



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-323600-25

Development	First floor extension over public house, with internal and external associated works.
Location	The Rustic Inn, Main St, Drumanure, Abbeyshrule, Co. Longford , N39 F6A2
Planning Authority	Longford County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2460214
Applicant(s)	Goldline Taverns Ltd.
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party vs. Grant First Party vs. Condition
Appellant(s)	Peter Rooney
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	22 nd June 2026
Inspector	Stephen Ward

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description.....	3
2.0 Proposed Development.....	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0 Planning History	7
5.0 Policy Context	7
6.0 EIA Screening	10
7.0 The Appeal.....	11
8.0 Assessment.....	17
9.0 AA Screening	24
10.0 Water Framework Directive	25
11.0 Recommendation.....	25
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	25
13.0 Conditions.....	26
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening.....	29
Appendix 2 – Form 2: EIA Preliminary Examination.....	31
Appendix 3 – AA Screening Determination.....	33
Appendix 4 - Water Framework Directive Screening Determination.....	37

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located in the village centre of Abbeyshrule, in the southeast of County Longford. The village comprises a small number of houses supported by several commercial and community facilities which are mainly sited between the Royal Canal (to the west) and the River Inny (to the east). The Longford Forest 'Center Parcs' tourist attraction is c. 4km to the southwest.
- 1.2. The site itself has a stated area of 950m² and is roughly rectangular in shape. It is already developed for commercial purposes, including a bar/lounge, restaurant, function room and kitchen at ground floor, and 5 guestrooms at first floor level. The existing building has a stated floor area of 1,172m².
- 1.3. To the east, the site is bounded by the main local road running through the village. There is a footpath and a 'hard shoulder' area between the western side of the road and the existing building, while on the opposite (eastern) side of the road there is an area (indicated as being within the same ownership as the appeal site) containing car/cycle parking (10 spaces each) and an open garden with seating. To the north, the site is bounded by a single storey dwelling (indicated as being within the same ownership as the appeal site), while to the south is the appellant's two-storey dwelling and associated yards. The site is bounded to the west by the banks of the Royal Canal.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. In summary, permission is sought for a first-floor extension (186.20 sq m) to consist of 5 no. accessible bedrooms and ensuites. It is also proposed to install an internal elevator to facilitate the accessible bedrooms. The application outlines that the proposed development aims to enhance regional tourism by offering high quality, unique facilities.
- 2.2. It is proposed to provide a designated set down and collection area to accommodate taxis and private vehicles during peak times. Water and wastewater connections are proposed to the existing Uisce Eireann infrastructure and surface water is to be diverted to the existing public sewer.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By Order dated 20th August 2025, Longford County Council (LCC) made a decision to grant permission subject to conditions.

3.1.1. Conditions

The conditions of the decision are mainly standard in nature. However, notable conditions can be summarised as follows:

2 – The guest rooms shall be used for short-term (maximum one month only) tourist accommodation only.

8 – Requires confirmation of connections to water services from Uisce Eireann prior to commencement of development.

12 – Requires the payment of €1,722.35 development contribution for the proposed extension, and €18,350 development contribution for the car parking space shortfall.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Further Information

Following the initial assessment of the application a request for Further Information was issued. In summary, the matters raised were as follows:

1. Submit a detailed statement for the justification and design of the proposed tourism development in accordance with CDP Development Management Standard DMS16.187.
2. Confirm the existing and proposed car parking facilities for the bar and bistro/guesthouse accommodation and confirm how the additional room capacity can be serviced by car parking facilities at the site.
3. Consult with Uisce Eireann regarding water/wastewater infrastructure, including the submission of a pre-connection enquiry and foul sewer design details.

3.2.2. Planning Reports

The LCC planning assessment is outlined in two Planning Reports, i.e., the initial assessment recommending the request for further information (FI) and the subsequent report on the FI response. The assessment can be collectively summarised under the following headings.

Principle of the Development

- The CDP (including CPO 10.28) supports the development of tourism facilities subject to suitable design, environmental protection, and adequate infrastructure.
- Further Information was requested on the justification for the development in accordance with DMS16.187. The subsequent report on the applicant's response confirms that there is sufficient need and justification for the proposed development.

Parking

- CDP parking requirements were noted as per DMS16.124 and Further Information was requested on existing and proposed car-parking proposals.
- The applicant's response submits that 10 no. existing spaces are dedicated to accommodate guesthouse and bistro usage; that a dedicated set down/pick up area has been identified for short-term stopping; and that staff parking is accommodated on a nearby site (within same ownership).
- However, the planning authority considers that there is insufficient parking to cater for the existing development and therefore a fee shall be levied for the shortfall in parking spaces for the 5 additional bedrooms (€3,670 per space). The planning authority will need to clarify further details of existing floor areas and bedrooms in order to calculate the shortfall of parking spaces¹.

Water Services

- Further Information was requested requiring consultation with Uisce Eireann regarding water/wastewater infrastructure, including the submission of a Pre-Connection Enquiry (PCE), Confirmation of Feasibility (COF), and foul sewer design details.

¹ It would appear that no such request for clarification was subsequently sought.

- The applicant's response included the PCE and foul sewer design details. However, it did not include the COF, and standards conditions should apply.

AA & EIA

- On the basis of the nature and scale of the development proposed and given that there is no direct hydrological link to a Natura 2000 site, it is considered that there is no potential for significant effects on the Natura 2000 network arising from the proposed works either alone or in combination with other plans and/or projects by way of a loss fragmentation, disruption, disturbance to habitats, species or habitats of species that are of conservation interest.
- The proposed development does not fall within the types of development listed in Part 1 or Part 2 of Schedule 5 to the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and the Planning Authority is satisfied that no EIA is required.

