



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ACP-322919-25

<b>Development</b>	Permission to construct a new agricultural yard to include stables, farmyard manure store, horsewalker, paddock and all ancillary site works
<b>Location</b>	Island Upper, Rossminouge, Co. Wexford
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Wexford County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	20241620
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Aidan, Paul & Patrick Kavanagh
<b>Type of Application</b>	Planning permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Refuse permission
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Aidan, Paul & Patrick Kavanagh
<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 .....	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	5
3.1. Further Information .....	5
3.2. Decision .....	7
3.3. Planning Authority Reports .....	8
3.4. Prescribed Bodies .....	9
3.5. Third Party Observations .....	9
4.0 Planning History.....	9
5.0 Policy Context.....	9
5.1. Development Plan.....	9
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations .....	12
5.3. EIA Screening .....	12
6.0 The Appeal .....	13
6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	13
6.2. Planning Authority Response.....	13
7.0 Assessment.....	14
7.1. Introduction .....	14
7.2. Siting and Location .....	15
7.3. Landscape and Visual Impact.....	17
8.0 AA Screening.....	19
8.1. Screening.....	19
9.0 WFD Screening .....	20

9.1. Screening.....	20
9.2. Conclusion .....	21
10.0 Recommendation .....	21
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The 2.386ha site is situated in a rural area at the southern edge of Craanford village, which is situated approximately halfway between Carnew and Gorey in northwest County Wexford.
- 1.2. The site comprises agricultural land set out across two large fields and accessed from a local road at the west (L-1021-5) via an existing agricultural laneway. The fields are set back from the public road by 135m with another field within the same landholding situated between the site and the road.
- 1.3. There is a GAA sportsgrounds situated on adjacent land to the north while adjacent land at the south and west comprises a commercial/light industrial property. All other adjacent land is agricultural use however there also are 3no. detached residential properties situated 50m to the northwest, at the north of the commercial/light industrial property.
- 1.4. There is a large steel lattice type pylon situated at the southwest of the site which carries overhead power cables across the site from southwest to northeast. Boundaries comprise mature mixed and native species hedgerows and treelines.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for development which comprises the following:
  - New agricultural yard including:
    - 1,39m<sup>2</sup> stable and barn building reaching 8.6m in height and 38x38m in width and length. It includes machinery store, feed store, 3no. tack rooms, 10no. individual small stables, 4no. large, shared stables and a wash area. This pitched roof building would be finished with nap render at lower levels and a metal cladding at upper levels with the same cladding forming the roof finish and be accessed from a variety of roller doors, double barn doors and sliding doors.
    - 5.2m high pitched roofed 144m<sup>2</sup> farmyard manure store and associated 67m<sup>3</sup> effluent tank. This structure would comprise a three-sided structure

finished in a similar manner to the above main building with render and metal cladding.

- 9m diameter horse-walker
- Paddock
- All ancillary site works including a new recessed entrance with splayed walls form the existing laneway.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Further Information**

3.1.1. The applicant was advised that the site is situated outside of the level 4 settlement of Craanford and that the Local Authority had concerns regarding the siting of the shed on land encroaching on the built-up area of the village. The further information request outlined how it was the Local Authority's opinion that the shed would be better located away from the built-up area, including possibly in one of the existing structures situated west of the site and in the ownership of one of the applicants. The applicants were therefore requested to reconsider site selection and resituating the shed with a further setback from the built-up area of Craanford. In the event they chose to continue with the previous proposal and layout etc the applicant was requested to submit a justification rationalising the approach which encroaches on the settlement of Craanford and which is removed from existing agricultural structures.

3.1.2. An additional 6no. items of further information were requested as follows:

- Submit a sectional drawing and/or contiguous streetscape elevation to assess the potential visual impact of the proposal.
- Details of the intended water supply.
- Demonstration of sightlines of 65m in both directions at the public road.
- Appropriate splays at the vehicular entrance from the public road which facilitates a safe parking/dwell area while the gate is closed.

- Confirmation that the facility is for private use and not visited by the public. If employees/staff are required then car parking should be demonstrated.
- Surface water management details for the existing lane and any upgrade proposals for its surface.

