



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-323651-25

Development	Permission for the development of first floor extension to the rear of existing childcare facility and all site works.
Location	Mary's House, Drakestown, Ballapousta, Ardee, Co. Louth, A92C437
Planning Authority	Louth County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560066
Applicant(s)	Mary's House Ballapousta Ltd.
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Damian Roche
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	10 th December 2025
Inspector	Emma Gosnell

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.....	8
6.0 Natural Heritage Designations	10
7.0 EIA Screening.....	10
8.0 Water Framework Directive Screening	11
9.0 The Appeal	11
10.0 Assessment.....	12
11.0 AA Screening Determination	22
12.0 Recommendation	23
13.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	23
14.0 Conditions	24
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening and Form 2: EIA Preliminary Examination.	
Appendix 2 – Screening for Water Framework Directive Assessment Determination.	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site, which has a stated area of 0.192ha, is located at Mary's House, Drakestown in the rural node of Ballapousta, Ardee, Co. Louth, A92C437.
- 1.2. The site, which is situated at the south-western edge of Ballapousta, is adjoined to the north by Ballapousta National School and by its sports pitches to the east, with a detached dormer dwelling being located to its immediate south.
- 1.3. The site comprises of a single storey childcare facility (c. 280sq.m) with ancillary customer parking to its front and staff parking and play space facilities to its rear. The property, which provides Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) for children of pre-school age, is accessed from the west off the L-1264 local road (subject to 50kmph speed limit) via 2 no. separate in/ out vehicular entrances and 1 no. pedestrian entrance leading off the public footpath.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development for which permission is sought comprises of:
 - (i) a first floor extension to the rear of existing childcare facility to provide 2 no. classrooms and 4 no. toilets (c. 160sq.m GFA) to accommodate up to 44 no. ECCE children (from hours 8am to 6pm) increasing total services users to a maximum of 94 no. children, with related conversion of attic space and changes to floor-to-ceiling heights and to the profile of the roof (existing hipped roof on the southern end of the building will be replaced with a gable-end and a flat roof).
 - (ii) a new external escape stairs on the northern gable of the building.
 - (iii) changes to the internal layout at ground floor level with related small-scale changes to the building's internal walls/ partitions, opes and external envelope.
 - (iv) new on-site wastewater treatment system & decommissioning of existing system.
 - (v) closing-up existing of existing 'exit only' gate.
 - (vi) provision of 9 no. additional carparking spaces.
 - (vii) all associated landscaping and site works.
- 2.2. Further information (FI) stage changes concerned access and site servicing arrangements only.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission granted on 29/08/2025 subject to 5 no. conditions (see Section 3.2.3).

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

2 no. planning reports formed the basis of the planning authority's (PA) assessment:

Planner's Report (24/03/2025) – Initial Application Stage

Key points of note raised in the report are as follows:

- *Principle of Development* – acceptable having regard to nature of existing established use and site's location within Ballapousta Rural Node and adjoining Ballapousta National School. Proposal to extend and improve an existing childcare/ ECCE facility is consistent with LCDP Section 13.12.1 and Policy Objectives SC35, SC37, SC38 and SS54.
- *Design* – proposed rear extension and internal/ external modifications will not significantly alter the character of the building visible from the public road (to west) and PA satisfied that there would be no negative visual impact on same.
- *Visual Amenity* - The rear extension will give rise in a change in the scale and visual character of east side of building, where the existing c. 2.65m – 6.78m high gable will be replaced by a gable of c. 6.155m in height, but this will not unreasonably impact on the visual amenity of the neighbouring property to the south.
- *Open Space* – proposal will not impact on existing dedicated play space to rear.
- *Privacy Impacts* – no windows are proposed on south-facing (gable) elevation and upper floor windows on proposed rear elevation will face east/ southeast and away from observers' property, with no potential for overlooking.
- *Overshadowing/ Daylight Impacts* – sun path analysis indicates that proposal will only cast brief shadows in a portion of the observer's front garden in the morning (eastern sunlight) and will not obstruct evening (western) sunlight to its rear garden, with no potential to affect internal daylighting on account of its aspect and siting.