Development Contributions

- Table 1 A1 (€6 per m²) and B (€12.50 per m²) apply. Therefore, €18.50 per m² x 186.20m² = €3,444.70. The development is tourism related and this has a 50% reduction. Therefore, a total of €1,722.35 applies.
- The car parking shortfall shall be charged and levied at €3,670 per space x 5 spaces = €18,350.

Conclusion

- The report recommends a grant of permission, and this forms the basis of the LCC decision.

3.2.3. Other Technical Reports

None.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

An objection was received from the appellant. The main issues raised are covered in the grounds of appeal (see section 7 of this report).

A representation was received from an elected member of LCC in support of the scheme.

4.0 Planning History

P.A. Reg. Ref. PL21-133: Planning permission granted (23/07/2021) for development consisting of a covered outdoor dining area (40.7m²) & associated site works to the rear of the premises.

P.A. Reg. Ref. PL12-254: Planning permission granted (13/05/2013) for alterations to the existing first floor plan, consisting of removal of toilet facilities, store room and changing room (floor area of 118.442sq.m) to 3 no. guest bedrooms and en-suites and permission is sought for the construction of a first floor extension to the rear of the existing building consisting of 3 no. guest bedrooms and 3 no. en-suites (floor area of 68.969sq.m.). Permission is also sought to connect into the existing sewerage system and all ancillary works.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

The operative plan for the area is the Longford County Development Plan 2021-2027. The main relevant provisions can be summarised under the following headings.

Zoning

In accordance with the Abbeyshrule Zoning Map (Appendix 1E), the site is zoned 'Town Core'. The objective is '*To provide for the development and enhancement of town core uses including retail, residential, commercial, civic and other uses*'.

Placemaking

Section 7.4.2.3 outlines the importance of supporting town and village centres. Relevant policy objectives include:

CPO 7.18 - Support investment in town and village centres so that they can become more sustainable places for communities to live, work and enjoy.

CPO 7.20 - Ensure that all town and village centre proposals positively enhance the public realm.

Tourism

Section 8.7.4 outlines support for sustainable tourism growth. Relevant policy objectives include:

CPO 8.85 - Promote tourism as an integral part of County Longford's overall economic profile supporting urban and rural enterprise, recognising the key strategic location of the County and promoting access to tourist sites and attractions.

CPO 8.86 - Promote the development of sustainable tourism as part of our economy, that recognises our landscapes, cultural heritage, environment and linguistic heritage.

Chapter 10 'Tourism' also includes (as summarised):

CPO 10.5 - Promotes the development of sustainable and high-quality visitor attractions, activities and infrastructure.

CPO 10.14 - Consider applications for tourism development in line with the planning criteria as set down in Chapter 15: Development Management Standards.

CPO 10.16 - Ensure the potential environmental effects of a likely increase in tourists/tourism-related traffic volumes in particular locations/along particular routes shall be considered and mitigated as appropriate.

CPO 10.28 - Facilitate the development of high-quality tourist accommodation such as hotels, hostels, B&B's / guesthouses, camping and glamping etc. at suitable locations, in both urban and rural settings throughout the county, subject to ensuring a high standard of design, layout, landscape and environmental protection, the provision of adequate infrastructure.

CPO 10.29 - Encourage the upgrade of existing accommodation facilities including to meet Fáilte Ireland's Standards' as appropriate, subject to development management standards.

CPO 10.46 - Facilitate increased access to Longford's waterways, from towns and villages where visitor services are located.

CPO 10.60 - Support the provision of visitor services within existing towns and villages, such as cafes, accommodation, and changing facilities, by providing linkages with greenways and trails where appropriate.

Natural Heritage and Environment

Chapter 12 outlines how the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity is fundamental in the achievement of sustainable development. Relevant policy objectives include (as summarised):

CPO 12.1 aims to protect, conserve and enhance the County's natural heritage and biodiversity.

CPOs 12.5-12.23 outline a range of measures to protect Designated Sites and Non-Designated Sites.

CPO 12.34 aims to preserve, protect and enhance the Counties inland lakes and waterways, including the Royal Canal.

CPO 12.40 is to protect the broadzones of the lakes, rivers, canals and deciduous woodlands from inappropriate development.

CPOs 12.92-12.103 outline a range of measures to protect water quality.

Development Management Standards

Chapter 16 outlines standards that will provide guidance and assistance to those who seek permission for development and support and inform the implementation of County Policy Objectives. Relevant provisions include:

16.4.2 'Urban Design'.

16.4.4.7 'Overlooking'.

16.4.4.8 'Overshadowing'.

16.4.7 'Road Safety and Access'.

16.4.8 'Car Parking'.

DMS 16.124 - The standards set out in Table 16.1 Car Parking Standards shall apply to all new developments, be it new construction or a new extension or a material change of use of existing buildings.

DMS 16.187 'Tourism and Recreation' - Require a detailed statement confirming the following to be submitted for all pre-planning and to be submitted with any planning application which indicates the following:

- The need for the development and the facility to be provided.
- Justification for the proposed site location.
- Details on accessibility, including pedestrian, cycle and public transport provisions and linkages to the proposed development.
- Provision of adequate, secure, covered cycle facilities.
- Adequate and safe set-down and collection areas to facilitate peak traffic movements and adequate car parking for staff.
- Adequate and appropriate signage, lighting and boundary treatments.

5.4 Natural Heritage Designations

The nearest Natura 2000 site is Glen Lough SPA, located c. 9km northeast of the appeal site. The site is within the boundaries of the Royal Canal Proposed Natural Heritage Area.