3.1.3. In response to the first item, the proposal did not alter however the applicants submitted a justification demonstrating why it was chosen as follows:

- Floodlighting for the adjacent GAA pitch precludes residential development on the site due to amenity concerns.
- There are other lands within the settlement boundary suitable for housing. The applicants were refused permission for housing on another site due to a lack of capacity in the local wastewater treatment plant.
- An exclusion zone associated with the 220kV OHL crossing the site precludes development on land situated adjacent to the commercial/light industrial property.
- It is the long-term plan to utilise the site for agricultural purposes however the existing laneway may facilitate future housing to the east if required.
- Paddocks are naturally situated behind stables to provide a quieter area for young or nervous horses so they are not disturbed by vehicles entering and exiting the site. There are also security concerns locating the paddocks to the front as well as unspecified issues from the floodlighting.

3.1.4. A contiguous elevation drawing was submitted from the perspective of the streetscape and public road and additional vegetative screening was provided to lessen the visual impact of the shed.

3.1.5. The response states that water is proposed to be supplied via a new private well. It also states that the proposed facility would be for private use and not open to the public.

3.1.6. A revised drawing was submitted with alterations proposed to the vehicular entrance to accommodate sightlines and a dwell area as well as a new passing way on the laneway. No additional works are proposed to the surface or drainage regime of the laneway which comprises a permeable stone finish draining naturally to ground.

3.1.7. Revised statutory notices were published in relation to the further information received.

### 3.2. **Decision**

3.2.1. Wexford County Council issued a notification to refuse permission on 06<sup>th</sup> June 2025 subject to 1no. reason as follows:

1. Having regard to the location of the application site within the village of Craanford, the backland nature of the site, and its proximity to lands which may be utilised to provide for the future residential growth of the village taken in conjunction with the nature and scale of the proposed development and the justification submitted in support of the proposed development, it is considered that the development as proposed would be contrary to the following Objectives of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028:

- Objective CS18 - 'To protect and promote the quality, character and distinctiveness of the county's rural towns, villages and open countryside while supporting the proportionate growth and appropriately designed development that contributes to their revitalisation and renewal and the development of sustainable communities.'
- Objective ED97 - To ensure that all agricultural buildings are appropriately sited and sympathetic to their surroundings in terms of scale, design, materials and colour.
- Objective ED98 - To ensure all developments permitted in rural areas in accordance with Objective ED49, including agricultural, horticultural and rural diversification do not impact negatively on the quality of the environment or character of the rural area or rural settlement.

It is considered by the Planning Authority that the proposed development represents an ad hoc piecemeal form of development which would seriously injure the amenities of the area, would militate against the rural environment, and would be prejudicial to the sequential and orderly development of Craanford. The proposed development would therefore set an undesirable

precedent for similar developments in the area and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development.

### 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.
- It considered the site constituted an infill site with an exposed nature and that the scale of the development is not designed to respect, enhance or respond to the built context of the area. It further considered the development would damage the quality and character of the village by its positioning and encroachment of the built-up area.
- Following receipt of the further information response, the report considered the response did not adequately justify siting the development in this location and not elsewhere on the applicant's 13ha landholding and states the applicants did not substantively demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in a loss of future residential amenity by reason on noise, odour or pollution.
- The report considered the contiguous elevation drawing to be inappropriate as it *'does not entirely take into account the lie of the land with a slight slope rising towards the proposed development's location or the adjacent uses either side of the lands'*.
- It noted the additional vegetative screening proposed with the further information response but states that the development situated on an infill site and detached from agricultural structures has not been appropriately sited and is not sympathetic to its surroundings in terms of scale, design, materials and colour. It does not specify how or why these conclusions were drawn.



- Comments from the Senior Executive Planner are included with the second report which state *'I agree with the planner's recommendation to refuse this application on the grounds that this large equine development if permitted would negatively impact on the future development and growth of Craanford village.'*

#### 3.3.2. Other Technical Reports

- Roads Section: Two reports received, one recommending further information regarding the vehicular access, surface water and operational issues and a second recommending a grant of permission with unspecified *'standard conditions'*.
- Environment Section: No objection subject to conditions.

#### 3.4. Prescribed Bodies

- None.

#### 3.5. Third Party Observations

- None.

### 4.0 Planning History

- None.