- *Access* – PA note proposal to close-up existing exit gate at Mary's House and to provide a single in/out gate at the existing entry only point, and require additional information in the form of a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) re: traffic generated by existing and proposed uses; an autotrack vehicle sweep path analysis to demonstrate large vehicles can safely manoeuvre through the entire access road and turning area; and, a fully dimensioned set of drawings showing clear junction sightline distances, roadway and footpath widths, junction radii, road gradients, road cross falls and horizontal alignment. **Further Information requested.**
- *Parking* – proposal to provide for 17 no. car parking spaces for 94 children is compliant with parking standards for creches (1 per 6 no. children) set out under LCDP Section 13.16.12.
- *Flood Risk* – site not at risk of flooding.
- *Surface Water* – no drainage design proposals submitted and compliance with PO IU19 not demonstrated. **Further Information requested.**
- *Wastewater* – PA note proposal to provide for a new wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) for the site. Insufficient information provided in respect to design of DWWTs and percolation area; location of on-site well; and, compliance with EPA Code of Practice re: system installation, groundwater flow direction, and separation distance from nearby wells and percolation area. **Further Information requested.**

A request for Further Information (FI) issued on 28/03/2025 in relation to 6 no. items.

The applicant's response to the FI request was received on 06/08/2025 and consisted of cover letter, a traffic and transport assessment report, an engineering report, and new and revised drawings. The response was not found to be significant.

Planner's Report (27/08/2025) – Further Information Stage

This report provided an assessment of the FI received as follows:

- *Item 1 (TIA), Item 2 (Access Drawings), Item 3 (Swept Path Analysis) and Item 4 (WWTS)* – submissions all acceptable and PA recommend a conditional grant.
- *Item 5 (Surface Water Management)* – PA satisfied that proposal would give rise to a negligible impact on existing site's existing, acceptable surface water drainage.
- *Item 6 (Readvertising)* – not required as PA do not consider changes material.

Permission was granted for the full proposal subject to conditions (as per Section 3.1).

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Initial Application Stage

Placemaking (20/03/2025) – seek FI in respect to sightlines/ junction/ road design, preparation of a TIA, and further detail in relation to Autotrack analysis for the manoeuvring of large vehicles within the confines of the site.

Environment (10/03/2025) – seek FI in respect to proposed wastewater treatment system.

Further Information Stage

Placemaking (27/08/2025) – no objection subject to conditions.

Environment (15/08/2025) – no objection subject to conditions.

3.2.3. Conditions

Conditions of note attached to the PA's grant of permission are as follows:

- *Condition No. 2* – provision of a 6m wide two-way access point; setback and slating of entrance; clearance works within the site visibility splay; completion of roadways/ footpaths/ carparking/ road markings etc. prior to operation of proposal; and, adoption of Drop-Off/Collection Policy outlined in Section 3.4.10 of FI stage TIA.
- *Condition No. 3* – WWTS shall comply with the EPA Code of Practice: Treatment Systems for Small Communities, Business, Leisure Centres and Hotels (1999).
- *Condition No. 4* - existing well in northwest corner of site shall be decommissioned and all water serving facility shall be via existing mains water connection.

In the event the Commission are minded to grant permission, I recommend the attachment of conditions to this effect.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No submissions on file.

3.4. Third Party Observations

1 no. submission received from neighbouring property owners, Noleen and Damien Roche (the appellant), raised the following issues:

- Overdevelopment of site.
- Scale and proximity to neighbouring property to south re: visual intrusion, overlooking and daylight impact.
- Impact on property value.
- Noise and disturbance.
- Site specific planning history of refusal for first floor level accommodation.
- Capacity issues with existing water supply.
- Inadequate parking provision and concerns re: traffic and road safety.
- Non-compliance with LCDP childcare policies SC35, SC37 and SC38.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Appeal Site

P.A. Ref. 08/225 (ABP Ref. PL15.230688) – construction of a 276sqm sessional childcare facility, 10 parking spaces, a set down/ drop off area and associated siteworks, granted by PA with decision upheld on appeal subject to 14 no. conditions. Permission implemented.

P.A. Ref. 06/269 – construction of a 263sq.m childcare facility on ground floor, with 2 no. 96.7 sq.m 2-bed apartments with private balconies to front & rear at first floor level, refused on 27/04/2008 for 8 no. reasons relating to principle of development, urban design and form, overlooking, public health, traffic hazard and surface water issues.

4.2. Adjoining Site (National School)

P.A. Ref. 211458 – extension of duration of P.A. Ref. 17285 granted on 03/02/2022 subject to 2 no. conditions. Permission implemented.

