



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-323390-25

Development	Construction of 35 dwellings and all site works
Location	Glasganny, Ardcahan, Co. Wexford.
Planning Authority	Wexford County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	20250071
Applicant(s)	Oakmore Developments Limited
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Mairéad Ryan & Conor Breen and Others.
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	13/11/2025
Inspector	Hugh O'Neill

1.0 Site Location and Description

The greenfield site consists of a locally elevated, irregularly shaped 1.41 Ha portion of an intensively farmed agricultural field currently in tillage use, located c. 800 north of the village centre.

There are housing estates on three sides, Woodview to the east, Millpark and Cois Eden to the south and Ard Ailinn to the southeast and east and agricultural land to the north.

Submitted survey levels show a 9.5m fall from the highest point to the north of the site to the lowest point in the southern corner of the site.

Access to the site is from Barley Court Road/Chapel Hill (local secondary road L-7007-4). The boundary to the road is formed by a timber post and wire fence to the top of an embankment of c. 2m above the road. Coniferous trees are planted behind the wire fence to the top of the bank.

The boundary treatment to gardens of the established residential estates to the south and west of the site vary. There are embankments, block walls, post and panel and occasional remnants of hedgerows including native trees.

The southwest boundary to the rear of houses in the Ard Alainn estate coincides with the townland boundary between the townlands of Castlebridge and Glasganny.

There is no evidence of any field drains or other water bodies associated with boundaries or otherwise within or adjacent to the application site.

2.0 Proposed Development

Works required for proposed development include:

- Stripping of site.
- Construction of surface and foul water drainage network including excavation and construction of detention basins and underground surface water storage tanks.
- Construction of access routes, roads, footpaths and car parking.
- Construction of services.

- Construction of 35 no. residential dwelling units.
 - 15 no. 2 bed houses (43%)
 - 18no. 3 bed houses, (51%)
 - 2 no. 4 bed houses (6%)
- Setting out, grading and planting of open spaces

The proposal is presented as phase 1 with provision of infrastructural capacity and for the construction of future additional housing.

The application was supported by the following reports:

- Planning report
- Universal Access Statement
- Design Statement
- Landscaping and Public Realm plan
- Infrastructure design report
- Design Report and Specifications for lighting and EV charging
- Resource & Waste Management Plan
- Construction Environmental Management Plan
- Appropriate Assessment screening report

An Archaeological Impact Assessment report was submitted in response to a Further Information request as described below.

3.0 **Planning Authority Decision**

3.1. **Decision**

Notification of a decision to grant permission was issued 23/07/25 subject to 25 conditions as recommended in the planning report.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

Report no 1 dated 18/03/25 concluded with a recommendation to request further information.

The report includes an extract from minutes of a pre-planning meeting which records that the reasons for refusal of application 20240530 were discussed. The phased approach now proposed consisting of 2 separate planning applications is recorded as having been recommended. The submission of a sequential development assessment was also recommended with confirmation that the proposed layout was generally acceptable.

The report addresses a number of the reasons for refusal of application 20240530 including housing mix, surface water management, refuse storage, footpaths and capacity of water infrastructure. However, it should be noted that no consideration was given to the difference between the previous 59 units and the now proposed 35 in relation to the core strategy or the sequential development of Castlebridge giving rise to the alternative recommendation.

This report set out an assessment under the following headings:

- Design and Layout
- Density
- Part V
- Landscape and Biodiversity
- Access
- Car parking
- Access for All
- Open Space
- Private Open Space
- Boundary Treatment
- Road Frontage

- Refuse storage
- Water supply
- Effluent Treatment
- Drainage
- Appropriate Assessment
- Flood Risk Assessment

The planning report concluded that the range of house types proposed is in line with the requirements of the housing body who will be acquiring the development, the density at 30 uph was agreed as acceptable and that Part V agreement is in place.

The planning report concluded that the proposal is acceptable from a landscaping and biodiversity perspective. Sightlines, access and car parking are reported as compliant with development plan standards.

Access for all, private and public open space, frontage to the public road and boundary treatments were determined to be acceptable in the planning assessment.

The absence of issues with water supply and wastewater treatment capacity was confirmed with reference to the connection feasibility letter from Uisce Eireann.

The planning report determined that following screening that a stage 2, Appropriate Assessment was not required.

The flood risk assessment highlighted that no issues with flooding affect the site.

The level of detail provided for the proposed surface water drainage was determined to be inadequate.

The recommendation of the Department of Housing Local Government and Heritage was referenced and accepted (described below in section 3.3).

The planning report concluded with a recommendation for further information to be sought to address:

- Surface water design
- Enhanced pedestrian linkages
- EV facilities

- Construction phase wheel wash
- Archaeological Impact Assessment

Report no. 2 dated 15/06/25 included a summary assessment of the further information received.

The report accepted the recommendation of the Roads report (described in section 3.2.2) that further clarification was required regarding surface water design.

The recommendation of Department of Housing Local Government and Heritage that the submitted Archaeological impact assessment as set out in section 3.3 below was also accepted.

Clarification was sought in relation to aspects of the proposed surface water system design including attenuation tank discharge rate and the proposal to use a system inconsistent with the taking in charge policy.

Report no. 3 dated 21/07/25 accepted the report of the roads department as described in section 3.2.2 regarding the submitted clarification and concluded with a recommendation to grant permission subject to 25 conditions which are generally of a standard nature.

A notification of decision issued 23/07/25 subject to 25 conditions as recommended.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- The Roads department report recommended that further information be sought from the applicant regarding surface water management, pedestrian connectivity, EV charging and construction impact on roads. Following receipt of the further information a second roads report dated 30/05/25 found that clarification regarding aspects of the proposed surface water system was required. A final roads report dated 16/07/25 recommended a grant of permission with 11 recommended conditions.
- A letter of agreement in principle for compliance with Part V from the housing section of Wexford County Council to the Planning section dated 20/12/24 was submitted in support of the application.

- Access officer report advised that a Disability Access Cert is not required and provided advice regarding compliance with TGD M of the Building Regs and development plan policy.