### 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).
- 5.1.2. Table 3-2 of the CDP sets out the settlement hierarchy for Wexford and identifies Craanford as a Level 4 'large village'. The development approach for this tier of settlement is set out in section 3.6.5 as follows:

*'The spatial planning approach for these villages is to concentrate new residential growth within the exiting footprint of the village. The Council will apply the sequential approach to the development of land, focusing on the*

*development of lands within and closest to the village centre first. 'Leap-frogging' of undeveloped lands and greenfield lands will not be considered. The Council will vary the Plan to include settlement boundary maps for these settlements within three years of the adoption of the County Development Plan or within one year of the adoption of the LAPs for Wexford Town, Enniscorthy Town and New Ross Town, whichever is sooner.*

...

*In order to safeguard their continued existence into the future, it is important that growth is encouraged and facilitated in a sustainable manner. These settlements should aim to target local investment in generally small scale non-intensive industry that is based on local rural resources.*

....

*In these settlements it is essential that growth is supported while also strictly controlled so that development is undertaken in a manner that is respectful to the character of these villages and the environmental sensitivities of these rural areas and the sensitivities of coastal settlements.'*

5.1.3. For clarity, a settlement boundary map for Craanford has not yet been published or adopted by Wexford County Council.

5.1.4. Objectives CS18, ED97 and ED98 are specified above in the reason for refusal however Objective ED98 has additional text and is outlined in full as follows:

*To ensure all developments permitted in rural areas in accordance with Objective ED49, including agricultural, horticultural and rural diversification do not impact negatively on the quality of the environment or character of the rural area or rural settlement. Applications for all such developments will be required to submit details to demonstrate that the proposed development:*

- Will not result in the contamination of potable water, surface or ground waters, or impact on natural or built heritage;*
- Is appropriate in terms of scale, location, design and that the character of the farm or settlement is retained and enhanced where possible;*

- *When located on a farm, it is located within, or adjacent to, existing farm buildings, unless the applicant has clearly demonstrated that the building must be located elsewhere for essential operational or other reasons;*
- *Is appropriately sited so as to benefit from any screening provided by topography or existing landscaping and does not seriously impact on the visual amenity of the area;*
- *Will not result in an unacceptable loss of residential amenity by reason of noise, odour or pollution;*
- *Will not result in a traffic hazard,*
- *Will provide for adequate waste management; and*
- *Where possible will restore and/or enhance built and/or natural heritage.*

*The Council will monitor and report on the number, nature and impacts of applications for economic development granted in rural areas outside of settlements. Reporting will take place as part of the 2 year review of the County Development Plan and as part of SEA.*

5.1.5. Objective ED49 referenced above seeks to ensure that commercial development in rural areas is related to agriculture, horticulture or other rural related resource or activity with some specified exceptions.

5.1.6. Objective ED129 seeks to *support and promote the equine industry in the county as an economic and employment provider.*

5.1.7. Objective L07 seeks:

*To ensure that, where a development will have a negative impact in the Upland, River Valley, Coastal, or Distinctive Landscape Character Unit, an overriding need is demonstrated for that particular development and ensure that careful consideration is given to site selection. The development should be appropriate in scale and be sited, designed and landscaped in a manner which minimises potential adverse impacts on the subject landscape.*

5.1.8. Volume 2 of the CDP comprises a Development Management Manual and Section 5.5.1 therein refers to agricultural buildings. It states:

*The Planning Authority will facilitate agriculture developments at appropriate locations. The Planning Authority recognises the need for agricultural buildings and acknowledges that there is often a requirement for these structures to be significant in scale. Notwithstanding this, these buildings will be required to be sympathetic to their surroundings in terms of scale, materials and finishes. The building should be sited as unobtrusively as possible and the finishes and colours used must ensure the building will blend into its surroundings and landscape. The use of appropriate roof colours of dark green and grey will be required. Where cladding is proposed it shall be dark in colour also. The Planning Authority will give consideration to the following during the assessment of planning applications:*

- It should be demonstrated that there are no suitable redundant buildings on the farm holding to accommodate the proposed development.*
- The proposal should not detract from the character and visual amenities of the immediate and surrounding area.*
- The proposals should not detract from the residential amenities of properties in the vicinity.*
- The traffic movements associated with the proposed development must not give rise to a traffic hazard.*
- All waste associated with the proposed development must be stored and disposed of in accordance with the relevant legislation and guidelines and not impact on public health.*

## **5.2. Natural Heritage Designations**

- 5.2.1. The only natural heritage designated site situated within 10km of the site comprises the Slaney River Valley Special Area of Conservation which is situated 2km southeast of the site.