P.A. Ref. 17285 – application for construction of new 2-storey extension including 6 new classrooms, library, multipurpose room, GP hall, associated stores and administrative offices, along with refurbishment of existing school building. Demolition of existing boundary wall to the west of the site and construction of new boundary wall with separate in and out vehicle access points, on-site bus turning and set down area including car park, 2 ball courts and bin storage area. New waste water treatment plant and all associated site works, granted on 03/07/2017 subject to 9 no. conditions.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Policy

Project Ireland 2040 – National Planning Framework (2025) – Strategic Investment Priority No. 10 – Education, NSO 10 – Access to Quality Childcare and Section 6.5 (Re: Early Learning and Childcare), NPO 41 – investment in ECCE/ childcare.

Climate Action Plan (2024 & 2025) and Ireland's 4th National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBAP) 2023-2030 – Outcome 2A protection of existing designated areas and protected species.

Childcare Facilities: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2001).

5.2. Other National Guidance

Traffic and Transport Assessment Guidelines (TII, 2014).

EPA Code of Practice: Treatment Systems for Small Communities, Business, Leisure Centres and Hotels (1999).

Dept. of Education Circular 11/95 - Department of Education and Science Primary Branch To Boards of Management and Principals of National Schools: Time in School (1995).

5.3. Regional Policy

Eastern & Midland Regional Assembly Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy 2019-2031 – RPO 9.20: Support investment in the sustainable development of the Region's childcare services as an integral part of regional infrastructure and Health and Childcare and Section 9.5 (Childcare Access).

5.4. Development Plan

The Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027 (LCDP), as varied, applies.

Zoning

The appeal site is located within the rural node of Ballapousta. Sections 2.18 (Rural Nodes) and 3.17.6 (Development in Level 5 Settlements – Rural Nodes): There is

capacity in these rural nodes to accommodate a small level of growth, with the capacity to accommodate growth dependent on the size of the settlement.

PO SS52 - To support and facilitate balanced and proportionate population and economic growth in the Self-Sustaining Growth Towns, Small Towns and Villages, and Rural Nodes that will meet the needs of the residents of the settlements identified in each of the settlement categories.

PO SS57 - There is capacity in these rural nodes to accommodate a small level of growth, with the capacity to accommodate growth dependent on the size of the settlement.

Volume 2 – Town & Village Statements – Rural Node Map 5.2 (Ballapousta).

Childcare Facilities

Sections 4.11 (Childcare Facilities) and 13.12.1 (Childcare).

PO SC35 – To support and facilitate the sustainable provision of childcare facilities in appropriate and suitable locations and seek their provision concurrent with new residential development, all having regard to the Childcare Facilities Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2001) and Childcare Regulations (2006) and any subsequent guidelines, in consultation with the Louth County Childcare Committee. Such facilities will be directed to settlements identified in the Settlement Hierarchy.

PO SC37 – To permit childcare facilities of appropriate size and scale in settlements, in proximity to existing community and/or educational facilities and in existing residential areas provided they do not have a significant negative impact on the character or amenities of an area, particularly with regard to traffic generation, car parking and noise disturbance.

PO SC38 - The Council will encourage the co-location of childcare facilities with schools in the interest of sustainable development.

Access and Servicing

Section 13.9.14 (Access) and Section 13.16.17 (Entrances and Sightlines).

Table 13.13 (Minimum visibility standards for new entrances) and Figure 13.1 (Junction Visibility Splays).

Section 13.16.12 and Table 13.11 (Car Parking Standards).

Section 13.16.16 and Table 13.12 (Cycle Parking Standards).

Section 13.16.9 (Charging Points for Electric Vehicles).

Section 10.1.2 (Wastewater and Water Services).

POs IU16 & 17 – construction and installation of wastewater treatment systems.

POs IU19 - 23 – requires use of SuDS.

6.0 Natural Heritage Designations

The appeal site is not located within or adjoining any designated site.

The nearest European Sites in close proximity to the appeal site are as follows:

- c. 9km to Stabannan-Braganstown SPA (Site Code 004091).
- c. 12.5km to River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (Site Code 004232).
- c. 12.5km to River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (Site Code 002299).
- c. 15km to Dundalk Bay SAC (Site Code 000455).
- c. 15km to Dundalk Bay SPA (Site Code 004026).
- c. 20km to North-west Irish Sea SPA (Site Code 004236).