3.2.3. Conditions

The PA have attached conditions requiring the submission of a phasing scheme for agreement with the Planning Authority prior to commencement and for details of active play provision and EV charging to be agreed before first occupation.

The remaining conditions are of a standard nature.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

A confirmation of Feasibility from **Uisce Eireann** dated 01/8/24 submitted in support of the planning application states that the water connection is feasible with upgrades to be funded by the developer and waste water connection is feasible without upgrade.

The Development Applications Unit of the **Department of Housing Local Government and Heritage** report to the PA dated 25/02/25 requested an Archaeological Impact Assessment report by way of Further Information and advised the Council of the policies of the County Development Plan. A further report dated 29/05/25 following receipt of the information requested confirmed that the department concurred with the findings of the archaeologist.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Submissions to the planning authority relate to issues raised in the subsequent third-party appeal and observations to An Coimisiún. However, I considered the following point from those observations to be relevant:

- The exceedance of the core strategy target of 103 units is described as in direct contravention of the plan.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Subject site:

4.1.1. Reg ref: **20240530** Oakmore Developments were refused Permission for the construction of 59 no. fully serviced residential dwelling units on a larger site of 1.957Ha which incorporated the current application site. (the remaining 24 houses are proposed as future phase 2 of the current proposal)

The 6 reasons for refusal are summarised as follows:

1. Number of units excessive for edge of village site. CDP policy to sequentially prioritise development of sites closer to the village centre. Contrary to objectives CS04 and TV34 of Volume 1 of the CDP.
2. Insufficient mix of house-types, contrary to Section 4.7.5 and Objective SH21 of Volume 1 and Section 3.12.1 of Volume 2 of the CDP.
3. Inadequate design for sustainable urban drainage and nature-based design principles contrary to Section 9.11.11 and Objective SWMO01 of the CDP.
4. Refuse storage arrangements for many of the dwellings inappropriate having regard to their position to the front of houses and their design/finish. As such the proposed development would be contrary to Volume 2 Section 3.12.6 of the CDP.
5. Insufficient information has been submitted with regard to footpath provision within and linking to the proposed development contrary to Objectives TV31 and TS43 of Volume 1 and Section 2.3.5 of the CDP.
6. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that Uisce Eireann are satisfied with proposals to connect to the public water supply and public sewers.

4.1.2. Reg ref: **990297** Permission refused for 61 dwellings for 3 reasons which I have summarised as follows:

1. Substandard, haphazard layout in conflict with the Wexford County Development Plan, 1993.
2. Deficiencies in the provision of water supplies, sewerage facilities and surface water facilities, and the period within which the constraints involved may reasonably be expected to cease.

3. Having regard to the pattern of development and the character of the village, it is considered that the proposed development of this site would be premature in the absence of an action plan for Castlebridge.

4.2. Recent, relevant in the area

4.2.1. 20230502 ABP-317638-23 : c. 900m south of centre. Construction of 60 houses. Site located 1.5km approx. to south of subject site. **Refused** by WCC for 3 reasons **refused** by ABP for 1 reason:

The proposed development of 60 housing units is considered excessive having regard to the location of the site at the southern edge of the Castlebridge. It is the policy of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 to sequentially prioritise development sites closer to the village centre. As such the proposed development would be contrary to objectives CS02, CS04, CS21, SH06 and TV34 of Volume 1 and Section 3.4.2 of Volume 3 of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 and to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

4.2.2. 20240044 c. 500m south of Castlebridge centre. Construction of 28 houses **Refused** for 6 reasons, distance from centre, sequential, deficient in range of house types, separation distances prejudice future development active travel. Absence of Part V data, Absence of flood risk data.

4.2.3. 20250113 c. 700m south of centre Construction of 12 houses. **Granted**

4.2.4. 20241233 c. 700m northwest of centre. 22 houses granted subject to 26 conditions including omission of 2 units to be substituted for additional open space. **Granted**

4.2.5. 20221629 c. 1km northwest of centre 12 no. two storey dwelling houses. **Granted**

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Planning Framework First Revision 2025

The National Planning Framework (NPF) is the Government's high-level strategic plan for shaping the future growth and development of our country out to the year 2040.

Plan led growth is key to the achievement of the goals of the National Planning Framework. The NPF strives towards distribution of development to achieve efficient use of existing and future investment as well as sustainable regional development with a strong focus on strengthening urban structure in a planned settlement hierarchy.

National Policy Objective 11 Planned growth at a settlement level shall be determined at development planmaking stage and addressed within the objectives of the plan.

5.2. NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements July 2025

The Guidelines interpret the national housing growth requirements identified in the Revised National Planning Framework for implementation through development plans. They provide the basis for a consistent approach to be taken by planning authorities in incorporating national and regionally-based population and housing projections of the Revised NPF into the statutory plans. It is clearly stated within the guidelines that they may not be relied on for the purposes of any consenting or permitting process and the purpose of the Guidelines is to inform a plan review or variation process.

5.3. Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) for the Southern Region, 2020-2032

The southern region RSES provides the framework through which the NPF's vision and the related Government policies and objectives are delivered through spatial policy in the development of the region. A key element of the RSES is the prioritisation of development in locations within and contiguous to existing urban areas where it can be served by sustainable transportation. RSES includes specific consideration of Wexford Town but not Castlebridge.

RPO 3 In preparing Core Strategies, local authorities shall determine a hierarchy of settlement and appropriate growth rates in accordance with the guiding principles (including environmental protection) and typology of settlement in the RSES.

5.4. Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028

The Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 (CDP) is the operational plan for the area. It came into effect on July 25, 2022.

The plan states that the Council intends to vary the Plan to include land use zoning maps for Castlebridge however at the time of writing no such variation has been made or commenced.

An initial consultation in advance of preparation of a Local Area Plan for Wexford Town was undertaken from June to August 2023. Published consultation documentation included a SEA Scoping report which contains a map of the area to be considered as part of the LAP. Castlebridge falls outside of the proposed LAP area.

