



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-323588-25

Development	Demolition of existing extension and addition of new single storey extension to rear.
Location	40 High Street, Wexford, Co. Wexford.
Planning Authority	Wexford County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	20241622
Applicant(s)	Philp Coyne
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Peter Donati. Anita Gaul.
Date of Site Inspection	13/11/25
Inspector	Hugh O'Neill

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. No. 40 High street is a three-storey mid terrace unoccupied, residential property on an irregularly shaped plot extending to a large rear yard.
- 1.2. The property is in generally poor condition with failure of the roof to the rear extension which it is proposed to demolish, as well as over the rear return accommodating the stairwell. Water penetration has led to decay and failure of building elements in both areas.
- 1.3. No 40. is flanked (north and south) by two-storey residential properties to its frontage onto High Street. Ground level of the rear yard rises significantly towards the western boundary. The yard is defined to the north by a substantial stone wall which is also the rear boundary of properties facing onto Mary Street, and to the south by property facing onto High Street.
- 1.4. The rear (west) boundary wall and its immediate area are designated as ACA, Recorded Monument WX037-032 town and protected structure Nos. WBC0289 and WBC0290 as the wall incorporates extant upstanding remains of Wexford Town wall.
- 1.5. The wider area is predominantly characterised by longstanding urban residential development with occasional commercial uses in an edge of centre location. There is a high density of National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH) records in the vicinity however the subject property was not recorded by the NIAH.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Demolition of 25sqm of existing extension to rear along with substantial excavation of the rear garden.
- 2.2. Construction of new self contained single storey 74 sqm apartment at a reduced ground level is described as an extension to the rear of the house which is to be accessed through a shared access corridor from the street. Shared bike and bin storage areas are also accessed from this corridor.
- 2.3. Renovation of the house to create a 102 sqm 2 bedroom apartment. The renovation is contained within the existing building envelope with the exception of the a flat roof replacement of the failed pitched roof over the rear return. The replacement of this

roof will result in a minor increase in the height of the external envelope at this point with the existing eaves replaced by flat roof parapet. This alteration results in no impact on floor area.

- 2.4. Construction of divided private open space to rear, with 20sqm and 50sqm for the garden apartment no. 1 and existing house apartment no. 2 respectively

Note: the development description references a four bedroom apartment which is an error, both proposed apartments are 2 bed units. I consider this error to be minor and not to be such that any party to the process has been disadvantaged as a result.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority decided to grant permission on 22 August 2025 subject to 9 conditions which are generally of a standard nature with the exception of condition 2 which sets out in detail the requirements of the Dept. of Housing, Local Government & Heritage addressing monitoring of demolition of extensions and treatment of the rear boundary wall.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning report dated 25/02/25 set out the context for the proposal, accepted the principle of renovation and reuse and recommended that further information be sought which I summarise as follows

- Amended drawings and application fee to acknowledge 1st floor extension
- Response to 3rd party submissions re: impacts on amenity
- Demonstrate compliance with design standards for new apartments
- Section 97 Exemption application (part V exemption)
- Access details for ground floor apartment.
- Archaeological Assessment
- Wastewater

- Surface water/SUDS

3.2.2. Planning report 2 signed and dated 16/06/25 concluded that each point had been addressed with the exception that clarification was required regarding proposed ground levels relative to boundary wall and taking account of the refusal of the S97 exemption cert a proposal was sought for compliance with Part V. A hand written note by the senior planner was appended to the report requesting that an area of at least 3m from the wall to be protected from future development and excluded from amenity space of the apartments.

3.2.3. Planning Report 3 dated 24/08/25 considered details submitted re: height of structure and boundary wall to have addressed the issue. A repeat application for a S97 exemption cert is noted. The PA planning report states no Part V requirement and concludes that the matters had all been addressed and a recommendation that permission should be granted.

3.2.4. Other Technical Reports

- Senior Executive Scientist (environment) requested FI be sought re: waste water disposal. Following assessment of the response the report recommends a grant of permission with conditions for the control of noise, dust and waste.