The nearest Natural Heritage Areas in close proximity to the appeal site are as follows:

- c. 3km to Kildemock Marsh pNHA (Site Code 001806).
- c. 4km to Mentrim Lough pNHA (Site Code 001587).
- c. 5.5km to Mellifont Abbey Woods pNHA (Site Code 001464).

7.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

8.0 Water Framework Directive Screening

I have concluded, 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 (refer to form in Appendix 2 for details).

9.0 The Appeal

9.1. Grounds of Appeal

A third party appeal submission was received from Damian Roche (15/09/2025) against the PA's decision to grant permission. The grounds of appeal are as follows:

- *Design and Layout* - proposed extension constitutes the overdevelopment of the site and concerns raised re: inadequate play space for children.
- *Residential Amenity* - proximity of extension to appellant's property (to south) giving rise to noise, visual intrusion, overbearance, overlooking and internal daylighting and negative impact on property value.
- *Procedural Issues* - with regard to lack of contextual details on drawings.
- *Planning History* - site specific refusal for 2-storey development on grounds which incl. privacy impacts and property value depreciation.
- *Water Supply* - pressures/ capacity issues.
- *Road Safety* – proposal will generate additional traffic in locality at peak times which when combined with adjoining school gives rise to significant local traffic/ pedestrian safety and exacerbation of existing congestion issues (not compliant with Section 13.12.1). Lighting, parking and pedestrian infrastructure in vicinity of site is inadequate. Methodological issues identified with at FI stage TIA.
- *Parking* – proposed parking will mainly cater for staff and is not for customers.
- *Servicing* – changes to access arrangements means servicing happens on-street.
- *Policy Non-Compliance* – PO SC35 no substantial development in area, PO SC37 proposal would give rise to parking, traffic and noise issues, PO SC38 – no synergies between proposal and primary school in terms of drop-off/ parking.

- *Other* – recent removal of traffic calming measures in the vicinity of the primary school and related increases in traffic speed.

9.2. **Applicant Response**

None received.

9.3. **Planning Authority Response**

Response dated 03/10/2025 states that the PA consider the GOA are a replication of the grounds of objection submitted at application stage which were addressed in the PA's reports of 24/03/2025 and 27/08/2025. The PA seeks that the Commission uphold their decision to grant permission.

9.4. **Observations**

None received.

9.5. **Further Responses**

None received.

10.0 **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 to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Intensification of Use
- Layout
- Residential Amenity
- Mobility and Servicing
- Other Matters

10.1. Principle of Development

10.1.1. The appeal site is located in the designated rural node of Ballapousta and adjoining the local national school. LCDP Section 2.18 (Rural Nodes) and policy objective SS57 provide that there is capacity in such nodes to accommodate a small level of growth where it is relative to the size of the settlement. The proposal, subject to the appeal before the Commission, is detailed in Section 2.1 of this report and relates to the extension and modification of an existing use (a childcare facility) and, as such, I consider that it constitutes a small level of growth relative to the overall scale of the rural node as illustrated on Rural Node Map 5.2 in Section 3 of Volume 2 of the LCDP. The proposal also endeavours to meet the needs of the settlement of Ballapousta, in line with policy objective SS52 which seeks to support and facilitate balanced and proportionate population and economic growth in rural nodes which meets the needs of the residents of the settlement. Having regard to the foregoing considerations, in addition to the more generalised policy support for the provision of childcare facilities provided under national and regional policy and policy objectives SC35, SC37 and SC38 (where they are co-located with schools), I consider the proposal to be acceptable in principle, subject to the detailed considerations below.

10.2. Intensification of Use

10.2.1. While not raised directly as a ground of appeal, I draw the attention of the Commission to the issue of intensification in the use and operation of the childcare facility that would arise from the proposed increase in services users from 44 no. currently to a maximum of 94 no.

10.2.2. The key question for determination is whether this intensification of use would have a detrimental impact on residential amenities (given its location adjoining the appellant's property), on parking and traffic in the locality (given the site's location adjoining a national school), and on infrastructural servicing – matters which were also considered by the PA at application stage (as detailed in Section 3.2 of this report). I consider these matters further in Sections 10.4, 10.5 and 10.6 of this report.

10.3. Layout

10.3.1. The appellant considers that the proposed extension and related works will give rise to the overdevelopment of the site, and they raise specific concerns in relation to the impact on the availability of play space provision.