The **Core Strategy set out in Chapter 3** of the CDP designated Castlebridge as a Level 3a Service Settlement. The Core Strategy states that: The location of these settlements, together with targeted growth and investment in services, will contribute to the balanced spatial development of the county. A development approach is set out including sequential development, regeneration and renewal, the creation of attractive, liveable, well-designed, high-quality settlements and the protection and enhancement of amenities, heritage, green infrastructure and biodiversity. Section 3.6.3 of the CDP describes the role, function and development approach for level 3a settlements.

A population allocation for Castlebridge is set out in *Table 3-3 Allocation of Population to the Settlement Hierarchy*.

2016	2021	2027	2031	2040
1,840	1,965	2,116	2,201	2,392

Table 3-4 Core Strategy Population Allocations, Housing Units and Housing Land 2021-2027 which relates to zoning requirement concludes that 103 units were required in Castlebridge between 2021 and 2027 as follows:

Core Strategy Population Allocation	Housing Units	Units to be delivered within built up area	Average Density Unit/HA	Zoned Land Required (Ha)
151	103	31	25	4.12

The basis for the above calculations and the definition of built-up areas is not set out in the plan.

The following objectives of the Development Plan are relevant to the subject appeal:

- **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 CS02** To ensure that new residential development in all settlements complies with the population and housing allocation targets and the principles set out in the Core Strategy and Settlement Development Strategy in so far as practicable.
- **Objective CS04** To achieve more compact growth by promoting the development of infill and brownfield/ regeneration sites and the redevelopment of underutilised land within the existing built up footprint of existing settlements in preference to greenfield lands and to identify infill, brownfield and regeneration sites when preparing Local Area Plans, Settlement Plans and settlement boundaries.
- **Objective CS21** To ensure growth and development in the Service Settlements, Strategic Settlements, Large Villages and Small villages across the county is proportionate to the scale, size and character of the settlement and well designed so as to contribute to the regeneration of these settlements. To implement, as resources allow, interventions in the public realm, the provision of amenities, the acquisition of sites and the provision of services and ensure good quality of life and well-being for the local communities.

Chapter 4 of Volume 1 addresses sustainable housing with Goals and Strategic objectives seeking compliance with national and regional housing policy.

At section 4.7.5 House Types, the County Development Plan states that a development of over 25 houses should provide for the following house type mix:

- 25% two-bedroom houses
- 30% three-bedroom houses
- 30% four-bedroom/five-bedroom houses
- 15% to be allocated to any of the above based on evidence of demand.
- The CDP states that the planning authority will consider deviation from this mix where local requirements and/or market evidence suggest that a different housing mix is required. These provisions are also directly referenced from section 3.12.1 of Volume 2 Development Management Standards of the Wexford CDP.**Objective SH01** To ensure that new residential developments contribute to and represent sustainable neighbourhoods which are inclusive and responsive to the physical or cultural needs of those who use them, are well-located relative to the social, community, commercial and administrative services and are integrated with the community within which they will be located.
- **Objective SH06** To prioritise the provision of new housing in existing settlements and at an appropriate scale and density relative to the location in accordance with the National Planning Framework, the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region and the Core Strategy and the Settlement Strategy in the Plan.

Table 4-5 Indicative Density and Scale states that the scale of residential development in Level 3a settlements will be set out in the Settlement/Local Area Plan and in that the combined permitted residential development should not increase the population of a settlement by more than 20% of its 2016 population during the lifetime of this Plan.

Chapter 5: Design and Place-making in Towns and Villages

S 5.10.1 Greenfield Expansion

In villages such as Rosslare Strand and Castlebridge, which have significant potential for inner and outer infill, development will only be permitted within the existing built-up area. Greenfield expansion outside the existing built up area will not be permitted.

- **Objective TV34** To require that all new development represents an efficient use of land and supports national policy objectives to achieve compact growth in towns and villages. The location of new development should be based on the sequential approach focussing on the development of lands within and closest to the town and village centre and should avoid 'leap-frogging' where development of new areas is removed from the existing contiguous village. Development of lands with no links to the town or village centre will be refused.
- **Table 9-3** Overview of Public Wastewater Infrastructure states that Castlebridge is served by the Wexford Town Waste Water Treatment Plant and that headroom of 14011 existed at that time.

Chapter 9 Infrastructure Strategy

- The water resource zone for Castlebridge is listed in table 9.1 as South East Wexford. Capacity of source/treatment is noted as:
 - capacity available in the main networks supplying the village to cater for the 2027 population targets and
 - capacity potentially available in the WRZ to cater for the 2027 population targets with the assistance of water conservation measures and network improvements to provide the level of service required.
- **Objective IS02** To work with Irish Water to protect existing water and wastewater infrastructure in the county and facilitate the development of new infrastructure ensuring its provision is integrated with the county's Core Strategy and Settlement Strategy and land use plans, improves environmental quality and ensures the sustainable development of the county whilst complying with all relevant European and national legislation.
- **Objective WS09** To protect water services abstraction points and infrastructure from inappropriate development and zoning.

Volume 2

3.12.1 Mix of Dwelling Types

The overall dwelling mix in residential schemes should provide for a balanced range of dwelling types and sizes to support a variety of households. The mix of house types and sizes should provide far greater diversity than the traditional 3-bed semidetached type housing development. Section 4.7.5 in Volume 1 Chapter 4 Sustainable Housing sets out the requirements relating to type mix in both houses and apartment developments. Design Statements for residential or mixed use development proposals with a residential element will be required to address the mix of dwelling types.

Volume 3 Chapter 3 Castlebridge specific objectives

3.3.6 states that available capacity in Wexford Town Waste Water Treatment Plant should be predominantly reserved for Wexford Town. The area is also served by the SOW Regional Water Scheme, which is due to be upgraded within the lifetime of the Plan. At present there is a limited public surface water network serving the village, with individual housing schemes collecting, treating and disposing of their own surface water.

Section 3.4.2 Includes the stated intention to apply the sequential approach to the development of land, requiring residential development to take place within the existing footprint of the settlement. The leap frogging of infill/brownfield lands to undeveloped or greenfield lands will not be considered

- **Objective CB12** To prioritise the development of vacant, infill and under-utilised brownfield sites in the settlement plan area to achieve compact growth and sustainable development.