## **5.3. EIA Screening**

- 5.3.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations

2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

## **6.0 The Appeal**

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

- The applicants do not agree that it represents ad-hoc and piecemeal development or that it detracts from the rural landscape or community.
- Development has a coherent infrastructure design promoting sustainability.
- The roads department recommended a grant of permission.
- There are more suitable sites within the village awaiting approval for planning permission. This includes an application made by the applicants under ref. 20230356 which was refused for reasons including a lack of wastewater capacity in the treatment plant. Therefore an argument whether the subject site is required for housing or should be sterilised for housing purposes only is futile and contradicts the earlier decision as housing is not feasible at the site for wastewater purposes but also due to the overspill from adjacent floodlighting and the subsequent impact to residential amenity.
- The applicants reside in the village and support local amenities and facilities including the school and GAA through their crane hire business which is one of the main employers in the area. They would not design a development to be detrimental to their homes, lives and families.
- Applicants are not commercial horse traders or farmers, and they do not have a farmyard complex. Multiple members of the extended family own horses and the development is proposed in order to provide a suitable stable in close proximity to them all for the welfare of their own animals.

### **6.2. Planning Authority Response**

None.

## 7.0 Assessment

### 7.1. Introduction

- 7.1.1. The site is not situated on zoned land but is within and contiguous to the village of Craanford. The CDP identifies an intention to publish a settlement plan or boundary for the village however no such plan or boundary exists to date. I also note that the Local Authority's reason for refusal states: *'Having regard to the location of the application site within the village of Craanford, the backland nature of the site, and its proximity to lands which may be utilised to provide for the future residential growth of the village ...'* I therefore consider it has been established that the site is not situated on lands identified for any specific future purpose or development. Further, I note that the site is currently in agricultural use and that the proposed development also comprises an agricultural use and therefore there will be no change in the use or nature of the lands.
- 7.1.2. Section 3.6.5 of the CDP refers to Large Villages including Craanford and states *'In order to safeguard their continued existence into the future, it is important that growth is encouraged and facilitated in a sustainable manner. These settlements should aim to target local investment in generally small scale non-intensive industry that is based on local rural resources'*. The proposed development constitutes a significant equine facility with accommodation for 24no. horses. The application documents state that it is proposed for family purposes only and no commercial operation is proposed however the scale of the proposal is, in my opinion, akin to a commercial operation, albeit small scale in terms of employment and investment. Objective ED109 of the CDP seeks to support and promote the equine industry as an economic and employment provider. In this context and noting its rural and agricultural character and nature, I consider the development complies with the requirements to target local investment *in generally small scale non-intensive industry that is based on local rural resources*. I therefore consider that the principle of development is acceptable.
- 7.1.3. 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 relates to the following:

- Siting and Location
- Visual and Landscape Impact

## **7.2. Siting and Location**

- 7.2.1. The reason for refusal states the development *'represents an ad hoc piecemeal form of development which would seriously injure the amenities of the area, would militate against the rural environment, and would be prejudicial to the sequential and orderly development of Craanford'*. It also quotes three objectives, CS18, ED97 and ED98, all of which support sustainable and appropriate levels of growth and agricultural development, subject to upholding environmental sensitivities and the rural character of the site. When the principle of development is not questioned, and all of the land in question is unzoned and outside of any development boundary, the reason behind the refusal in my view implies that an insufficient setback from the existing village is proposed in order to uphold future residential amenity, and that inadequate justification was submitted to support this.
- 7.2.2. Access to the site is from an existing agricultural laneway situated within the centre of the village, however the actual development area where new structures are proposed is set back 135m from the public road and effectively creating an infill site of c.1ha adjacent to the public road. I also note that the vehicular access in question is the only vehicular access to the applicants stated 13ha landholding which extends further to the southeast and does not include any existing buildings or farmyards but is situated adjacent to a third-party farmyard 450m southeast of the site.
- 7.2.3. Section 3.6.5 of the CDP advocates for sequential development and states: *'Leap-frogging' of undeveloped lands and greenfield lands will not be considered*. Having regard to the existing agricultural use of the lands, the proposed agricultural use of the site, as well as the lack of any development boundary or settlement plan for Craanford and the lands in question, I do not consider the proposed development constitutes leapfrogging. While a new infill site will be created, the positioning of the new development at the east of the site rather than at the roadside at the west is appropriate in my opinion in order to retain lands closer to the village centre for

residential/village centre purposes and retaining agricultural purposes to the fringes, adjacent to existing agricultural lands. This complies with the principle of the Local Authority's requirements to protect the future amenity and development potential of the lands for village centre/residential purposes.