6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Appendices 1 & 2 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 First Party Appeal

The applicant welcomes the LCC decision and does not wish to appeal same. However, the applicant wishes to appeal Condition no. 12 (i.e. the sum of €18,350) of the decision on the following grounds:

- It is excessive for a small family-run business.
- This hospitality business has been successfully servicing the rural community for the last 80 years without an incident with traffic congestion or otherwise.
- The addition of bedrooms will greatly enhance the customer offer.
- There is ample parking across the road and on the street to cater for the numerous functions hosted here.
- Staff use private parking off site and the church group along with private parking adjacent to the facility. (*sic*)
- The money (€18,350) will not be spent in the village to enhance parking or otherwise.
- Any work done in the village was done and funded by local community groups and there has never been an issue with parking or traffic.
- There would be no issue with paying a reduced fee.

7.2. Grounds of Third-Party Appeal

The grounds of the appeal can be summarised under the following headings.

Car Parking

- The proposal does not provide the parking spaces required in accordance with s. 16.4.8 of the CDP.
- Together with the lack of adequate parking for the existing venue, the proposed development would lead to further congestion and unauthorised parking, which would have a negative impact on neighbouring properties.
- It is estimated that the existing ground floor accommodation (c. 500m²) requires 71 car-parking spaces based on a standard of 1 space per 7m². An additional 10 spaces are required for the existing and proposed guestrooms at 1st floor level according to the LCC Planner's report, resulting in a total requirement of 81.

- The site layout plan submitted at further information stage did not include any increase in parking provision.
- The applicant's claim that staff parking would be facilitated at a nearby relative's house has not been detailed or advertised as significant further information / revised plans.
- There is a history of congestion and unmanaged parking which has blocked access to the appellant's property, congested roads/residential estates, and interfered with sightlines/traffic safety. Photographic evidence of same is enclosed with the appeal and the problem still prevails.
- Measures to address the matter (road marking, bollards, etc.) have not been respected by patrons or management of the venue.
- The planning authority is aware of the problem but has failed to address it.
- The application includes no signage or management/monitoring measures to ensure that 10 off-street parking spaces will be dedicated for guests. In any case, this will simply displace parking demand to the street and the vicinity of the appellant's property.

Residential Amenity

The appeal raises concerns about adverse impact on the amenity of the appellants property as follows:

- Height and scale will lead to increased overshadowing of the kitchen and yard.
- The kitchen windows are c. 7m from the boundary wall which will be increased in height to facilitate the proposed development.
- The applicant's Daylight Study was not based on a survey of the appellant's property, and the margin of error cannot provide 100% accuracy.
- The height, mass and proximity of the proposed development would negatively impact on the appellant's property by reason of its overbearing scale.

Visual Amenity

- The first-floor extension would be incongruous with the style and layout of surrounding buildings in the village.

Wastewater

- The availability of wastewater treatment infrastructure capacity to cater for the proposed development has not been confirmed by Uisce Eireann. Permission should not be granted in the absence of certainty about the capacity of infrastructure.
- The further information stage afforded the applicant an adequate timeframe to get confirmation from Uisce Eireann.
- While condition no. 8 of the LCC decision requires confirmation of feasibility prior to commencement of development, the confirmation is needed for the immediate needs of the development and therefore the condition is not in accordance with the intent of s. 34(4) of the Act.

Appropriate Assessment

- The site is directly adjacent to the Royal Canal, and this hydrological corridor could transmit pollutants to proximate Natura 2000 sites.
- An AA Screening assessment should have been carried out, particularly in relation to potential construction stage effects.
- The Royal Canal and River Inny provide a hydrological link to other water bodies in the area.
- No construction compound or materials location has been identified.
- It has not been demonstrated that there is adequate wastewater infrastructure to cater for the development.
- The potential negative impact of run-off or air borne pollution from this activity has not been appropriately screened or assessed.

7.3. Applicant Response

The applicant has responded to the third-party appeal. In addition to the points already raised in the first-party appeal, the response can be summarised under the headings below.

Car Parking

- The application included full details of floor areas.
- Photographs and plans are included showing customer parking/set-down areas along the adjoining road and staff parking space on other nearby lands.

- There is no opportunity to extend car-parking space at this location.
- Yellow lines have been installed to prevent parking outside the appellant's house. While the subject business has no control over unauthorised parking, they do try to discourage patrons from parking there.
- The appellant's photographs of unauthorised parking were taken over a year, and it is common that such incidents will occur.
- The proposed extension is intended to accommodate patrons that would already be attending a function at the premises. There will be no increase in parking demand.
- Signage at the areas saying reserved for overnight guests is incorrect to say as that is not the case. (*sic*)
- Many of the patrons and staff are within walking distance of the premises and do not require parking.

Building Height

- The height of the extension will not exceed the height of the existing building.

Daylight and Sunlight Assessment

- The response includes an updated version of the Daylight and Sunlight Analysis (originally submitted as unsolicited further information).
- The development will have little impact on the appellant's dwelling.
- The one window that is affected is a back kitchen window which does not receive direct light as it faces northeast.
- Some skylight will be obstructed.
- In accordance with s. 3.3.7 of the BRE Guide (2022), 2 hours of sunlight will fall on the appellant's garden. This shows no significant loss of light.
- The report was compiled using the plans of the appellant's house as per P.A. Reg. Ref. 10102.

Water Services

- The response includes confirmation from Uisce Eireann that it has received the applicant's Pre-Connection Enquiry and that it is being assessed.

Appropriate Assessment Screening

- No AA Screening was required. The applicant is prepared to employ a suitable professional to carry out AA Screening should the Commission request this.

7.4. Planning Authority Responses

Response to First Party Appeal

The response outlines that the LCC Development Contribution Scheme includes an 'urban' and 'rural' fee for car-parking shortfalls. On reflection it is stated that the 'urban' fee of €3,670 per space was incorrectly applied. The 'rural' fee of €1,780 per space should be applied, resulting in a reduced fee of €8,900 for the 5-space shortfall.