Section 3.4.8 repeats the core Strategy additional population allocation of 151 between 2021 -2027 which, without detailing the methodology equates to 103 houses and reiterates that all units to be provided in a sequential manner within the built-up footprint of the settlement.

5.5. Natural Heritage Designations

- Wexford Harbour and Slobbs Special Protection Area

- Slaney River Valley Special Area of Conservation

Both measured at their closest point at a straight-line distance of Circa 700m to the site separated by the village centre.

5.6. EIA Screening

I refer An Coimisiún to Appendix 1 of this report – Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening and Form 2 EIA Preliminary Examination.

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development comprising of a residential development of 35 no. dwellings, the nature of the receiving environment and the availability of public services, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment, screening can be excluded at preliminary examination and an EIAR is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A single third party appeal was received on 14th August 2025 on behalf of 4 households consisting of 8 referenced individuals residing in the Mill Park housing development to southeast of the proposal. The grounds set out in that appeal are as follows:

- Concern that the proposal would contribute to a conflict with the Core strategy noting that section 3.4.8 of the Wexford Development Plan 2022-2028 provides for a population increase allocation for Castlebridge of 151 persons/103 additional households.
- Concern expressed regarding the capacity of the SOW regional water scheme and the Wexford Town public wastewater treatment plant.
- Current deficiencies in water supply including pressure in the area, concerns expressed that the proposal would exacerbate this. Where upgrades are necessary what guarantees timely delivery.

- Concern for surface water management and potential impacts on adjacent property, including capacity for future phases.
- Capacity and adequacy of road and transport infrastructure serving the proposal and in the wider village context of concern.
- Deficiency in street lighting in the area highlighted.
- Concern regarding capacity of local services including medical services, playgrounds, and school capacity.
- Concern that community facilities levies will not serve the immediate area of the development.
- Concern expressed regarding compliance of the proposal with policy for mixed dwelling types in HDNA section 4.7.5 of Wexford CDP and 3.12.1 of volume 2 of Wexford CDP.

6.2. Applicant Response

A response to the appeal was prepared and submitted on behalf of the applicant and addresses the grounds of appeal under the following headings:

6.2.1. Core Strategy

The county core strategy is out of date and the current population figures have not been adjusted to consider the NPF first revision.

Reference is made to 4 housing estates granted permission since 2022 the applicant states that these consents are not under construction or completed and are therefore not contributing to the achievement of Core Strategy targets in the lifetime of the plan.

The number of units in the proposal along with that which has been consented since 2022 would result in 144 which is 41 above the CDP requirement of 103. In the context of upward revisions of requirements the applicant considers this acceptable.

6.2.2. Inadequate water infrastructure and potentially limited wastewater capacity

The SOW Regional Water scheme upgrade was completed in late 2024 ensuring continuous safe and reliable supply to Castlebridge.

The developer will fund the upgrade of the water supply network and states that upgrade works will be completed prior to first occupation of any of the proposed dwellings.

In response to concern regarding capacity of the wastewater treatment plant the applicant references the confirmation of feasibility letter from UE which states that the wastewater connection is feasible without upgrade.

All surface water will be dealt with within the application boundary.

The surface water system in the current application has been designed with capacity for the second phase.

6.2.3. Poor road infrastructure, high volumes of traffic and speeding, poor circulation for cyclists, poor parking facilities

The applicant notes the recommendation from the Wexford Co Co roads department for a grant of permission and that a financial contribution towards provision and improvement of roads infrastructure in the area would contribute to transport infrastructure.

6.2.4. Lack of medical facilities

Castlebridge is within the catchment of Wexford for medical facilities.

6.2.5. Lack of investment in community, recreational facilities and poor street lighting

Open space forms part of the proposal.

Distribution of development levies is the responsibility of Wexford County Council.

Public lighting within and along frontage forms part of the proposed development.

6.2.6. Large classroom sizes

The local school provided information that average class size is 19/20 and that there is capacity for additional students.

6.2.7. Dwelling types

Deviation from the house mix set out in section 4.7.5 of the County Wexford Development Plan is provided for. The CDP states that the planning authority will consider a deviation where local requirements and/or market evidence suggests a different mix.

The applicant states that the mix proposed meets the requirements of an approved housing body in consultation with the housing department of Wexford Co Co. The applicant considers this to be sufficient justification for the proposed deviation.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

None on file.

6.4. Observations

None on file.

6.5. Further Responses

None on file.

7.0 Assessment

Having reviewed the details and appeal documentation on the file, the submissions made, having inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local and national policy and guidance, I conclude that the main issues are the following:

- Principle including zoning/absence thereof.
- Water supply and wastewater capacity.
- Surface water management.
- Road and transport infrastructure.
- Capacity of local services including school.
- Mix of dwelling types.
- Other Matters including material contravention.

7.1. Principle including zoning.

7.1.1. Core strategy

No land use zoning or other development objective has been assigned to the subject site.

In the absence of site specific policy or objective, the principle of housing development on the subject site is informed to a large extent by the core strategy as described in the current Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028. The Core Strategy is, in turn informed by the regional and national planning policy.

The planning reports submitted in support of the planning application and in response to the appeal set out a case that there has been under provision of housing in County Wexford and that the subject development would go towards meeting targets and demand. The demand for housing generally is acknowledged. However, distribution of development including housing is a matter of spatial policy determined in the Core Strategy of the County Development Plan.

Taking policy hierarchy and environmental and infrastructural carrying capacity into account the Core Strategy allocated 103 housing units for Castlebridge up to 2027. A boundary to which the allocation applies is not set out which presents a challenge to monitoring of delivery.

A boundary is presented in Figure C-1 at section 3.3.9 of Volume 3 of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 (flood risk extent in Castlebridge). Although not referenced, it appears this boundary is the 2016 census settlement boundary. Useful for population data in drafting of core strategies the extent of these boundaries vary between each census, for example the 2016 Castlebridge boundary is more extensive than that defined for the purpose of the 2022 Census. In the absence of a spatial plan expressly assigning this function, CSO settlement boundaries do not form settlement boundaries for the purpose of spatial policy.

