



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-323262-25

Development

Erection of Shed and waste water treatment system

Location

Retaine, Robinstown, Navan, Co. Meath C15YA70

Planning Authority

Meath County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2560263

Applicant(s)

Pat & Carolyn Kelly

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant(s)

Kenneth & Sarah Fay

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

17th November 2025

Inspector

Stephen Ward

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0 Planning History	7
5.0 Policy Context	7
6.0 The Appeal	8
7.0 Assessment	11
8.0 Water Framework Directive Screening	12
9.0 AA Screening	13
10.0 Environmental Impact Assessment Screening	14
11.0 Recommendation	14
12.0 Reasons and Considerations	14
13.0 Conditions	15
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	18
Appendix 2 – Water Framework Directive Screening Determination	20

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located in the rural townland of Retaine, approximately 1km northwest of Robinstown village. It has a stated area of 0.2ha and site levels fall gently from north to south (front to rear). The western and southern site boundaries comprise a mixture of hedges and trees which adjoin undeveloped fields. The eastern boundary comprises hedgerows and trees which adjoin a single-storey dwelling. The wider area is mainly in agricultural use containing sporadic one-off housing and agricultural buildings.
- 1.2. There is an existing small single-storey cottage at the front (northern) end of the site adjoining the public road. Access is provided at the northeast site corner, from where an access road runs along the eastern site boundary to the rear (southern) end of the site. A previously existing shed (stated to be unauthorised) has been removed at this end, although some small storage structures remain in the southeast corner. The dwelling is served by an existing septic tank and percolation area.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. In summary, permission is sought for the following:
 - Erection of a metal shed to the rear garden (86sqm) for use as a double garage and storage.
 - A new domestic wastewater treatment system to replace the existing septic tank and percolation area.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By Order dated 10th July 2025, MCC made a decision to grant permission subject to 10 no. conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Further Information

Following the initial consideration of the application, MCC issued a request for further information. The issues raised in the request can be summarised as follows:

1. Garage design proposals to reflect the scale, form and finishes on the main house in accordance with the Rural Design Guide.
2. Submit a clear rationale and justification for the requirement of a domestic garage with a floor area of 86 sqm. or alternatively provide revised drawings reducing the scale of this structure to c. 50 sqm.
3. Clarify the planning status of existing structures to the rear of the site.
4. (a) Clarify the no. of bedrooms in the house to determine the PE for wastewater treatment system.
(b) Clarify the dates of the Percolation Test holes for Step 2 and Step 3 and re-submit the Site Characterisation Report.
5. Invitation to address the content of third-party submissions received.
6. Advice regarding the submission of additional data the potential need to readvertise the application.

3.2.2. Planning Reports

The Planning assessment comprise two Planner's Reports, i.e. the initial report recommending further information and the subsequent report on the further information received. The assessment can be cumulatively summarised under the headings below.

Principle of the development

- A domestic garage would be ancillary to the existing residential use and would be acceptable in accordance with the 'RA Rural Area' zoning objective.
- The applicant's further information response satisfactorily addresses third-party concerns about the use and size of the shed and potential impacts on the adjoining property.

Design

- The initial report outlined concerns about the scale of the proposed structure, the planning status of other existing structures, and that the proposed structure would have a commercial appearance. Further information and revised proposals were requested in this regard.
- The subsequent report notes that the applicant's response does not include any changes to the size or design of the proposed garage. The MCC 'Graduate Planner' recommends refusal on this basis. However, additional comments from the MCC 'Senior Executive Planner' conclude that the proposal is acceptable given the limited storage available in the existing cottage; the setback location of the shed; and the potential to require additional landscaping by condition.

Wastewater

- The initial report outlined the need for further information regarding PE and the dates of percolation tests as highlighted by the MCC Environment section.
- The subsequent report notes that the applicant's response does not clarify the PE or the dates of percolation tests on the Site Characterisation Report. The MCC 'Graduate Planner' recommends refusal on this basis. However, additional comments from the MCC 'Senior Executive Planner' conclude that the proposal is acceptable given that no additional living accommodation is proposed, and the replacement of the existing septic tank will improve the existing situation.