- 7.2.4. Having regard to the above as well as the lack of any alternative vehicular access to the site, I do not consider the development represents ad-hoc or piecemeal development. Section 3.6.5 of the CDP states: *'In these settlements it is essential that growth is supported while also strictly controlled so that development is undertaken in a manner that is respectful to the character of these villages and the environmental sensitivities of these rural areas and the sensitivities of coastal settlements.'* What remains to be determined therefore is whether this development is respectful to the character of the village and environmental sensitivities of the rural area. This centres on the provision of a sufficient set back from the built-up area of Craanford including selection of an alternative site further east/southeast in order to protect the amenities of Craanford as well as an assessment of the scale and design of the development.
- 7.2.5. The site is not situated adjacent to any existing sensitive properties such as residences, schools or churches or any lands specifically designated for the provision of such. I consider the development is unlikely to generate noise to such an extent which would impact on future residential development. The location of the site adjacent to the GAA grounds to the north and east, and a commercial/light industrial yard at the west, means the site is far more likely to be impacted from noise than it being a significant generator of noise in my opinion. The location of the dungstead to the east of the site would likely preclude any concerns regarding malodours for any potential future residential development on the infill site due to the 65m separation between the dungstead and the western boundary of the site. The dungstead would be situated 25m from the boundary of the GAA grounds to the north however given the temporary and transitory nature of those open space lands where players and spectators spend limited periods of time, I do not consider that the scale of the dungstead is likely to negatively impact on the amenity of the sportsgrounds in terms of odour. I also note that the GAA has provided a letter of consent to works at the vehicular entrance of the site. In conclusion, I do not consider the proposed



development is likely to negatively impact the amenities of Craanford in terms of noise or odour.

- 7.2.6. With regard to likely traffic generation associated with the development, I note that the layout of the proposed development comprises accommodation for 24no. horses. The number of trips in and out of the site in order to maintain, train and care for this number of animals is not likely to be significant or have any impact on the carrying capacity of the local road network. I therefore do not consider it likely that traffic generation would negatively impact the character of amenities of Craanford, regardless of where on the landholding the proposed development is situated.
- 7.2.7. There are no other environmental sensitivities in the area such as archaeology or ecological concerns which may be impacted with the exception of landscape and visual impact as discussed below.

### **7.3. Landscape and Visual Impact**

- 7.3.1. The proposed stable block would be 8.6m in height and have a width of 38m facing the public road which is a significantly scaled structure in the rural area in my opinion. I do note however that the scale and form of the building would not be dissimilar to the nearby school, sports hall and community buildings situated 200m north/northeast of the site. I also note that the closest dwelling to the site which is situated to the west of the newly created infill area is a detached structure reaching 7-8m in height and therefore consider there is scope for a building of this height, scale and form in close proximity to the village of Craanford. The materials and finishes for the proposed building are also very similar to the existing commercial shed situated adjacent to the site as well as to the sports hall and school building and in this context I do not consider that the proposed finishes would be inconsistent with Craanford or would detract from the existing built form in the village, particularly given the proposed set back and additional planting.
- 7.3.2. The landscape in which the site is situated is not designated for any scenic routes, views or prospects. The landscape is characterised as an uplands area which has a high sensitivity to development however it is not situated within the identified boundary of any distinctive landscape as set out in chapter 7 '*Landscape Character Assessment*' to the CDP.

7.3.3. The Case Planner's report states the site affords extensive views across the uplands area and having inspected the site I concur that long range views are afforded of the ridge to the east however much of the view is blocked entirely or partially screened by a mature and dense treeline and hedgerow forming the eastern boundary to the site. I viewed the site in September while the trees were in full leaf and am of the opinion that in winter more extensive views are achievable from the public road as evidenced in the Case Planner's report. In this regard, the proposed stable building would impede on and obscure long-distance views across the site from the public road.