Response to Third-Party Appeal

The response outlines that the matters raised were taken into consideration in the assessment of the application.

The Daylight and Sunlight Analysis report received as unsolicited further information was considered.

Condition no. 8 was attached to ensure that water/wastewater connections are available from Uisce Eireann prior to commencement of development.

The planning authority undertook Screening for Appropriate Assessment and considered the potential for impacts on the Natura 2000 sites identified.

7.5. Observations

None.

7.6. Further Responses

Further responses to the above submission are summarised hereunder.

Applicant's response to the Planning Authority

- The applicant is extremely satisfied with the reduction in the car parking levy from €18,350 to €8,900 and is willing to accept same.

- The submission also includes Confirmation of Feasibility from Uisce Eireann that water and wastewater connections are feasible without infrastructure upgrade.

Appellant's response to the Applicant

- The appellant has been forced to engage the Gardai as his residential amenity has been severely impacted by uncontrolled parking and the applicant has shown no intention to operate a traffic management plan or policy.
- Date stamped photographs are enclosed covering the period 2013 to 2025 which demonstrate the traffic/parking congestion caused by events at the Rustic Inn. The problems are also reflected in an attached Adjudication Report (2019) from Tidy Towns Ireland.
- Evidence of the venue causing congestion in the wider area is available on 'google maps'.
- The off-site staff parking area is not included within the site boundary and does not appear to be in active use. If the area is going to be used for car-parking it needs to be within the defined area of the application.
- Notwithstanding the applicant's technical assessment that daylight impacts on the appellant's kitchen window would be insignificant, there would still be a negative impact on residential amenity due to the increased height and scale of the walls around the appellant's cramped yard.
- The Confirmation of Feasibility of water connection is noted.
- It is common practice to submit an AA Screening Report or for the planning authority to carry out AA Screening when there are Natura 2000 sites within 15km and when a hydrogeological pathway exists, as applies in this case.

Planning Authority Response to Applicant

- No further comment.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Introduction

- 8.1.1. I note that the planning authority had no objection to the principle of the proposed development. And while the third-party appeal raises concerns about its scale, design, servicing and environmental impacts, there is no fundamental objection to the principle of the proposed use at this location. Consistent with the above, along with the established commercial hospitality use on the site, the 'Town Core' zoning objective for the site within which a 'guesthouse' use is 'permitted in principle', and the support for such tourism proposals in the CDP (including CPOs 10.28, 10.29, 10.60), I am satisfied that the principle of the development is acceptable in accordance with the provisions of the CDP.
- 8.1.2. Having regard to the foregoing, the documentation submitted in connection with the application and the appeals, including all submissions received, and having inspected the site and had regard to relevant local, regional and national policy and guidance, I consider that the main issues for assessment are as follows:
- Car Parking (Including First-Party Appeal)
 - Impacts on the Third-Party Appellant's Property
 - Visual Amenity
 - Water Services.

8.2. Car Parking (Including First-Party Appeal)

- 8.2.1. The issue of car-parking is central to both the first-party and third-party appeals and the relevant matters are considered in this section. I note the applicant's contention that there have been no problems with car-parking associated with the Rustic Inn. In response to this the third-party appellant has included comprehensive photographic evidence showing parking congestion at this location over a long period from 2013 to 2025.
- 8.2.2. However, I do not consider that such parking congestion can be definitively attributed to the existing development at the Rustic Inn. There are other nearby attractions, services and facilities in the village that may have contributed to such congestion. For example, this would include the nearby church which is not served by any significant dedicated on-site parking.

- 8.2.3. In any case, I consider that any existing parking/traffic congestion simply represents the existing baseline situation. The proposed development involves the provision of 5 additional bedrooms, and I consider that assessment should, for the most part, be limited to the impact of same and compliance with CDP requirements.
- 8.2.4. I acknowledge that the planning authority has taken into consideration the parking requirements associated with existing development, particularly the 5 existing guestrooms, resulting in a total requirement of 5 spaces for 10 existing/proposed guestrooms. In normal circumstances I would consider this retrospective application of parking requirements to existing development to be unreasonable. However, I would note that as part of the consideration of the original application for guestrooms (P.A. Reg. Ref. 12/254) further information was requested on car parking proposals. Based on the applicant's response proposal to provide an additional 4 no. parking spaces to the front of the existing dwelling to the north of the Rustic Inn, the planning authority was satisfied that no parking shortfall would arise. However, I note that these spaces were never provided. Therefore, I consider it reasonable to consider the cumulative impact of the existing and proposed guestrooms (i.e. 10 no. guestrooms).
- 8.2.5. Section 16.4.8 and DMS 16.124 of the CDP outline that the standards set out in Table 16.1 'Car Parking Standards' shall apply to all new developments, be it new construction or a new extension or a material change of use of existing buildings. Table 16.1 states that for 'Hotels, B&B, Guesthouses' the parking requirement is '1 space per 2 bedrooms within the speed limit'. Therefore, the 10 bedrooms equates to a requirement for 5 spaces.
- 8.2.6. I note that DMS 16.126 states that non-residential car parking standards are set down as maximum standards and the number of spaces should not exceed the maximum provision set out in the table 15.11. The reference to 'table 15.11' would appear to be a typographical error as there is no 'table 15.11' in the CDP. It would appear that it should refer to 'table 16.1' and that the intention is to apply a maximum parking standard to non-residential uses. Therefore, I consider that a maximum parking requirement of 5 spaces applies, which would allow the application of a lower requirement if deemed appropriate.
- 8.2.7. Furthermore, DMS 16.127 allows further flexibility by stating that '*The car parking standards shall be applied at the discretion of the Council in the County's rural towns and villages having regard to the availability and adequacy of on street parking, existing or proposed off street parking to serve the development and the settlement*'.