Appropriate Assessment

- The proposed development (entire project), by itself or in combination with other plans and developments in the vicinity, would not be likely to have a significant effect on European Site(s). In light of this, it is considered that a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment (Natura Impact Statement) is not required in this instance.

Environmental Impact Assessment

- The proposed development does not equal or exceed a threshold or represent a category of project listed in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 to 2025. Having regard to the small scale and nature of the

development and the site location, the proposal would not require sub-threshold EIA.

Conclusion

- As previously outlined, the MCC ‘Graduate Planner’ recommended refusal of permission.
- However, the MCC ‘Senior Executive Planner’ concludes that the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area or the residential amenities of the properties in the vicinity, would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment or the ecology of the area. A grant of permission is recommended, and this forms the basis of the MCC decision.

3.2.3. Other Technical Reports

Environment (Wastewater): The report requested further information in relation to the dates of the Percolation Test holes for Step 2 and Step 3 of the Site Characterisation report, and in relation to the number of bedrooms in the existing dwelling. There was no subsequent report on the further information received.

3.2.4. Conditions

The conditions of the decision are largely standard in nature. Notable conditions can be summarised as follows:

2. Limits the use of the shed to be incidental to the existing dwelling.
6. Outlines requirements for the wastewater treatment system to be in accordance with the EPA Code of Practice (2021).
10. Landscaping proposals to be agreed with the planning authority.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One objection was received from the appellants. Consistent with the grounds of appeal (see section 6 of this report), it raises concerns about size/height, commercial use, and impacts on residential amenity.

4.0 Planning History

P.A. Reg. Ref. 22/975: On 5th September 2022, an application by Paul Bartley to retain ‘existing detached structure currently serving as domestic home office/home entertainment area/home gym/domestic storage/domestic garage/home music studio, including all ancillary site works’.

In summary, the reason for refusal outlined that there was no justification for the structure; the structure is not consistent with the description; would be an inappropriate form of domestic building; would establish an undesirable precedent; would negatively impact the value of neighbouring property; and would be contrary to proper planning and sustainable development.

P.A. Reg. Ref. NA201445: On 27th November 2020, an application by Paul Bartley to retain ‘existing detached domestic shed, including all ancillary site works’ was refused.

The reason for refusal outlined that there was no justification for the structure; it may be used for commercial purposes; it would materially contravene CDP objective SS OBJ 4 which aims to focus development in Large Growth Towns; would establish an undesirable precedent; would negatively impact the value of neighbouring property; and would be contrary to proper planning and sustainable development.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027

The site is zoned as ‘RA Rural Areas’, the objective for which is ‘*To protect and promote in a balanced way, the development of agriculture, forestry and sustainable rural-related enterprise, community facilities, biodiversity, the rural landscape, and the built and cultural heritage*’.

Chapter 6 deals with Infrastructure, including wastewater. Objective INF OBJ 13 is ‘*To ensure that septic tanks, proprietary effluent treatment systems and percolation areas are located and constructed in accordance with the recommendations and guidelines of the EPA and the Council in order to minimise the impact on surface water of discharges*

Appendix 13 of the CDP comprises the 'Rural Design Guide'. Section 5.7 outlines that, in general, the garage form should reflect the form, design, and finishes on the main house. It also advises that the garage structure can be used to create an external enclosure and provide shelter, forming a courtyard or similar external space. Section 4.1 also suggests that traditional corrugated shed forms can be used inform building form.

5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

The closest Natura 2000 sites are the River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC and River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA, which are located c. 2.4km and 2.7km respectively to the southeast of the site.

6.0 **The Appeal**

6.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

The decision of MCC to grant permission has been appealed by Kenneth & Sarah Fay of Retaine, Robinstown. The grounds of appeal can be summarised under the following headings.

Planning History

- The previous owner had a larger unauthorised shed (96sqm) at this location, which the appellants objected to on the basis of injury to residential amenity due to noise, gatherings, and commercial use. This was refused retention permission under P.A. Reg. Ref. 201445 (see section 4 above).
- Although the shed has been removed and ownership has changed, there are serious concerns that there will be similar noise issues close to their rear garden.
- The planning condition restricting the use to 'uses incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling' might not afford protection against 'gatherings' at the shed.