- 10.3.2. The Childcare Facilities Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2001) provide no specific spatial requirements in respect to outdoor play areas beyond requiring the availability and management of same, with LCDP Section 13.12.1 (Childcare) requiring the adequate availability (undefined) of indoor and outdoor play space. Therefore, whilst the number of children that will be catered for is increasing, I can find no policy requirement which states that there needs to be a proportionate pro-rata increase in play space.
- 10.3.3. Having compared the applicant's existing and proposed site plans, I note that there would be no material change to the footprint of the childcare facility building (this is also evident on the proposed floor plans), nor to the children's play area (to immediate rear of the building), or to the current extent of the site given over to circulation and parking (front and rear side). In light of the foregoing considerations, I consider that the appellant's concerns with regard to site overdevelopment and play space provision are unfounded.

10.4. Residential Amenity

- 10.4.1. The GOA outline various concerns in respect to the design, siting and impact of the proposal on the enjoyment and value of their property in terms of overbearance/ visual intrusion, noise and disturbance, sunlight and daylight impacts, and overlooking.

Visual Intrusion and Overbearance

- 10.4.2. The gable (south) elevation of the extended childcare facility would be sited c. 4.2m from the boundary shared with the appellant's property which, in turn, is sited c. 1.5m to the south of this boundary. Whilst the two properties would be proximate to each other (separated by c. 5.7m), I note that they are oriented at an offset, oblique angle to one another i.e. given that the childcare facility faces northeast and the appellant's house faces southwest.
- 10.4.3. The facility's existing south elevation has a depth of c. 15.5m, a minimum eaves height of c. 2.7m and a substantial roofscape (A-roof with two slopes and a length of c. 16m and a hipped roof with a length of c. 12m) with a max ridge height of c. 6.8m. The proposed south elevation includes a new gable wall and a rear first floor element whose flat roof reaches a height of c. 6.2m (sitting c. 0.6m below main roof ridgeline).

10.4.4. In light of the foregoing, it is clear to me that whilst the proposed extension will not give rise to any increase in the overall depth of the building, it will give rise to a change in the massing and visual character of the south and east elevations and rear part of the building. However, I do not consider that the proposal will give rise to unacceptable visual intrusion or to overbearance on the appellant's property having regard to the offset orientation between the properties and to the nature and extent of the proposed extension/ elevation changes relative to the substantial scale/ massing, pitch and overall height of the existing slate roofscape - which is already visible from the appellant's property.

Overlooking

10.4.5. The appellant seeks to bring to the Commission's attention to a previous site refusal for a 2-storey development on the grounds of privacy and property value depreciation. Having reviewed the site specific planning history, I note that the appellant is referring to a mixed-use development (P.A. Ref. 06/269) with 2 no. 2-bed apartments with private balconies to front and rear at first floor level, where the PA's concerns regarding privacy impacts on neighbouring property related to these units' private amenity space. As such, given the differing nature of the proposed occupancy and the fact that no balconies form part of the current proposal, I am satisfied that this previous refusal is not relevant to my assessment of the impact of the current proposal on the residential amenity of the appellant's property.

10.4.6. The proposed first floor extension does not feature any windows on its side elevations, with the only windows provided facing east and towards the site boundary with the adjoining sports pitches (c. 18m away). Having regard to this window orientation, and to the offset, oblique angle of the two properties relative to one another (as detailed in paragraph 10.4.2) and to the non-habitable nature of the proposed accommodation, I consider that there is no potential for the proposal to give rise to negatively affect the privacy of the appellant's property.

Noise and Disturbance

10.4.7. The appellant raises issues in relation to noise and disturbance but does not provide further details in respect to their concerns in regard to the latter issue.

10.4.8. The Childcare Facilities: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2001) do not provide guidance in respect to the assessment, mitigation or management of noise arising

from childcare facilities. LCDP policy objective SC37 requires regard to be had to criteria including noise disturbance when assessing proposals for childcare facilities.

10.4.9. I note that the issue of noise was not explicitly considered by the PA. The Inspector's report on the preceding appeal (PL15.230688 – original application for childcare facility) did have regard to the issue of noise and determined that any nuisance arising from same could be addressed by the attachment of conditions, requiring the supplementation of the southern boundary to appellant's property and restricting the opening of windows to the front and rear elevations in order to help to abate and mitigate noise emanating from the sessional rooms. However, I note that the latter recommendation was not carried forward/ attached to the Board Order.