- 8.2.8. Having regard to the foregoing, I conclude that the maximum parking requirement in this case is 5 spaces and the CDP provides flexibility to require a lesser amount. However, having regard to the limited provision of on-site parking or other parking options in the vicinity of the site, I do not consider that there is justification to apply a lower requirement in this case. Therefore, I consider that a requirement for 5 spaces should apply.
- 8.2.9. I would acknowledge that this is a constrained site with limited potential for the provision of additional parking. And while traffic/parking congestion would appear to periodically occur at this location, I consider that this can be attributed to specific events/functions, be that associated with the long-established Rustic Inn and/or other attractions, services and facilities in the village. In that context I consider that the shortfall of 5 spaces is relatively minor and would not significantly contribute to parking/traffic congestion so as to warrant a refusal of permission.
- 8.2.10. According to 'Table 2' of the LCC Development Contribution Scheme 2023–2027 in place at the time of the LCC decision, I note that 'Category A' applies a levy for a shortfall in the provision of car-parking spaces. This is standard planning practice, and I consider it to be a reasonable solution in cases such as this.
- 8.2.11. The Planning Authority decision applied the 'urban' shortfall rate of €3,670 per space, resulting in a total car-parking levy of €18,350. This has been appealed by the applicant on the basis that it is excessive. However, the planning authority has since clarified that it incorrectly applied the 'urban' rate and that the 'rural' rate of €1,780 should have been applied. Therefore, the planning authority has submitted that a reduced total of €8,900 should apply, and the applicant has confirmed satisfaction with same.
- 8.2.12. Having reviewed the LCC Development Contribution Scheme 2023–2027, I note that the full description of the 'urban' category is '*Urban (i.e. Longford Town Area)*'. Therefore, I consider that it applies exclusively to the Longford Town area and that the 'rural' rate should correctly be applied in this case, resulting in a car-parking shortfall levy of €8,900 in the event of a grant of permission. I consider that this will suitably contribute to the improvement of parking facilities in the village in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 8.2.13. In addition to the car-parking levy of €18,350, I note that condition no. 12 of the LCC decision also included a separate development contribution of €1,722.35. This was based on the floor area and was calculated as a standard development contribution towards

services and facilities in accordance with Table 1 of the LCC Development Contribution Scheme. However, the first-party appeal related to the car-parking levy of €18,350 only, and not the 'standard' development contribution of €1,722.35.

- 8.2.14. In the absence of any appeal against this fee of €1,722.35, and given that it has been applied correctly in accordance with the LCC scheme, I consider that it should continue to apply in the event of a grant of permission. However, I consider that the wording of condition no. 12 of the LCC decision is somewhat confusing and separate conditions should apply for the 'standard' and 'car parking' contributions in the event of a grant of permission.

8.3. Impacts on the Third-Party Appellant's Property

- 8.3.1. The third-party appeal has raised concerns about adverse impacts on the residential amenity of the adjoining residential property to the south. The concerns relate to daylight/sunlight and overbearing impacts. I note that no new windows are proposed on the southern elevation of the proposed extensions and therefore there will be no overlooking or privacy impacts.
- 8.3.2. I note that the applicant submitted a Daylight and Sunlight Analysis report as unsolicited further information at application stage. This has been updated in the applicant's response to the appeal, and I will consider this updated version in my assessment. The report is based on the BRE Document 'Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight, A Good Guide Practice, PJ Littlefair (2022)' and details of the appellant's dwelling are based drawings associated with a previous planning application.
- 8.3.3. I note that the CDP outlines various provisions relating to the provision and protection of daylight and sunlight levels. DMS 16.37 requires daylight and shadow projection diagrams to be submitted where new buildings are located very close to adjoining buildings. DMS 16.38 states that '*Daylight and sunlight levels should, generally, be in accordance with the recommendations of Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (B.R.209, 2011), and any updates thereof*'. DMS 16.55 refers to '*Design that maximises access to natural daylight and minimises overshadowing and loss of light*', while DMS 16.81 (e) is that '*New extensions should not overshadow adjacent dwellings to the degree that there is a significant decrease in daylight or sunlight entering into the house*' (albeit in the context of 'dwelling extensions').

- 8.3.4. I would submit that the above provisions are part of the wider CDP sections 16.4.4 and 16.4.5, which effectively outline policies and standards within and between existing and proposed residential developments. They do not specifically relate to the subject case involving a commercial extension adjoining an existing residential property.
- 8.3.5. Notwithstanding this, I will have regard to the provisions of '*Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice*', which was updated in 2022 (i.e. the BRE Guide). In doing so, I would highlight that the CDP does not require specific compliance with same. DMS 16.38 states that daylight and sunlight levels should only 'generally' be in accordance with the recommendations of the document. Furthermore, the recommendations of the document itself (section 1.6) include that the advice is '*not mandatory*'; '*should not be seen as an instrument of planning policy*'; and that numerical guidelines '*should be interpreted flexibly*'.
- 8.3.6. In summary, the BRE Guide outlines that if any part of a new building or extension, measured in a vertical section perpendicular to a main window wall of an existing building, from the centre of the lowest window, subtends an angle of more than 25° to the horizontal, then the diffuse daylighting of the existing building may be adversely affected. This will be the case if either:
- the VSC² (Vertical Sky Component) measured at the centre of an existing main window is less than 27%, and less than 0.80 times its former value
 - the area of the working plane in a room which can receive direct skylight is reduced to less than 0.80 times its former value.
- 8.3.7. The applicant's analysis considers the impacts on the 'back kitchen' window facing the proposed development. It acknowledges that the proposed development would subtend an angle of more than 25° to the horizontal (i.e. 39°), and that the existing VSC (34%) would be reduced to less than 0.8 times (i.e. 23.5% or 0.69 times the existing). The applicant's report also highlights that the 'back kitchen' is connected to an adjoining room which receives additional light from the southwest.
- 8.3.8. The BRE Guide also outlines that where room layouts are known (for example if they are available on the local authority's planning portal), the impact on the daylighting distribution