Wexford CDP Core Strategy Monitoring Report (November 2024) reports that in the first 2 years of the Development plan period, (concluding June 2024) that 24 houses had been granted (table 6) and 63 had been completed (table 2) yielding 87 houses permitted and/or completed in Castlebridge in that 2 year period. Taking account of the 32 houses permitted after that reporting period (section 4.2 of this report) a total

of 119 units have been permitted and completed since the adoption of the current Wexford CDP exceeding the housing allocation of 103 by 18 units.

In the event that permission was granted for the proposed 35 units subject of this appeal it would result in a 41 unit exceedance and would for that reason be in contravention of the Core Strategy.

I note the RSES at RPO16 makes it an objective to strengthen Wexford town. No reference to Castlebridge in the RSES.

The planning applicant's case is that the 35 units proposed represents only 34% of the total number of units (103) allocated for Castlebridge for the plan period and 17% of the total number of units required by 2040 and that in the context of the upward revision of housing targets/allocations this exceedance would be acceptable.

As a result of the exceedance of Core Strategy allocations the proposal is in contravention of the guiding principles and development approach referenced in Objective CS01 of the Wexford Development Plan 2022-2028 as well as the regional and national spatial policy which informed it.

In contrast to the previous refusal on subject site neither the planning report or the delegated decision maker addressed the issue of the core strategy.

The proposal if permitted and constructed would serve to undermine the delivery of plan led development as required by National Policy Objective 11 of the National Planning framework first revision and RPO 3 of the regional guidelines as set out in section 5 above. It is the stated intention of the Wexford Development Plan that it would be varied to include a plan for Castlebridge. The ad hoc revision/further exceedance of the current allocation of 103 units would be premature pending variation of the plan. As noted in section 5.3 above, no such variation process has commenced at the time of writing this report

7.1.2. Location of the site relative to Castlebridge.

Whereas the assessment and refusal of permission under planning ref: 20240530 on the subject site as described in section 4.1.1 above considered the location of the

site including in the context of sequential development, no such consideration was given to the subject case.

I consider that the functional boundary of the settlement of Castlebridge in the subject area is defined by the housing estate walls forming the boundary with the undeveloped agricultural land of the appeal. If permitted the proposal would change the boundary of the settlement to an increased urban area contained by the interface between urban and rural land use.

In the event of a development boundary and a sequential order being assigned in policy, the subject site has characteristics which could contribute to a case for its inclusion and/or to be prioritised for development above other sites as referenced in the case presented by the applicant. However, it could equally remain without the benefit of a policy support for development and/or lower in the order of priorities. Consideration of the planning policy context of the subject site would be appropriately undertaken at plan making stage and not at project approval stage.

The subject site is not a brownfield, infill or regeneration site as envisaged by objective CS04 of the Wexford Development Plan.

In the absence of a land use zoning objective or future development boundary in the Spatial Policy for Castlebridge I consider permitting the subject development would be premature and could undermine and prejudice the plan led development of Castlebridge.

7.2. Water and wastewater capacity.

As set out above in section 3.3 Uisce Eireann has provided a conditional and limited confirmation of feasibility of connection to wastewater and to water supply. The confirmation notes the requirement for local network upgrade by the developer.

The Core Strategy provides the context for coordinated planning and prioritisation of investment in infrastructure. Prioritisation/allocation of existing and future capacity of water supply and wastewater treatment between settlements is a consideration for the plan making process and not of project approval stage. Section 3.3.6 of the Wexford CDP (Castlebridge Settlement Plan) states that available capacity in the Wexford Town Wastewater Treatment Plan should be predominantly reserved for Wexford Town.

The current Core Strategy allocation of 103 additional houses for Castlebridge in the current plan period and therefore the committed infrastructure capacity have been exceeded as set out in section 7.1 above. Further exceedance would serve to undermine and restrict the reserved plan making function of Wexford County Council and therefore contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

The adequacy of water supply to Castlebridge with particular reference to water pressure has been raised as a ground of appeal as set out in section 6.1. of this report. Capacity of the water supply to Castlebridge is presented in table 9-1 of chapter 9 of volume 1 as set out in section 5.4 of this report.

In response to this ground of appeal the applicant has stated that a water scheme upgrade was completed in late 2024 which along with the commitment of the applicant to fund upgrade of the distribution network before occupation of any of the proposed houses will address any issues with water supply in the vicinity.

Uisce Eireann for their part have confirmed conditional feasibility of connection and the Planning Authority have given the matter no further consideration in permitting the development.

The Uisce Eireann Water Supply Capacity Register as published online at the time of writing this report states that potential Capacity is Available to meet 2034 regional population targets but that a Level of service (LoS) improvement is required to maintain/improve levels of service as demand increases through the National Water Resources Plan and investment planning process.

Table 9-1 of volume 1 of the CDP states that water supply capacity for Castlebridge is potentially available to cater for the 2027 population targets with the assistance of water conservation measures and network improvements.

The relationship between allocation of available existing and future capacity, investment in infrastructure and the distribution of housing allocation is beyond the scope of this appeal. The committed water supply allocation in the Core Strategy for residential development in Castlebridge has been exceeded. Further exceedance could serve to prejudice, undermine and restrict the reserved plan making function of Wexford County Council.

For reason of exceedance of current allocation and consideration of distribution of limited resources I consider the proposal to further breach the Core Strategy, inconsistent with plan led development and for that reason in conflict with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

7.3. Surface water management

The proposed surface water management system was the subject of repeated consideration by the applicant and the planning authority as described in section 3 of this report.

The surface water system was redesigned at FI and at clarification. Surface water swales and underground storage tanks were altered to meet the taking in charge standards of Wexford County Council. A 1m high clay bund was also included in open space no. 2 to the southwestern corner of the development.

No analysis of the surface water drainage design is set out in the planning report. Site meetings with the area engineer in the course of the application are referenced.