Location

- The location of a garage/home office at the end of a long driveway along the common boundary would appear unnecessary and will cause serious noise disturbance.

- The obvious location for incidental uses would be close to the house.

Size and Construction Materials

- The size of the shed is excessive in relation to its stated use and the existing dwelling, and it will injure the appellants' visual amenities.
- The materials (metal cladding) will amplify any noise within the shed, which was an ongoing issue with the previous shed.

Use

- There are concerns that the shed will be used for commercial purposes and will result in further enforcement action and conflict.
- The development should be refused in accordance with the previous decision.

6.2. Applicant Response

The response includes letters from the applicants and their agent. The contents can be cumulatively summarised under the headings below.

Planning History

- The previous shed had an area of 178m² (not 96m² as stated by the appellants) and had a ridge height of 6.1m. The proposal is for a much smaller shed of 86m² with a ridge height of 4m.
- The applicants had no involvement with the construction or use of the previous shed, and any previous nuisance cannot be ascribed to them. The inference that there were parties at the previous shed was not the case.
- The applicants removed the previous shed at considerable cost.

Location

- The tarmac driveway to the proposed location cannot possibly be a source of serious noise disturbance.
- The proposed shed location maximises the distance from the appellants' property and complies with planning requirements for minimum distances.
- The proposed location makes the most sense given that there is an existing concrete foundation in place.

Size and Construction Materials

- The location, scale, and design of the proposal cannot possibly be considered visually obtrusive.
- The material finishes are a dark high-quality insulated metal siding with matching roof and doors, which in no way contravenes any planning or building regulations or the Rural Design Guidelines.
- Any attempt to replicate the existing dwelling would result in a much taller building.
- The predominant material for sheds in the countryside is metal.
- Rural sites require more storage space, including space for gardening equipment.
- The size and scale are in keeping with similar sized properties.

Use

- The conditions of the permission clearly state that the shed is to be used for purposes ancillary to the enjoyment of the dwelling. It will not be used for commercial purposes.
- The shed will be used for gardening equipment, covered spaces for 2 cars, and a small home office. This is in no way unreasonable for a large rural site and is needed because the house is too small.

Relevant Planning Issues

- The erection of a shed is permitted in this 'RA' zoning as per the CDP.
- As per the CE Order, the dwelling (*sic*) does not give rise to any negative impact on residential amenities; it occupies a generous plot with sufficient private amenity space; and the further information response has addressed the issues raised by the appellants.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

The response indicates that the issues raised in the appeal have been substantively addressed in the MCC Planner's reports. It requests that the decision to grant permission be upheld.

6.4. **Observations**

None.

7.0 **Assessment**

- 7.1. I have examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority and prescribed bodies, and I have inspected the site and had regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance.
- 7.2. I note that the development includes the replacement of the existing septic tank and percolation area with a wastewater treatment system, and that clarification was requested in the internal MCC reports about the population loading (P.E. – ‘population equivalent’) associated with the dwelling and the dates of on-site percolation testing. However, consistent with the comments of the MCC Senior Executive Planner, I would acknowledge that there is no proposal to increase residential capacity (i.e. no. of bedrooms) and that the installation of an upgraded wastewater treatment system would ultimately improve the level of treatment on site. The matter has not been raised in the appeal, and I am satisfied that the wastewater proposals can be accepted subject to suitable conditions to comply with the EPA Code of Practice 2021 as per the MCC decision.
- 7.3. The appeal is primarily concerned with the proposed shed, and I consider that the substantive issues in this case relate to planning history; location, siting and design; use; and residential amenity.
- 7.4. It is clear that there was a previous unauthorised shed at a similar location on the site. Permission to retain that shed was refused on two occasions (see section 4 of this report). The structure has since been removed, and the applicant has confirmed that the other temporary storage structures on site would be removed on foot of the proposed development. Ultimately, I consider that the proposed development should be considered on its merits notwithstanding any previous unauthorised development or alleged anti-social behaviour.
- 7.5. I acknowledge that the proposed shed would be distanced from the existing dwelling on site. However, given the established layout of the site including the driveway and

garden, I do not consider that its location is unreasonable or that any small volumes of traffic on the driveway would result in unacceptable noise or other nuisance.