² The ratio of the direct sky illuminance falling on the vertical wall at a reference point (usually the centre of the window), to the simultaneous horizontal illuminance under an unobstructed sky.

in the existing building should be found by plotting the 'no sky line' (NSL)³. It states that if, following construction of a new development, the NSL moves so that the area of the existing room which does receive direct skylight is reduced to < 0.80 times its former value, this will be noticeable to the occupants and more of the room will appear poorly lit.

- 8.3.9. The applicant's analysis includes a depiction of the NSL plotted 1464mm into the room. It does not quantify the comparative reduction in NSL but again highlights that the space will benefit from light from other windows. Based on the applicant's NSL plot, it would appear that the NSL would be reduced to less than 0.8 times the existing value.
- 8.3.10. Having regard to the foregoing, I would acknowledge that the proposed development appears to impact on daylight to the existing property. However, with regard to VSC, I consider that the shortfall is relatively small, i.e., a VSC of 23.5% or 0.69 times the existing, in comparison to the respective targets of 27% or 0.8 times the existing value. I also consider that the impact will be limited given the small size of the 'back kitchen' space involved, and that impacts on daylight are to be expected within village centre areas such as this. Therefore, consistent with the flexibility afforded by the CDP (DMS 16.38) and the BRE Guide, I do not consider that the impacts would warrant a refusal of permission in this case.
- 8.3.11. With regard to sunlight, the BRE Guide outlines that obstruction may become an issue if a living room of an existing dwelling has a main window facing within 90° of due south. In this case however, the proposed development is located to the north of the appellant's dwelling, and any opposing windows in the appellant's dwelling do not face within 90° of due south. Accordingly, I am satisfied that obstruction of sunlight to existing windows/living rooms is not an issue in this case.
- 8.3.12. I also note the small existing yard area to the rear of the appellant's house. In this regard the BRE Guide states that for it to appear adequately sunlit throughout the year, at least half of a garden or amenity area should receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21 March. If, as a result of new development, an existing garden or amenity area does not meet the above, and the area that can receive two hours of sun on 21 March is less than 0.80 times its former value, then the loss of sunlight is likely to be noticeable.

³ The outline on the working plane of the area from which no sky can be seen.

- 8.3.13. The applicant's analysis includes a 'shadow analysis' for the 21st March which compares the 'existing' and 'proposed' scenarios. As would be expected given the location of the proposed development to the north of the existing yard space, the analysis shows no significant shading impact on the 21st March. Similar analysis and results are also included for 21st June, 21st September, and 21st December. Accordingly, I am satisfied that there will be no significant overshadowing of the existing yard space.
- 8.3.14. In relation to the third-party appellant's concerns regarding overbearing impacts, I note that the CDP does not contain any specific provisions. Similarly, there is no recognised industry standards or recommendations for assessment. However, similar to daylight impacts, I consider that the overbearing impact is strongly influenced by the height and scale of the proposed development and its proximity to existing development. Having considered these matters in the context of this village centre location, I do not consider that the proposed extension would result in any excessive overbearing impacts on the adjoining property.
- 8.3.15. Having regard to the foregoing, I conclude that the proposed development is acceptable in accordance with relevant CDP provisions and would not result in any unacceptable impacts on the residential amenity of the adjoining property.

8.4. Visual Amenity

- 8.4.1. The third-party appeal contends that the proposed extension would be incongruous with the style and layout of surrounding buildings in the village.
- 8.4.2. In this regard I would highlight that the existing building is of a modern design and construction and that there are a range of building styles throughout the village. The proposed extension will be consistent with the character of the existing building, particularly in relation to glazing patterns, roof design, and external wall/roof finishes.
- 8.4.3. Having regard to the above, I consider that the proposed extension will reinforce the established character of the existing building and will not seriously detract from the visual amenity of the area or character of existing development in the village.

8.5. Water Services

- 8.5.1. The third-party appeal raised concerns that wastewater treatment infrastructure capacity to cater for the proposed development had not been confirmed by Uisce Eireann. It contends that permission should not be granted in the absence of certainty about the capacity of infrastructure and that condition no. 8 of the LCC decision was inadequate in this regard.
- 8.5.2. However, as part of the correspondence submitted in connection with the appeal, the applicant has now included Confirmation of Feasibility from Uisce Eireann that water and wastewater connections are feasible without infrastructure upgrade.
- 8.5.3. Accordingly, I consider that this confirmation satisfactorily addresses the matter subject to standard conditions regarding Uisce Eireann connections in the event of a grant of permission.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. An AA Screening exercise has been completed (See Appendix 3 of this report). 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 any European Sites in view of the conservation objectives of these sites, which are therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.
- 9.2. This determination is based on:
- The nature of the proposed works and their limited scale and duration.
 - The application of standard construction and operational measures which would be implemented regardless of proximity to a European Site.
 - The limited connectivity between the appeal site and the nearest European Sites as a result of distance, dispersal and dilution factors.
- 9.3. No measures intended to avoid or reduce harmful effects on European Sites were taken into account in reaching this conclusion.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. An assessment of the proposed development has been carried out in accordance with Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive and relevant EPA guidance, including best practice in drainage design (See Appendix 4 of this report).
- 10.2. The development will not involve a significant increase in surface water as it is already developed and will connect to the public system. Wastewater will also be discharged to the public sewer and will have only negligible impacts on capacity.
- 10.3. These measures ensure that there will be no increase in pollutant loading, no alteration of the receiving waterbody's hydrological regime, and no risk of deterioration in water quality or ecological status. Any residual risks identified during the assessment are capable of being addressed through standard mitigation measures and best practice construction management, including the implementation of an appropriate Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) as a condition in the event of a grant of permission.
- 10.4. The proposed development will not impact on the achievement of environmental objectives for any water body and is therefore considered compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