The design of the proposed surface water system advanced considerably in the course of the consenting process. Taking account of the existing hydrological characteristics of the site I consider that concerns regarding surface water impacts on adjoining property have been fully addressed by design.

7.4. Road and transport infrastructure

The road design and layout of the proposal is derived as an extract from the preceding (refused) development of 59 houses.

I consider the proposed layout, and design does not demonstrate full compliance with DMURS. Lower road widths, home zones, vertical and horizontal deflections would be expected to feature in the design to achieve a higher standard of urban design combined with enhanced road safety. I consider the roads design and layout to be unsatisfactory.

Pedestrian connectivity, EV charging and construction impacts on roads were raised in the Council Roads report. Amendments were made by the developer to footpath

and cycle lanes within the scheme as well as introducing a retraining structure and guard rails at Further Information and Clarification stage towards the public road.

No issues were raised in the grounds of appeal in relation to the proposed internal road network, or regarding the access on the public road to/from the proposal. I am satisfied that the entrance to the development from the public road is a safe vehicular entrance.

The proposal provides no details regarding interim presentation of boundary treatments and finishing of roads in anticipation of extension into phase 2 and beyond, if permitted at a future date.

The public road to the site frontage has existing footpaths to both sides which do not benefit from streetlighting which is highlighted in the grounds of appeal. The application proposes to provide increased footpath width of 3m and street lighting for the full extent of the development frontage, the precise manner in which this is to be achieved and implications for the public road and adjacent sites have not been set out in and therefore cannot be assessed.

I consider the provision of streetlighting beyond the proposed development as raised in the grounds of appeal to be beyond the scope of the development. I do not consider deficiencies in lighting beyond the subject site to form the basis of a reason for refusal by An Coimisiún. However, I note the first party proposal to contribute to public lighting.

Ground of appeal as set out in section 6.1 include general concerns regarding the capacity of transport infrastructure in the village to accommodate additional traffic volumes. By virtue of its location, future residents will not have access to high capacity public transport or a comprehensive integrated cycling and pedestrian infrastructure in the wider vicinity. However, I note there is public transport provision within walking distance of the proposed site. I do not consider the constraints to the existing transport infrastructure in the vicinity to be such as would be significantly negatively impacted by an increase of 35 houses.

I have no concerns that the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard or obstruction of road users or lead to significant congestion and for that reason I consider road and transport infrastructure issues would not impact on the consideration of An Coimisiún in this case.

I consider that deficiencies in road infrastructure including cycling and pedestrian facilities and the lighting thereof as described in the grounds of appeal would not warrant refusal of the subject application.

7.5. Capacity of local services including school

The applicant for permission and the appellant present conflicting details regarding the capacity of the local primary school and capacity of local services. The applicant in response to the grounds of appeal state that there is capacity in the local school and other existing facilities both locally and in Wexford town to serve the proposed population increase.

I note planning permission was granted in 2018 for an extension of the local primary school, and I note that there appears to be capacity on the site for future expansion. The Department of education database lists 2024-2025 enrolment at 219 pupils with 9 classes, assuming 8 mainstream classes or otherwise it would appear the school may be approaching capacity. I note from Census 2022 data for Castlebridge that the numbers in younger cohorts were recorded as a downward trend. However, assuming a typical distribution of primary school going age children between urban and rural schools of different patronage, in and around a county town the capacity for and impact of the proposed development on primary school capacity is unlikely to be significantly impacted by the provision of 35 new houses. As with other physical and social infrastructure coordination of school capacity and spatial planning can only be undertaken at policy level from the population planning perspective a matter for the Core Strategy.

I consider that a further breach of the Core Strategy by permitting the proposal could serve to further undermine the plan led development of the area and on the provision of social infrastructure including school capacity.

7.6. Mix of dwelling types

The application proposes 15 no. 2 bed houses (43%), 18no. 3 bed houses, (51%) and 2 no. 4 bed houses (6%) which is not in accordance with the policy for housing mix set out in section 4.7.5 of the development plan see section 5 of this report. The development plan makes provision for deviation where appropriate.

Taking account of the submitted correspondence demonstrating a level of engagement with both the housing authority and the approved housing body regarding the matter of unit types I consider the proposed housing mix to be acceptable.

I am therefore of the view that the dwelling type mix has been adequately justified and is therefore acceptable in the context of development plan policy.

7.7. Other Matters including Material Contravention

7.7.1. Sequential development

Although not explicitly referenced in the grounds of appeal or the report of the planning authority the requirement for sequential development was referenced in reason for refusal no. 1 on the previous application on the site. I consider this to be an important consideration.

A sequential development assessment as recommended at pre-planning was prepared and submitted by the applicant in support of the proposal. 5 no. sites with potential for residential development were considered and each was determined to be unsuitable with the exception of the site subject of the application. Reasons for unsuitability include the suitability for use as a graveyard, intensification of use of junctions and access issues.

The sequential assessment submitted on behalf of the applicant concluded that the subject site is suitable for residential development from a sequential development perspective. However, I consider the sequential development assessment as submitted with the application inadequate to justify the residential development of the subject site. The selection of extent, location and prioritisation of sites for residential development could only be undertaken as part of spatial policy formulation. A sequential development assessment by an applicant is not a substitute for the making of spatial policy.

I agree with the decision of the Planning Authority in refusal ref: 20240530 that the subject site at the northern edge of Castlebridge is inconsistent with the development plan policy to prioritise sequential development.

7.7.2. **Layout and design**

No issues have been raised in the assessments undertaken to date regarding the layout and design of the proposal.

The proposal layout is extracted from the 59 unit proposal previously refused on the subject site. Dividing the previous layout into two phases without consideration of the design has resulted a proposal which if permitted and constructed would have the character of an unfinished estate until, and if, Phase 2 is authorised and completed.

The transition of the **frontage** to the public road from the proposal, to the south has not been adequately presented to facilitate an assessment. This location presents a challenging transition taking account of revised footpath widths, attenuation tank, its connections, the retaining structure, guard rails and a landscaping scheme suitable to be taken in charge and maintained by Wexford County Council as proposed.