3.2.5. Conditions

The planning Authority applied a detailed bespoke condition as recommended by Dept. of Housing, Local Government & Heritage. I consider that where An Coimisiún are minded to grant permission this condition should be repeated.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

A report was received from the Dept. of Housing, Local Government & Heritage 11/06/25 which responded to the Archaeological Impact Assessment report prepared by Shanarc Archaeology Ltd in response to the Further Information request. The report concluded that it was necessary that a more comprehensive survey, and conservation methodology should be implemented. A set of conditions are recommended in this regard.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

The planning authority received submissions on the application from each of the appellants. The points raised in these submissions are reflected in the grounds of appeal as set out below.

4.0 **Planning History**

No planning history on subject site

[20230054](#) ABP-316185-23 44 High Street residential over commercial. Granted by WCC and by ABP on appeal.

[20240034](#) 58 High Street (40m south of subject site) Permission to convert and extend an existing vacant house from a single residence to two 2 bed apartments and 2 studio apartments and all associated site works. Refused for 6 reasons, ACA, amenity of future residents, neighbouring amenity, archaeology, Part V, and insufficient detail on drawings.

[20241488](#) 58 High Street, Permission to convert an existing vacant house into three apartments Granted.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **Development Plan**

5.2. The Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028, is the operative plan for the site. The lands are not zoned and the time of writing this report the Wexford Town Local Area Plan is pending.

5.3. **Volume 1**

5.4. Section 4.7 Housing land management, includes strong policy support for the return of existing housing stock to use and for the delivery of a range of types and tenures. Objective SH20 To promote and support the implementation of plans and projects to bring back to use vacant homes.

5.5. Section 5.10 of the Development Plan sets out the principles of compact growth and regeneration. With regard to both the reuse of vacant buildings and the use of upper floors in central areas, the Council provides for flexibility in the application of development management standards and includes the following policy objectives.

Objective TV43 To adopt a presumption in favour of the development of infill and brownfield sites and to apply flexibility in the application of development management standards allowing for the achievement of performance standards for issues such as the protection of adjoining residential amenities, privacy, light and amenity.

Objective TV44 To ensure the scale of infill development reflects the location of the site and the characteristics of the settlement. The Council will consider the scale of infill development having regard to the need to make efficient use of centrally located sites and the prevailing scale in the area. The Council will encourage development which intensifies the use of the land to at minimum the intensity of adjoining uses but optimally, subject to the appropriate protection of amenities of adjoining residences to a higher intensity.

Objective TV46 To promote and encourage residential uses on upper floors of appropriate buildings located in town and village centres and to require that independent street access to the upper floors of shops / commercial units is retained to ensure use of the upper floors of buildings for residential accommodation or commercial development.

5.6. Section 13.3 addresses archaeological heritage. Objective AH09 To protect historic urban defences (both upstanding and buried) and associated features and safeguard them from inappropriate development in accordance with National Policy on Town Defences (Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government, 2008).

5.7. Section 13.4 addresses built heritage Objective BH08 To promote the retention of any original or early building fabric including for example timber sash windows, stonework, brickwork, joinery, ironmongery, traditional mortars, render and decorative or weather finishes and slate and vernacular architectural details (whether relating to a Protected Structure or not). Likewise, the Council will encourage the reinstatement of historically correct traditional features and retention of original ridge heights as appropriate.

5.8. **Volume 2 ‘Development Management Manual’**

5.9. Section 2.6 states that all developments should be designed to protect the amenities of adjoining properties and properties in the vicinity. Reiterating that all development should ensure that it would not give rise to undue overshadowing, loss of daylight and sunlight or undue overlooking of properties in the vicinity.

5.10. Section 3.4 specifically relates to extensions to Dwelling Houses. Appropriate extensions to existing dwelling houses are to be considered subject to compliance with a set of criteria which reiterate common principles including that the extension should not have an adverse impact on the amenities of adjoining properties through undue overlooking, undue overshadowing and/or an over dominant visual impact

5.11. Section 3.5 states that the sub-division of a dwelling which has public waste water and water infrastructure will be considered where it does not detract from the character of the property, adjoining properties and the amenities of the area. The proposal will be required to meet the minimum standards relating to residential developments including services, private open space and car parking.

5.12. Section 3.8 states that back land development will contribute to efficient use of land and should amongst other requirements be cognisant of the height of adjoining dwellings and location/orientation of private open spaces, to reduce overshadowing and overlooking.

