annex 1 species listed and increased sedimentation and pollution could alter habitat quality for feeding and nesting grounds. Ecological surveys at the site showed no signs of birds listed as QIs. No operational phase impacts are anticipated.

### **Mitigation measures and conditions**

Please refer to Section 4 of the NIS for a full list of detailed mitigation measures.

The focus of mitigation measures proposed are at preventing ingress of pollutants and silt into surface water, receiving watercourses and wetlands. This is to be achieved via design (avoidance) application of specific mitigation measures as well as recommendations to prepare a CEMP.

### **In-combination effects**

I am satisfied that in-combination effects has been assessed adequately in the NIS. The applicant has demonstrated satisfactorily that no significant residual effects will remain post the application of mitigation measures and there is therefore no potential for in-combination effects.

### **Findings and conclusions**

The applicant determined that following the implementation of mitigation measures the construction and operation of the proposed development alone, **or in combination with other plans and projects**, will not adversely affect the integrity of this European site.

Based on the information provided, I am satisfied that adverse effects arising from aspects of the proposed development can be excluded for the European sites considered in the appropriate Assessment. No direct impacts are predicted. Indirect impacts would be temporary in nature and mitigation measures are described to prevent ingress of silt and pollutant laden surface water. I am satisfied that the mitigation measures proposed to prevent adverse effects have been assessed as effective and can be implemented.

#### **Reasonable scientific doubt**

I am satisfied that no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of adverse effects.

#### **Site Integrity**

The proposed development will not affect the attainment of the Conservation objectives of the 5no. European sites named above. Adverse effects on site integrity can be excluded and no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of such effects.

#### **Appropriate Assessment Conclusion: Integrity Test**

In screening the need for Appropriate Assessment, it was determined that the proposed development could result in significant effects on the following European sites in view of the conservation objectives of those sites and that Appropriate Assessment under the provisions of S177U was required:

- Slaney River Valley SAC
- Wexford Harbour and Slobbs SPA
- Raven Point Nature Reserve SAC
- The Raven SPA, and
- Seas off Wexford SPA

Following an examination, analysis and evaluation of the NIS all associated material submitted, I consider that adverse effects on site integrity of the 5no. European sites can be excluded in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and that no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of such effects.

My conclusion is based on the following:

- Detailed assessment of construction and operational impacts.
- The conservation interest features considered in the AA.
- The proposed development will not affect the attainment of conservation objectives for the European sites or prevent or delay the restoration of favourable conservation condition.
- Effectiveness of mitigation measures proposed and adoption of a CEMP.



## Appendix 3: Water Framework Directive Screening

### WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING

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

<b>An Bord Pleanála ref. no.</b>	<b>322767-25</b>	<b>Townland, address</b>	Drinagh North, Drinagh, Co. Wexford
<b>Description of project</b>		Proposed warehouse, offices, access road, connection to public water and wastewater network and SUDS with discharge to adjacent stream.	
<b>Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,</b>		<p>The subject site is located on agricultural land south of Wexford, in a peri-urban area. The Lower Slaney Estuary transitional waterbody (IE_SE_040_0200) is situated 300m east of the site while the Wexford Harbour coastal waterbody (IE_SE_040_0000) is situated another 300m to the east but essentially forming one connected waterbody. There is a stream situated on adjacent land to the north referred to as the Rathaspick_010 (IE_SE_12R020920) which flows north and northeast and discharges into the estuary 500m northeast and downstream of the site. There is an unnamed .7ha lagoon/pond situated 220m east of the site which is the closest and largest in a series of such water features situated to the east and southeast of the site. The groundwater body is referred to as the Fardystown aquifer (IE_SE_G_064) which has moderate vulnerability. The site is situated in the Slaney and Wexford Harbour catchment area and the Forth commons sub-catchment</p>	

<b>Proposed surface water details</b>		SUDs system proposed with hydrocarbon interceptor, infiltration trenches, permeable paving, retention basin and detention basin. Any eventual residual surface water will discharge at the existing greenfield run off rate to an existing stream situated north of the site which in turn discharges to the estuary/harbour 500m downstream and northeast of the site.				
<b>Proposed water supply source &amp; available capacity</b>		Uisce Eireann mains water connection				
<b>Proposed wastewater treatment system &amp; available capacity, other issues</b>		Proposed Uisce Eireann Wastewater connection. A confirmation of feasibility was submitted with the application confirming the feasibility of connection to the public network without a requirement for infrastructure upgrades by Uisce Éireann.				
<b>Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection</b>						
<b>Identified water body</b>	<b>Distance to (m)</b>	<b>Water body name(s) (code)</b>	<b>WFD Status</b>	<b>Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk</b>	<b>Identified pressures on that water body</b>	<b>Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)</b>
River Waterbody	0m	Rathaspick_010 (IE_SE_12R020920)	Moderate	Under review	No pressures	Yes – surface water will discharge to this stream