- 7.6. I would also acknowledge that the proposed shed has a large floor area. However, I do not consider it excessive, particularly given that the existing dwelling has limited storage space. The proposed structure has a low profile of c. 4m and will be well setback and screened on the site, which will prevent any significant visual impacts on public or private views. I do not consider the proposed metal cladding finish to be unacceptable in a rural setting, and I do not consider that it would amplify noise impacts to any unacceptable level.
- 7.7. Having regard to the foregoing, I consider that the siting and design of the proposed structure is acceptable in this case. I do not consider that there is any reasonable indication to conclude that the development would be used for commercial or any other unacceptable purposes, and a suitable condition limiting use to domestic purposes would suffice in the event of a grant of permission. On this basis, I do not consider that the proposed development would detract from the visual or residential amenities of the area or adjoining properties, either by reason of use, noise, visual impact, light impacts, or otherwise.

8.0 Water Framework Directive Screening

- 8.1. The impact of the proposed development in terms of the WFD is set out in Appendix 2 of this report. There are no surface water features on the site or on the immediately surrounding lands. The nearest river features are tributaries of the Clady (c. 400m to the southwest) and the Boyne (c. 700m to the northeast). The Clady also flows into the Boyne. The site is underlain by the Trim Groundwater body.
- 8.2. The site is located in Flood Zone C and there is no significant flood risk associated with the development. The closest Natura 2000 sites are the River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC and River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA, which are located c. 2.4km and 2.7km respectively to the southeast of the site.
- 8.3. As per Appendix 2, I have outlined the potential pathways between the site and the relevant waterbodies and potential impacts at construction and operational stages. 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 and associated mitigation measures, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no residual risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies, either qualitatively or quantitatively.

8.4. The reasons for this conclusion are as follows:

- The nature and limited scale of the proposed works;
- The distance between the proposed development and relevant bodies, and/or the limited hydrological connectivity;
- The mitigation measures included as part of the application to address surface water and wastewater emissions.

8.5. I conclude 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. Accordingly, the proposed development can be excluded from further assessment

9.0 AA Screening

9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

9.2. The closest Natura 2000 sites are the River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC and River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA, which are located c. 2.4km and 2.7km respectively to the southeast of the site. There are no watercourses on or immediately adjoining the site, although there are tributaries of the Boyne River in the wider environs of the site (c. 400m to the southwest and c. 700m to the northeast). However, I am satisfied that, due to the significant separation distance and hydrological buffer, the Natura 2000 sites would not be within the zone of influence of a development of this nature and scale.

9.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale and residential nature of the development,
- The distance of the development from European Sites, the nature of intervening habitats, and the absence of significant ecological pathways to any European Site.

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

10.0 Environmental Impact Assessment Screening

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.

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be GRANTED for the proposed development, subject to conditions, and for the reasons and considerations set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027; the pattern and character of development in the area; and the design, scale and servicing of the proposed development; it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would be consistent with the domestic use of the site, would not detract from the character or amenities

of the area or properties in the vicinity of the site, would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience, and would not result in any significant environmental or ecological impacts. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the Planning Authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development, or as otherwise stipulated by conditions hereunder, and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The shed hereby permitted shall not be used for human habitation, commercial purposes, or any other purpose other than a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling on the site as such.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.

3. Within one month of completion of the proposed shed, the existing storage structures on site shall be permanently removed.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and orderly development.

4. All surface water generated within the site boundaries shall be collected and disposed of within the curtilage of the site. No surface water from roofs, paved areas, or otherwise shall discharge onto the public road or adjoining properties.

Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and to prevent flooding or pollution.

5. (a) The wastewater treatment system hereby permitted shall be installed in accordance with the recommendations included within the site characterisation report submitted with this application and shall be in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled "Code of Practice - Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10)" – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.

(b) Treated effluent from the wastewater treatment system shall be discharged to a soil polishing filter which shall be provided in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled "Code of Practice - Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10)" – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.

(c) Within three months of the installation of the wastewater treatment system and soil polishing filter, the developer shall submit a report to the planning authority from a suitably qualified person (with professional indemnity insurance) certifying that the wastewater treatment system and associated works is constructed and operating in accordance with the standards set out in the Environmental Protection Agency document referred to above.