7.3.4. Objective L07 seeks:

*To ensure that, where a development will have a negative impact in the Upland, River Valley, Coastal, or Distinctive Landscape Character Unit, an overriding need is demonstrated for that particular development and ensure that careful consideration is given to site selection. The development should be appropriate in scale and be sited, designed and landscaped in a manner which minimises potential adverse impacts on the subject landscape.*

7.3.5. Objective ED98 provides policy guidance on site selection for new agricultural buildings and requires the following:

- *When located on a farm, it is located within, or adjacent to, existing farm buildings, unless the applicant has clearly demonstrated that the building must be located elsewhere for essential operational or other reasons;*
- *Is appropriately sited so as to benefit from any screening provided by topography or existing landscaping and does not seriously impact on the visual amenity of the area;*

7.3.6. The proposed development does not comply with these requirements and does not minimise adverse impacts on the landscape as required by Objective L07. Having regard to the landholding outlined in the application documents, I note that there are additional fields situated southeast of the site, some of which are adjacent to an existing third party farmyard. These fields are situated further back from the public road, at a lower ground level and set behind a number of treelines which would therefore provide significant screening and landscape absorption.

- 7.3.7. I note the applicant's justification set out in the appeal and further information response however I do not agree with much of it. The matter of floodlighting for instance does not preclude the development of lands adjacent to sportsgrounds for residential development as evidenced in settlements all over the country. The requirement for an exclusion zone around the OHL powerline does not preclude future development of the landholding. There is an existing farmyard situated directly adjacent to the applicant's landholding against which the proposed structure could cluster with to prevent additional impacts on the landscape. There is also a commercial building situated at the west of the site which provides additional clustering opportunities. The further information response implies that the large stable building cannot be situated adjacent the commercial building due to a requirement to locate for quiet paddocks for young or nervous horses to the rear of the stables as well as increasing security in such a layout. Both of these requirements however support relocation of the development further from the GAA pitch with its impulsive shouts, whistles and clapping etc as well as away from the public road which adds to increased visibility and associated reduced security.
- 7.3.8. In conclusion, I do not agree with the refusal reason where it states that the proposed development would injure the amenities of the area, would militate against the rural environment, and would be prejudicial to the sequential and orderly development of Craanford. I do agree however that the development does not comply with Objective ED98 and L07 by reason of the availability of alternative sites on the landholding which would minimise visual impacts and impacts to the landscape.

## **8.0 AA Screening**

### **8.1. Screening**

- 8.1.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 8.1.2. The site is situated 2km northwest of the Slaney River Valley Special Area of Conservation.

- 8.1.3. The proposed development seeks to construct a stable block for 24no. horses and ancillary development including a manure store and horse walker. The stable block will include tack rooms, a machinery store, hay/feed store, small and large shared stables.
- 8.1.4. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.
- 8.1.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The agricultural nature of the works in a rural area,
  - The measures proposed for the management of manure including a dungstead and effluent tank,
  - The location of the site removed from any waterbodies and lack of any hydrological connectivity and
  - Taking into account the screening report/determination by Wexford County Council.

## **8.2. Conclusion**

- 8.2.1. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
- 8.2.2. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

## **9.0 WFD Screening**

### **9.1. Screening**

- 9.1.1. The subject site is located 640m southwest of the Lask River.
- 9.1.2. The proposed development seeks to construct a stable block for 24no. horses and ancillary development including a manure store and horse walker. The stable block will include tack rooms, a machinery store, hay/feed store, small and large shared stables.

- 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.
- 9.1.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The agricultural nature of the works in a rural area,
  - The measures proposed for the management of manure including a dungstead and effluent tank and
  - The location of the site removed from any waterbodies and lack of any hydrological connectivity.

## 9.2. **Conclusion**

- 9.2.1. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment

## 10.0 **Recommendation**

I recommend that planning permission is refused in accordance with the reason set out below:

1. Objective L07 of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 requires development to be sited, designed and landscaped in a manner which minimises potential adverse impacts on the subject landscape. Objective ED98 requires agricultural developments to be located adjacent to existing farm buildings and benefit from existing screening provided by topography and existing landscaping.

Having regard to the proposed location and layout of the proposed development, the justification submitted as well as the extent of the landholding illustrated in the application documents, it is considered that the location and site of the proposed development does not comply with the requirements of Objectives L07 and ED98 and is therefore contrary to the proper planning and development of the area.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

---

Sarah O'Mahony  
Planning Inspector

08<sup>th</sup> October 2025

### Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	322919-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Agricultural yard, stables, manure storage and horse walker
<b>Development Address</b>	Island Upper, Rossminouge, 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.  <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 150px; width: 100%;"></div>
<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  <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 100px; width: 100%;"></div>
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 100px; width: 100%;"></div>

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

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

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