Groundwater Waterbody	Underlying site	Fardystown aquifer (IE_SE_G_064)	Good	Under review	No pressures	Yes – the aquifer is classified as having moderate vulnerability	
Transitional Waterbody	300m east	Lower Slaney Estuary transitional waterbody (IE_SE_040_0200)	Moderate	At risk	Agriculture Urban Waste Water	Yes – hydrological pathway via Rathaspick stream which has an outfall to the estuary.	
Coastal Water	300m east	Wexford Harbour coastal waterbody (IE_SE_040_0000)	Poor	At risk	Agriculture Urban Waste Water	Yes – hydrological pathway via Rathaspick stream which has an outfall to the estuary.	
<b>Step 4: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage.</b>							
<b>CONSTRUCTION PHASE</b>							
No.	Component	Waterbody receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	<b>Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.</b>

1.	Surface	Rathaspick_0 10	Existing pathway via natural greenfield drainage and proposed surface water discharge to stream	Siltation, pH (Concrete), hydrocarbon spillages	Standard construction practice CEMP	No	Screened out
2.	Ground	Fardystown aquifer	Pathway exists with good drainage characteristics. Proposed SUDS features would allow direct infiltration to ground.	As above	As above	No	Screened out
3.	Surface	Lower Slaney Estuary transitional waterbody	Existing pathway via natural greenfield drainage and proposed surface water discharge to stream	As above	As above	No	Screened out
4.	Surface	Wexford Harbour coastal waterbody	Existing pathway via natural greenfield drainage and proposed surface water discharge to stream	As above	As above	No	Screened out
<b>OPERATIONAL PHASE</b>							

1.	Surface	Rathaspick_010	Proposed surface water discharge to stream	Hydrocarbon spillage and siltation	SUDs features	No	Screened out
2.	Ground	Fardystown aquifer	Proposed SUDS features would allow direct infiltration to ground.	As above	SUDs features	No	Screened out
3.	Surface	Lower Slaney Estuary transitional waterbody	Proposed surface water discharge to stream	As above	SUDs features	No	Screened out
4.	Surface	Wexford Harbour coastal waterbody	Proposed surface water discharge to stream	As above	SUDs features	No	Screened out
<b>DECOMMISSIONING PHASE</b>							
5.	NA						
<b>STAGE 2: ASSESSMENT</b>							
<b>Details of Mitigation Required to Comply with WFD Objectives – Template</b>							
<b>Surface Water</b>							

Development/Activity e.g. culvert, bridge, other crossing, diversion, outfall, etc	<b>Objective 1: Surface Water</b> Prevent deterioration of the status of all bodies of surface water	<b>Objective 2: Surface Water</b> Protect, enhance and restore all bodies of surface water with aim of achieving good status	<b>Objective 3: Surface Water</b> Protect and enhance all artificial and heavily modified bodies of water with aim of achieving good ecological potential and good surface water chemical status	<b>Objective 4: Surface Water</b> Progressively reduce pollution from priority substances and cease or phase out emission, discharges and losses of priority substances	Does this component comply with WFD Objectives 1, 2, 3 & 4? (if answer is no, a development cannot proceed without a derogation under art. 4.7)
	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 1:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 2:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 3:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 4:	
<b>Construction works</b>	Preparation of a CEMP to include standard good housekeeping, dust suppression, management of stockpiles etc as well as silt fences, site-specific design of settlement ponds, etc	Preparation of a CEMP to include standard good housekeeping, dust suppression, management of stockpiles etc as well as silt fences, site-specific design of settlement ponds, etc	NA	NA	YES
<b>Stormwater drainage</b>	Adequately designed SUDs features, permeable paving, retention and detention basins etc	Adequately designed SUDs features, permeable paving, retention and detention basins etc	NA	NA	YES

**Details of Mitigation Required to Comply with WFD Objectives – Template**

**Groundwater**

<b>Development/Activity</b> e.g. abstraction, outfall, etc.	<u><b>Objective 1: Groundwater</b></u> <b>Prevent or limit the input of pollutants into groundwater and to prevent the deterioration of the status of all bodies of groundwater</b>	<u><b>Objective 2 :</b></u> <u><b>Groundwater</b></u> <b>Protect, enhance and restore all bodies of groundwater, ensure a balance between abstraction and recharge, with the aim of achieving good status*</b>	<u><b>Objective 3:Groundwater</b></u> <b>Reverse any significant and sustained upward trend in the concentration of any pollutant resulting from the impact of human activity</b>	<b>Does this component comply with WFD Objectives 1, 2, 3 &amp; 4? (if answer is no, a development cannot proceed without a derogation under art. 4.7)</b>
	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 1:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 2:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 3:	
Stormwater Drainage	Adequately designed SUDs features, permeable paving, retention and detention basics etc	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Inspector:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