(d) The existing septic tank shall be de-commissioned following the connection to the proposed new wastewater treatment system, including de-sludging by a certified contractor. The area shall be chemically sterilised and demolished/backfilled accordingly. Photos of the decommissioning of the tank shall be provided to the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to prevent water pollution.

6. (a) The existing trees and hedgerows along the site boundaries shall be retained and protected from damage during construction.

(b) Detailed proposals for additional landscaping shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority, prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

Stephen Ward
Senior Planning Inspector

12th January 2026

Appendix 1
Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-323262-25
Proposed Development Summary	Erection of Shed and waste water treatment system.
Development Address	Retaine, Robinstown, Navan, Co. Meath C15YA70
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	No Screening required.

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

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

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 2
Water Framework Directive Screening Determination

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Coimisiún Pleanála ref. no.	323262-25	Townland, address	Retaine, Robinstown, Navan, Co. Meath C15YA70
Description of project		Erection of Shed and waste water treatment system.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		<p>There are no surface water features on the site or on the immediately surrounding lands. The nearest river features are tributaries of the Clady (c. 400m to the southwest) and the Boyne (c. 700m to the northeast). The Clady also flows into the Boyne.</p> <p>The site is underlain by the Trim Groundwater body.</p>	
Proposed surface water details		Disposal to on-site soak pit.	
Proposed water supply source & available capacity		Not applicable.	
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues		On-site wastewater treatment system and polishing filter.	
Others?		<p>Located in Flood Zone C - no significant flood risk associated with the development.</p> <p>The closest Natura 2000 sites are the River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC and River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA, which are located c. 2.4km and 2.7km respectively to the southeast of the site.</p>	

Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection							
Identified water body	Distance to (m)	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status (2019-2024)	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g. at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)	
River	C. 400m to southwest	CLADY (MEATH)_020 IE_EA_07C010260	Poor	At risk	Peat	Yes – Surface / ground water run-off and wastewater from the site.	
River	C. 700m to northeast	BOYNE_110 IE_EA_07B041600	Moderate	Review	Not identified	Yes, as above.	
Groundwater	Underlying	Trim IE_EA_G_002	Good	At Risk	DWTS, Unknown, Agriculture	Yes – As above, via the overlying soil.	
Step 4: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage.							
CONSTRUCTION PHASE							
No.	Component	Water body receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.
1.	Surface	CLADY (MEATH)_020 IE_EA_07C010260	Surface / ground water run-off from the site via overland flows.	Siltation, pH (Concrete), hydrocarbon spillages.	None.	No. Having regard to the limited scale of the works and the separation distance from	Screened out.

		BOYNE_110 IE_EA_0 7B04160 0	As above.	Siltation, pH (Concrete), hydrocarbon spillages.	None.	these waterbodies, I am satisfied that there would be no significant risk.	Screened out.
2.	Ground	Trim IE_EA_G _002	Via the overlying soil.	Siltation, pH (Concrete), hydrocarbon spillages.	None.	No. Having regard to the limited scale of the works, I am satisfied that there would be no significant risk to groundwater.	Screened out.

OPERATIONAL PHASE

1.	Surface	CLADY (MEATH) _020 IE_EA_0 7C01026 0 BOYNE_110 IE_EA_0 7B04160 0	Surface water run-off from the site. Wastewater emissions.	Hydrocarbon spillage / pollution, wastewater pollution.	Surface water disposal to on-site soak pit. On-site wastewater disposal in accordance with EPA Code of Practice 2021.	No. Having regard to the mitigation measures and the distance from waterbodies, there will be no significant residual pollution risk.	Screened out.
2.	Ground	Trim IE_EA_G _002	Surface water run-off from the site. Wastewater emissions.	Hydrocarbon spillage / pollution, wastewater pollution.	Surface water disposal to on-site soak pit.	No. Having regard to the mitigation measures, there will be no	Screened out.

			Via overlying soil.		On-site wastewater disposal in accordance with EPA Code of Practice 2021.	significant residual pollution risk.	
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
5.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A