Taking account of existing and proposed levels, I have serious concerns regarding the **design and detailing of entrance** to the site and the open space areas indicated to each side which in addition to accommodating significant level changes are also proposed to accommodate surface water swales and landscaping. Insufficient material has been provided to demonstrate the detailing of this area.

Corner units including numbers 06, 07, and 12, have inadequate design to address the function required of corner units in these locations including the internal layout not locating habitable to maximise passive surveillance.

I consider that the **proposed design of individual blocks** of houses could be improved to better reconcile the topography with the built environment potentially with stepping of the front building line.

The development contains an excessive prevalence of render. **Materials** with better weathering characteristics particularly in the dual aspect units turning corners and units closing view would provide for a better design in the medium to long term.

Amenity space 02 to the south corner of the development and the area of leftover space to the rear of number 8 and 9 are incongruous with good layout and design .

I consider the layout and design to be poorly considered falling below a standard which would be acceptable. While I have reservations regarding the proposed layout

and design, given the substantive reason for refusal, I recommend that this not be included as a reason for refusal.

7.7.3. **Material Contravention**

The Wexford Development Plan 2022-2028 requires implementation and compliance with the core strategy. In the absence of a settlement boundary and/or land use zonings for Castlebridge a clear interpretation of the spatial extent to which the allocation applies is unclear. However, analysis set out in section 7.1.1 above demonstrates exceedance of the core strategy allocation. .

The Core Strategy allocation is a specific quantitative provision framed within the specific statutory requirement of Section 10 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

Taking account of the importance and stated function of the Core Strategy across many of the issues arising with the proposal I consider that exceedance of allocations for Castlebridge of the scale arising in this case would serve to undermine the Core Strategy and in so doing the proper planning of the area. For that reason, I consider that if the proposal were permitted it would be a material contravention of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 in its central function informing the plan and as specifically expressed in Objectives CS01, CS02 of Volume 1 and section 3.4.8 of Volume 3.

8.0 **AA Screening**

See Appendix 2 of this report.

Screening Determination

Finding of no likely significant effects

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 the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on Slaney River Valley SAC site code: 000781 and Wexford Harbour and slobs SPA site code: 004076 in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- The Nature of the proposed development and the serviced nature of the development,
- The location of the site,
- The distance from nearest European site and lack of ecological connections

9.0 WFD Screening

See Appendix 3 of this report.

I have assessed the development of 35 houses on the northern periphery of Castlebridge 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.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Relatively small scale and nature of the development
- Location-distance from nearest Water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections
- Taking into account WFD screening

10.0 Conclusion

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

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be refused for the development for the reason below

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The proposed development of 35 houses, in combination with existing and permitted development in the settlement, would exceed the core strategy allocation for Castlebridge for the plan period. It is the policy of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 to implement the Core Strategy Guiding Principles and Development Approach and to sequentially prioritise development sites closer to the village centre. The proposed development, seeking to extend the built footprint and population of Castlebridge would materially contravene the Core Strategy and in so doing would materially contravene objectives CS01, CS02, CS04, SH06 of Volume 1 and Section 3.4.2 of Volume 3 of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed development if permitted would also be inconsistent with objective TV34 of Volume 1 which seeks to ensure that development represents an efficient use of land, to support national policy objectives to achieve compact growth in towns and villages. The proposed development if permitted would serve to undermine the delivery of a plan led system as required by NPO 11 of the National Planning Framework first revision and RPO3 of the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) for the Southern Region, 2020-2032. The proposed development is therefore incompatible with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

Hugh O'Neill
Planning Inspector
14 January 2026

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-323390-25
Proposed Development Summary	35 houses, see proposal description at section 2 of main report for further detail
Development Address	Glasganny, Ardcahan, Co. Wexford
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?	
	<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.	
<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 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. No Screening required.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.	Class 10 Infrastructure (b) (i) and (iv)
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 1 EIA Preliminary Examination

Form 2 -

Case Reference	ACP-323390-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of 35 dwellings and all site works
Development Address	Glasganny, Ardcahan, Co. Wexford
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development	Construction of a development of 35 houses on a site currently in use for high intensity tillage production. The proposal will also involve construction of roads, amenity open space and car parking in a location adjacent to existing housing estates of equal and greater scale, similar design.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	Irregularly shaped 1.41 Ha portion of an intensively farmed agricultural field currently in tillage use. Residential estates on three sides and agricultural land to the north. Boundaries with occasional and remnants of hedgerows including native trees to south and west. There is no evidence of any field drains or other water bodies associated with boundaries or otherwise. The boundary with the rear of houses in the Ard Alainn estate coincides with the boundary between the townlands of Castlebridge and Glasganny.

	An Archaeological Impact Assessment at Further Information Stage which included test trenching identified no archaeological sensitivities.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts	Given the scale and nature of the development, the proposed development does not have the potential for significant effects on environmental sensitivities in the area.
Conclusion	
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.

Appendix 2 Appropriate Assessment screening

Test for likely significant effects

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects				
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics				
Brief description of project		Construction of 35 dwellings and all site works		
Brief description of development of site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms		Construction of a development of 35 houses on a site currently in use for high intensity tillage production. The proposal will also involve construction of roads, amenity open space and car parking.		
Screening report		Y		
Natura Impact Statement		N		
Relevant submissions		No issues relating to AA raised.		
Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model				
European Site (code)	Qualifying interests¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections²	Consider further in screening³ Y/N
Slaney River Valley SAC 000781	<p>Estuaries [1130]</p> <p>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140]</p> <p>Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritima) [1330]</p> <p>Mediterranean salt meadows (Juncetalia maritimi) [1410]</p> <p>Water courses of plain to montane levels with the Ranunculion fluitantis and Callitricho-Batrachion vegetation [3260]</p> <p>Old sessile oak woods with Ilex and Blechnum in the British Isles [91A0]</p> <p>Alluvial forests with Alnus glutinosa and Fraxinus excelsior (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae) [91E0]</p> <p>Margaritifera margaritifera (Freshwater Pearl Mussel) [1029]</p>	c. 0.8 km	None	N