11.0 Recommendation

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

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Longford County Development Plan 2021-2027, including the 'Town Core' zoning objective for the site; the planning history and nature and extent of existing development on the site; the pattern and character of development in the area; and the design, scale and servicing of the proposed development; it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would constitute an acceptable intensification of an established use at this location, would not detract from the visual amenity or character of the area, would not be seriously injurious to the residential amenities of surrounding properties, would be acceptable in

terms of traffic safety and convenience, and would not pose any unacceptable risk of water pollution or any associated impacts on downstream Natura 2000 sites. It is considered that the proposed development would be compliant with the provisions of the Longford County Development Plan 2021-2027 and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

In relation to the first-party appeal against condition number 12 of the Longford County Council decision, i.e., the development contribution in lieu of the shortfall of 5 no. car-parking spaces, the Commission considered that the planning authority incorrectly applied the 'urban' rate under the Longford County Council Development Contribution Scheme 2023–2027. The Commission considered that the reduced 'rural' rate should apply and that the conditions should be amended accordingly.

13.0 Conditions

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

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The external finishes of the proposed extension shall match those of the existing building.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

3. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into Connection Agreements with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for service connections to the public water supply and wastewater collection network.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water and wastewater facilities.

4. The attenuation and disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of public health and environmental protection.

5. Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with the planning authority, a Construction Environmental Management Plan, which shall be adhered to during construction. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust management measures, water protection measures, waste management measures, and traffic management.

Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity.

6. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution of €1,722.35 (One Thousand Seven Hundred and Twenty Two euro and Thirty Five cents) 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.

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.

7. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution of €8,900 (Eight Thousand Nine Hundred euro) as a contribution in lieu of the car parking requirement in respect of car parking benefitting the 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 adopted Development Contribution Scheme made under Section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to the commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment.

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

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

Stephen Ward
Senior Planning Inspector

27th July 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-323600-25
Proposed Development Summary	First floor extension over public house, with internal and external associated works
Development Address	The Rustic Inn, Main St, Drumanure, Abbeyshrule, Co. Longford
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?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☐ 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)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.	
☒ 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?	
☐ 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.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.	

☒ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)	Part 2, Class 10(b)(iv) - An area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area.
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 ☐	
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3). Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ACP-323600-25
Proposed Development Summary	First floor extension over public house, with internal and external associated works
Development Address	The Rustic Inn, Main St, Drumanure, Abbeyshrule, Co. Longford
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 development is on a small site of 0.095 hectares and is a standalone development. The site area is significantly below the smallest applicable threshold of 2 hectares. The commercial nature of the development is consistent with the established use on site and other mixed uses in the village centre. There are no significant demolition works associated with the development. The development does not require the use of substantial natural resources, and the water supply requirements are typical of such small-scale commercial development. The construction stage would be relatively simple and short and would not give rise to significant nuisance or pollution subject to best standard practice. The main emissions are surface water and wastewater, and they would be managed appropriately through connections to the existing public systems. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, and would not be vulnerable to climate change. It presents no significant risks to human health.
Location of development	The site is located in Abbeyshrule village centre and is mainly surrounded by a mix of residential, commercial, and community uses. The site itself is currently in commercial use. The nearest Natura 2000 sites is Glen Lough SPA, located c. 9km northeast of the appeal site. As per section 9 of the Inspector's Report, there is no potential for likely significant effects on any Natura 2000 sites. The site is within the boundaries of the Royal Canal Proposed Natural Heritage Area.

	However, the works are within the footprint of the existing building and therefore there will be no land-take or any other significant effects on the pNHA. The site and surrounding area are not of significant built heritage value and impacts on the character of the area can be suitably considered as part of the normal planning assessment. The area is not of recorded archaeological significance. There are no protected views or prospects as per the CDP affecting the site.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts	The construction stage will not be significant in terms of duration or complexity and would be typical of previous local development. A construction management plan can be agreed as a condition in the event of a grant of permission. The main operational effects relate to traffic and surface water and wastewater emissions. However, the traffic impacts will not be significant and surface water and wastewater will be directed to the existing public systems and will have only negligible impacts on networks and emissions. Having regard to the simple nature and limited scale of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 3: AA Screening Determination

Test for likely significant effects

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects	
Case Reference Number: ACP-323600-25	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics	
Brief description of project	First floor extension over public house, with internal and external associated works.
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	The site is located within the village centre of Abbeyshrule. It has a stated area of 950m² and is already developed. It is bounded to the east by the main road through the village, and to the north and south by existing dwellings. The site is bounded to the west by the banks of the Royal Canal. It is proposed to connect to the existing public wastewater, surface water, and water services. The nearest European Site is Glen Lough SPA, located c. 9km northeast of the appeal site.
Screening report	No.
Natura Impact Statement	No.
Relevant submissions	The third-party appeal raises the issue of Appropriate Assessment as follows: • The site is directly adjacent to the Royal Canal, and this hydrological corridor could transmit pollutants to proximate Natura 2000 sites. • An AA Screening assessment should have been carried out, particularly in relation to potential construction stage effects. • The Royal Canal and River Inny provide a hydrological link to other water bodies in the area. • No construction compound or materials location has been identified.