5.13. Section 3.12.3, provides Apartment Standards and Design requirements cross referenced through the development plan and SPPRs and note the various exemptions/discretion provided to application of SPPR standards in the case of refurbishment and urban infill sites.

5.14. Table 6-7 prescribes a maximum parking standard for apartments of 0 in Town Centre locations.

5.15. **Natural Heritage Designations**

c. 250 m to Slaney River Valley SAC [000781](#)

c. 1km to Wexford Harbour and Slobs SPA [004076](#)

c. 500m to Proposed Natural Heritage Areas: Wexford Slobs and Harbour 000712

6.0 EIA Screening

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

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

Appeals were received from 2 parties,

- Peter Donati of no. 38 High street
- Anita Gaul of no. 42 High Street.

I have summarised the grounds of appeal as follows:

- The proposal will block sunlight to no. 42 and sunlight and views from no 38.
- Hours of construction unreasonable 9 to 5 would be more reasonable.
- Scale of development excessive.
- The development should be contained within the existing house and would in that case be in keeping with the area.
- Impact on privacy for no. 42.
- Devaluation of property in the area.
- Car parking constrained in the area.
- The proposal will end up as an HMO, (although not entirely clear, I take this to mean a house in multiple occupancy).

7.2. **Applicant Response**

None on file.

7.3. **Planning Authority Response**

None on file.

7.4. **Observations**

None on file.

8.0 **Assessment**

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

- Development principle
- Development Management standards/future residential amenity
- Impact on neighbouring residential amenity, sunlight, daylight, views, privacy and disturbance
- Devaluation of property in the vicinity
- Impact on car parking
- Archaeological impact
- Drainage

8.1. **Development principle**

8.2. The absence of a land use zoning objective does not impede the consideration of principle in this case. The site and surrounding area have a long standing established residential use.

- 8.3. Returning a vacant residential property to use along with addition of an infill second unit on a central urban site without impact on the character of the public domain is entirely in keeping with policy provisions set out in section 5 above. The proposal is acceptable in principle and in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area subject to the following considerations.
- 8.4. **Development management standards/future residential amenity**
- 8.5. The policy imperative of returning vacant property to use and of facilitating infill development subject to protection of adjacent amenities is described in section 5.10 including in objectives TV43 and TV44 of Volume 1 of the development plan. Provision for flexibility in application of development management standards is also set out therein.
- 8.6. The tight, irregular, ancient urban grain, height of adjacent buildings and boundary walls to the rear yard within which the stand alone apartment is proposed will impact on natural light levels in the internal and external spaces. However, taking account of the policy flexibility provided for at local and national policy in the case of refurbishment, urban infill and the small site size, combined with the urban amenities of the immediate area, I consider on balance the level of amenity for future residents of apartment 1 to be acceptable in this instance.
- 8.7. Compliance with all quantitative development management requirements for floor spaces and room widths for Apartment no.1, (garden apartment) have been demonstrated in the application.
- 8.8. Apartment no 2 (refurbished No 40 High Street) falls below the aspirations of planning policy at national and local level for new apartment development. The apartment will be an east facing single aspect apartment, (as is the house currently) which will result in internal natural light levels falling below the policy aspiration for new apartments. Living room widths at 3.1m fall below the 3.6m prescribed and aggregate bedroom floor area at 21.5sqm falls below the 24.4 sqm required minimum. These deficiencies arise as a result of the dimensions of the building. Taking account of the circumstances and context of the development I consider these deviations to be acceptable.