	<p>Petromyzon marinus (Sea Lamprey) [1095]</p> <p>Lampetra planeri (Brook Lamprey) [1096]</p> <p>Lampetra fluviatilis (River Lamprey) [1099]</p> <p>Alosa fallax fallax (Twaité Shad) [1103]</p> <p>Salmo salar (Salmon) [1106]</p> <p>Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355]</p> <p>Phoca vitulina (Harbour Seal) [1365]</p>			
<p>Wexford Harbour and Slob SPA 004076</p>	<p>Little Grebe (Tachybaptus ruficollis) [A004]</p> <p>Great Crested Grebe (Podiceps cristatus) [A005]</p> <p>Cormorant (Phalacrocorax carbo) [A017]</p> <p>Grey Heron (Ardea cinerea) [A028]</p> <p>Bewick's Swan (Cygnus columbianus bewickii) [A037]</p> <p>Whooper Swan (Cygnus cygnus) [A038]</p> <p>Light-bellied Brent Goose (Branta bernicla hrota) [A046]</p> <p>Shelduck (Tadorna tadorna) [A048]</p> <p>Teal (Anas crecca) [A052]</p> <p>Mallard (Anas platyrhynchos) [A053]</p> <p>Pintail (Anas acuta) [A054]</p> <p>Scaup (Aythya marila) [A062]</p> <p>Goldeneye (Bucephala clangula) [A067]</p> <p>Red-breasted Merganser (Mergus serrator) [A069]</p> <p>Hen Harrier (Circus cyaneus) [A082]</p>	c. 0.8km	None	N

	<p>Coot (<i>Fulica atra</i>) [A125]</p> <p>Oystercatcher (<i>Haematopus ostralegus</i>) [A130]</p> <p>Golden Plover (<i>Pluvialis apricaria</i>) [A140]</p> <p>Grey Plover (<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>) [A141]</p> <p>Lapwing (<i>Vanellus vanellus</i>) [A142]</p> <p>Knot (<i>Calidris canutus</i>) [A143]</p> <p>Sanderling (<i>Calidris alba</i>) [A144]</p> <p>Dunlin (<i>Calidris alpina</i>) [A149]</p> <p>Black-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa limosa</i>) [A156]</p> <p>Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157]</p> <p>Curlew (<i>Numenius arquata</i>) [A160]</p> <p>Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162]</p> <p>Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) [A179]</p> <p>Lesser Black-backed Gull (<i>Larus fuscus</i>) [A183]</p> <p>Greenland White-fronted Goose (<i>Anser albifrons flavirostris</i>) [A395]</p> <p>Wigeon (<i>Mareca penelope</i>) [A855]</p> <p>Little Tern (<i>Sternula albifrons</i>) [A885]</p> <p>Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

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

As the subject site has been found not to fall within the zone of influence of the above referenced or any other European Site, no European sites have been identified as being in need of further consideration.

I have excluded the potential for ex-situ effects on qualifying birds for reasons of current land management, adjacent urban development (disturbance) and abundance of land of the type in the wider area.

Although the submitted AA screening report, list of recent planning applications at table 6.2 may be out of date, taking account of the planning history set out in the section 4 of the inspectors report along with consideration that the Wexford Development Plan was subject to Appropriate Assessment I conclude that there are no in-combination effects with potential to result in likely significant effects on any European site.

The submitted AA screening report noted the intention for the Surface Water management system to discharge to a public surface water sewer. This element of the proposal was redesigned in the course of Further Information with the final design disposing of all surface water to ground. This neither impacts on the outcome of the submitted AA screening report or on the conclusions or determination set out below.

Direct, indirect, ex-situ and in-combination effects have been considered and none have been identified. The site falls outside of the Zone of Influence of any European site.

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

I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on Slaney River Valley SAC 000781 or Wexford Harbour and Slobs SPA 004076. The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European site(s). No further assessment is required for the project. No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.

Screening Determination

Finding of no likely significant effects

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 the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on Slaney River Valley SAC 000781 or Wexford Harbour and Slobs SPA 004076 in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- The Nature of the proposed development and the serviced nature of the proposal.,
- The location of the site, and,
- The distance from nearest European site and lack of ecological connections thereto.

Appendix 3 Water Framework Directive

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING						
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality						
An Bord Pleanála ref. no.	ACP-323390-25			Townland, address	Glasganny, Ardcahan, Co. Wexford	
Description of project				Construction of a development of 35 houses on a site currently in use for high intensity tillage production. The proposal will also involve construction of roads, amenity open space and car parking in a location adjacent to existing housing estates of equal and greater scale, similar design.		
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,				Free draining land. No drainage ditches or other water features on site.		
Proposed surface water details				SUDS on site disposal following redesign in the course of Further Information requests by the Planning Authority.		
Proposed water supply source & available capacity				Uisce Eireann		
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues				Uisce Eireann		
Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection						
Identified water body	Distance to (m)	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface runoff, drainage, groundwater)
River Waterbody	182 west and 307 east	IE_SE_12S030600	Moderate	Review	Agriculture	None
Groundwater waterbody	Underlying site	IE_SE_G_164	Good	Not at risk	No pressures	Free draining soil conditions.

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 water	IE_SE_12S030600	Run off from site during construction	Suspended solids and/or other pollutants Significant	Standard and best practice surface water controls	No	Screened out
2.	Ground	IE_SE_G_164	Pollutants draining to ground waters	Hydrocarbon or other Spillages, excavation into the water table.	Standard Construction Measures / Conditions	No	Screened out
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
3.	Surface water	IE_SE_12S030600	Run off from site during operation	Suspended solids and/or other pollutants Significant	Standard and best practice surface water system design	No	Screened out

					and operation Connection to public wastewater networks.		
4.	Ground	IE_SE_G_164	Pollutants draining to ground waters	Hydrocarbon or other Spillages, into the water table.	Standard and best practice surface water system design and operation Connection to public wastewater networks.	No	Screened out
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
5.	NA						