	- It has not been demonstrated that there is adequate wastewater infrastructure to cater for the development. - The potential negative impact of run-off or air borne pollution from this activity has not been appropriately screened or assessed.			
Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model				
European Site (code)	Qualifying interests	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections	Consider further in screening Y/N
Glen Lough SPA (004045)	Whooper Swan	9km	There is no direct hydrological connectivity between the appeal site and these European Sites, and any indirect connections are over a significant distance and hydrological buffer. There is a significant separation distance of at least 9km, and this would prevent any disturbance effects related to dust, noise etc. There would be no significant emissions from the site, and wastewater and surface water will connect to existing public systems. The habitat on site is unsuitable to support SCI species.	N
Lough Iron SPA (004046)	Whooper Swan; Teal; Coot; Golden Plover; Greenland White-fronted Goose; Wigeon; Shoveler; Wetland and Waterbirds	10.5km		N
Lough Ree SAC (000440)	Natural eutrophic lakes with Magnopotamion or Hydrocharition - type vegetation; Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates; Active raised bogs; Degraded raised bogs still capable of natural regeneration; Alkaline fens; Limestone pavements; Bog woodland; Alluvial forests with Alnus glutinosa and Fraxinus excelsior (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae); Otter.	12.4		N
Lough Ree SPA (004064)	Little Grebe; Whooper Swan; Teal; Mallard; Tufted Duck; Common Scoter; Goldeneye; Coot; Golden Plover; Lapwing; Common Tern; Wigeon; Shoveler; Wetland and Waterbirds.	12.7		N
Ballymore Fen SAC (002313)	Transition mires and quaking bogs	9.5		N

Having regard to the above table, it is considered that:

- The site is located well outside any European Sites and there is no potential for habitat loss/alteration, habitat/species fragmentation, or changes in population density.
- The significant separation distance between the appeal site and European Sites will prevent the potential for any significant disturbance effects on habitats or species relating to dust, noise or otherwise.
- It is noted that the site is in close proximity to the Royal Canal and that the River Inny is c. 150m to the southeast. However, having regard to the limited scale of the construction works within an existing developed site, the absence of any significant emissions at operational stage, and the significant distance/hydrological buffer between the appeal site and any European Sites, there is no potential for any significant effects as a result of hydrological connectivity with any European Sites.
- Wastewater and surface water from the development will be appropriately discharged to the existing public systems. Uisce Eireann has confirmed that the wastewater connection is feasible and there will be no significant increase in surface water as the site is already developed. Therefore, the effects on the public systems will be negligible.
- Having regard to the significant separation distances between the appeal site and European Sites, together with the unsuitability of the appeal site habitat, there is no potential for significant ex-situ effects.

In addition to the above, I have considered other developments that have been planned/permitted in the vicinity of the site and also note how the Longford CDP complies with the Habitats Directive by ensuring that all relevant projects will be subject to AA. Having regard to this and the foregoing assessment, I am satisfied that there will be no predicted in-combination effects given that the proposed development will have no significant effect on 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 any European sites. 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 any European Sites in view of the conservation objectives of the sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- The nature of the proposed works and their limited scale and duration.
- The application of standard construction and operational measures which would be implemented regardless of proximity to a European Site.
- The limited connectivity between the appeal site and the nearest European Sites as a result of distance, dispersal and dilution factors.

Appendix 4

Water Framework Directive Screening Determination

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT SCOPING TABLE			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Coimisiún Pleanála ref. no.	ACP-323600-25	Townland, address	The Rustic Inn, Main St, Drumanure, Abbeyshrule, Co. Longford
Description of project		First floor extension over public house, with internal and external associated works.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		The site is located within the village centre of Abbeyshrule. It has a stated area of 950m ² and is already developed. It is bounded to the east by the main road through the village, and to the north and south by existing dwellings. The site is bounded to the west by the banks of the Royal Canal. The River Inny is c. 150m to the south and flows west towards Lough Ree. The site is underlain by the Inny groundwater body.	
Proposed surface water details		Surface water is to be disposed to the public system.	
Proposed water supply source & available capacity		It is proposed to connect to the existing watermain. The limited scale of the development would have negligible impacts on capacity. Uisce Eireann has confirmed that connection is feasible.	
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues		It is proposed to connect to the existing sewer. The limited scale of the development would have negligible impacts on capacity. Uisce Eireann has confirmed that connection is feasible.	
Others?		Given the absence of ground level works, I am satisfied that flood risk is not a significant issue. As outlined in sections 6 and 9 of this report, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not have any significant hydrological effects on	

	biodiversity/ecology and would not have the potential for significant effects on any European Sites, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
--	---

Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection							
Identified water body	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective	Identified pressures	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)	Mitigation Measures proposed	Is mitigation sufficient? Will there be any residual impacts?
River/Canal	Royal Canal Main Line (Upper Shannon F) (IE_26F_AWB_RCMLW)	Good	Review	None identified	Limited potential for surface water run-off and groundwater pollution during construction and operation. Surface water and wastewater emissions at operational stage.	The construction stage works are not significant, do not involve significant excavation, and are distanced from waterbodies. Limited potential impacts on surface / groundwater can be satisfactorily addressed through standard best practice and the conditions of any permission. There will be not significant increase in operational surface water emissions given that the site is already	The mitigation measures are sufficient to prevent any significant residual impacts.
River	INNY_090 (IE_SH_26I011150)	Good	Not at Risk	None identified			
Groundwater	Inny (IE_SH_G_110)	Poor	Not at Risk	None identified			

						developed and will be served by the public system. Wastewater volumes will not be significant and will be discharged and treated via the public system, the effect on which will be negligible.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--