8.9. **Impact on neighbouring residential amenity**

- 8.10. The entirety of the proposed rear extension/ Apartment no. 1 is lower than the existing stone wall which forms the boundary of the site.. No works are proposed to the boundary wall. The proximity of the excavation and construction to the boundary wall are likely to present construction challenges which fall outside of the scope of this appeal.
- 8.11. The Sunlight and Overshadowing study submitted as further information received by the Planning Authority on 20/05/25 sets out a methodology and lists the appropriate guidance, standards and national policy. A shadow analysis was undertaken and submitted. I have examined modelled existing and future case shadows. I note that this report concludes that each of the houses examined (6, 7,8,9,10,11,12 Mary Street and 38 and 42 High Street) will not perceive a reduction in sunlight including to any windows or open space on any day of the year. This is as the total height of the proposed development is at a level below that of the boundary wall to the north resulting in no change to the shadow from baseline to future state.
- 8.12. Taking account of the height of the boundary walls and as confirmed by the finding of negligible adverse impact in the submitted sunlight and overshadowing study I consider there is no potential for impact on amenities of adjoining residences arising from changes to daylight or sunlight.
- 8.13. Taking account of the location of each of the proposed windows at ground floor level relative to the existing boundary walls I consider there is no potential for overlooking arising from the proposal.
- 8.14. By virtue of the proposed new structure being of a height entirely below that of the boundary wall, it will not impact upon any views from adjacent property.
- 8.15. For reasons including its height and lack of visual or other impact on public or private amenity, I consider it to be of a scale which I consider acceptable.
- 8.16. Whilst acknowledging that there will be disturbance in the course of the construction of the development, overly restrictive operating hours are likely to extend the duration of the disturbance. I consider that the proposed construction hours of 7am to 7pm protect sensitive receptors for the critical period and for that reason are appropriate.

8.17. Devaluation of property in the area

8.18. There is no evidence that the refurbishment and extension of the vacant property would result in the devaluation of property in the terrace or wider vicinity.

8.19. Impact on car parking

8.20. The development plan provides a maximum rate of parking provision in the urban area of 0 spaces per unit. The area is relatively well served by on street parking. I do not consider that the addition of 1 residential unit will result in a material impact on parking in the area.

8.21. Archaeological Impacts

8.22. An Archaeological Impact Assessment report was prepared by Shanarc Archaeology Ltd in response to a Further Information request relating to the rear boundary wall of the site. The developer had proposed not to undertake any works to or in the vicinity of the subject wall.

8.23. The Dept. of Housing, Local Government & Heritage recommended inclusion of conditions requiring engagement of specialists to record and prepare a methodology to address the concerns of the department. I consider where An Coimisiún are minded to grant permission these conditions should be included as set out below.

8.24. Drainage

8.25. As part of the further information response a report on the design of the surface and foul drainage system was submitted, which the PA report notes as satisfactory. The proposed green roof is designed to attenuate the area of new roof within the rear yard. Further opportunities for SUDS measures are limited by the nature of the site including levels. I consider the level of SUDS proposed to be acceptable taking account of the nature of the site and the proposed development.

8.26. No evidence of a public surface water system has been identified in the reporting of the Local Authority or in the site specific design submitted following the further information request. However, where An Coimisiún are minded to grant permission I

consider a standard ACP condition requiring final agreement of drainage details with the Planning Authority would be appropriate in this instance.

9.0 AA Screening

I have considered the proposal to construct an extension to and refurbish No. 40 High Street Wexford in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is a fully serviced urban site with a long established residential use located:

- c. 250m from the Slaney River Valley SAC [000781](#)
- c. 1km from Wexford Harbour and Slob SPA [004076](#)

The proposed development comprises the extension and refurbishment of a long standing building forming part of a terrace of similar structures in a long established central urban area.

No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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 nature of the development.
- The small scale, urban and serviced nature of the site and proposed development.
- The location-distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.

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 WFD Screening

The subject site is located at No. 40 High Street Wexford an established residential use on fully serviced urban site at a distance of 240m east of transitional water body IE_SE_040_0200, Lower Slaney Estuary which is categorised as Poor.

The proposed development comprises the refurbishment and extension of a 3 storey terraced vacant residential property to create 2 apartments.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

I have assessed the [title of project] 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:

- The small scale nature of the site and the works
- The fully serviced nature of the existing established and proposed use of the site
- Location-distance from nearest Water bodies and lack of hydrological connections.

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 jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be granted for the following reasons and considerations:

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the location of the proposal in the centre of Wexford town, the importance of residential development in Wexford town generally, the proposal to return a vacant property to use and densification of a central urban area, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of the policy requirements of the development plan, would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenities of the area and would not be prejudicial to public health. 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 the further information and clarification date stamped 20/05/2025 and 28/07/2025, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

3. a. The applicant is required to engage the services of a suitably qualified and experienced conservation architect/conservation engineer to carry out a

comprehensive survey of the town wall (both interior and exterior elevations) in consultation with the archaeologist engaged by the developer. The survey shall be completed in advance of any site preparation, demolition, site clearance and/or construction works and shall inform the preparation of a conservation methodology to be agreed with the Planning Authority, following consultation with the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, and implemented by the developer to ensure the preservation and protection of the town wall as an integral part of the overall development.

- b. Careful removal of vegetation by hand from the town wall will be required to facilitate a detailed visual inspection by the conservation specialist(s), analysis and recording of the built fabric and the completion of a comprehensive measured survey of the section of the town wall that forms the western boundary of the PDS. This will be required to determine the structural stability of the town wall, to identify any architectural features evident within the structure (e.g. evidence of wall walk, historical reinforcement works, parapet details, building phases etc.) and analysis of building materials to inform the preparation of the required conservation methodology to be implemented.
- c. The survey shall be completed and a report submitted to the Planning Authority and the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage in advance of any development works. Specifications for any required conservation works will be provided by a competent conservation specialist and included in the report. Any required conservation works specified by the planning authority, following consultation with the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, shall be implemented by the developer.
- d. The developer shall engage a suitably qualified archaeologist (licensed under the National Monuments Acts 1930-2014) to carry out pre-development archaeological testing in areas of proposed ground disturbance and to submit an AIA report for the written agreement of the Planning Authority, following consultation with the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, in advance of any groundworks and/or

construction works. The report shall include an archaeological impact statement and mitigation strategy.

- e. Where archaeological material is shown to be present, avoidance, preservation in-situ, preservation by record (archaeological excavation) and/or monitoring may be required. Any further archaeological mitigation requirements specified by the Planning Authority, following consultation with the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, shall be complied with by the developer. No site preparation and/or construction works shall be carried out on site until the archaeologist's report has been submitted to and approval to proceed is agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.
- f. The Planning Authority and the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage shall be furnished with a final archaeological report describing the results of any subsequent archaeological investigative works and/or monitoring following the completion of all archaeological work on site and the completion of any necessary post-excavation work. All resulting and associated archaeological costs shall be borne by the developer.

Reason: In order to protect and preserve archaeological heritage.

- 4. Prior to the commencement of any works associated with the development hereby permitted, the developer shall submit a detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for the written agreement of the planning authority. The CEMP shall incorporate details for the following: collection and disposal of construction waste, surface water run-off from the site, and environmental management measures during construction including working hours, noise control, dust and vibration control and monitoring of such measures. A record of daily checks that the construction works are being undertaken in accordance with the CEMP shall be kept at the construction site office for inspection by the planning authority. The agreed CEMP shall be implemented in full in the carrying out of the development.

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

5. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 0700 to 1900 hours Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between of 0700 to 1600 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

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

6. All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development. All existing over ground cables shall be relocated underground as part of the site development works.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

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

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

8. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or such other security as may be acceptable to the planning authority, to secure the

reinstatement of public roads which may be damaged by the transport of materials to the site, coupled with an agreement empowering the planning authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory reinstatement of the public road. The form and amount of the security shall be as agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Bord Coimisiún for determination.

Reason: To ensure that the public road is satisfactorily reinstated, if necessary

9. Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements, in writing where necessary, of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

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

28 January 2026

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	323588
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of existing extension and addition of new single storey extension to rear
Development Address	40 High Street, Wexford, Co. Wexford
	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?	<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.	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 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 b) (i) of Part 2: Construction of more than 500 dwelling units. Proposal for 1 apartment only
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 type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	323588
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of existing extension and addition of new single storey extension to rear
Development Address	40 High Street, Wexford, 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	The proposal entails the refurbishment of an existing fully serviced urban residential terraced property and the construction of a new garden apartment by way of extension.
Location of development	The site is located in a residential terrace in a densely populated, central, fully serviced central urban location. There are ACAs in close proximity, only the rear boundary wall falls into the ACA, this wall contains extant upstanding elements of the Wexford Town wall and has the benefit of archaeological protection as well as inclusion on the record of protected structures in the CDP. Specific mitigation and conditions are identified to obviate potential significant effects.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts	No potential for significant effects by virtue of the nature of the development.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.