10.4.10. I acknowledge that the proposal will give rise to an intensification in the use of the premises - with related increases in noise likely during its proposed hours of operation (8am – 6pm) cited in the statutory notices. However, I draw the Commission's attention to the absence of sufficient information on file with regard to this matter. Having regard to the inadequate level of detail on file, I consider that this matter could be addressed by a noise mitigation condition (as per the approach taken by ABP in PL15.230688) should the Commission wish to consider a grant of permission.

Sunlight and Daylight

10.4.11. The appellant is of the view that the proposal will give rise to overshadowing of their property, and they raise particular concerns about the impact on their kitchen and master bedroom (no details provided in the GOA in respect to the location of same).

10.4.12. Whilst no sunlight or daylight assessment was provided as part of the application or RFI, I consider that there is no potential for the proposal to give rise to a material, negative impact on internal daylighting to the appellant's property or to the sun lighting of its private amenity space (to the side/ rear), having regard to the aspect and orientation of the properties relative to one another (as discussed in paragraph 10.4.2), to the siting of the tall (c. 2m high – see site inspection photos) shared boundary and to the location of the appellant's property to the south of the childcare facility.

10.5. Mobility and Servicing

Traffic, Road and Pedestrian Safety

- 10.5.1. The appellant raises various concerns with regard to traffic congestion on account of the proposal's rural location and proximity to a national school and considers that the proposal is non-compliant with Section 13.12.1 (Childcare) and policy objective SC38 (re: synergies between proposal and primary school in terms of drop-off/ parking) in this regard. The appellant also considers that lighting, parking and pedestrian infrastructure in vicinity of site is inadequate, and they raise the issues of road and pedestrian safety in their GOA.
- 10.5.2. Section 13.12.1 states that, in assessing individual planning applications for childcare facilities, the PA will have regard to criteria such as local traffic conditions and convenient off-street car parking and/ or suitable drop-off and collection points for customers and staff.
- 10.5.3. As detailed in Section 4.2 of this report, Ballapousta national school (next door) was recently granted permission for and completed work on a large extension/ campus redevelopment works which included separate in and out vehicle access points, on-site bus turning, a dedicated set down area and new in-curtilage car park. There is also a large public car park located c. 60m to the north-east of the appeal site, which is connected to same via a recently upgraded pedestrian footpath. There are bollards along the west side of the public road adjoining the site and the school to stop unauthorised parking together with road safety signage and traffic calming measures.

Sightlines/ Pedestrian Safety

- 10.5.4. The PA were satisfied that the applicant could provide for adequate driver visibility sightlines (i.e. 75m in either direction) at their proposed widened in/out vehicular access in compliance with the Section 13.2.1 criteria for 'safe access'.
- 10.5.5. I note that the applicant's existing and proposed site layout plans provide details on the existing pedestrian footpath which runs along the full west boundary of the appeal site fronting the L-1264 (and continues past the neighbouring national school) and on the existing pedestrian access gate from same which is to be retained. Furthermore, having carried out a site inspection, I also note that there is existing street lighting in and around the L-1264 and within the appeal site which ensures that there will be adequate visibility for pedestrians, cyclists and others visiting the site. On the basis of the foregoing, I can find no evidence that the proposal will give rise to pedestrian or road safety issues.

Traffic Impact

- 10.5.6. A Traffic and Transport Assessment Report was submitted by the applicant at FI stage.
- 10.5.7. The appellant identifies what they consider to be methodological issues with the traffic impact assessment undertaken on the basis that a traffic data capture feature (Automatic Traffic Count (ATC)) was only installed to the south of applicant's premises and therefore, excluded all traffic approaching the premises from the north (i.e. via the L-1264 or from L-5262). I note that the exact location of the ATC is identified in Appendix A of the report with Section 4.3 explaining the TIA methodology as being "*In order to provide a robust assessment of the potential traffic impact from the proposed extension all development trips are considered to arrive from the L1264 from the north. In reality a proportion of trips will arrive from the south. Therefore, the impact assessment is a worst-case approach*". On this basis, I would draw the Commission's attention to the inherent contradiction in the siting of the ATC to the south of the appeal site and the assessment of traffic conditions being based on a worst case scenario of all traffic approaching the site from the north (and not therefore being captured by the ATC). However, notwithstanding this identified issue, I note that the likely vehicle trip rates of the proposal are based on comparative/ equivalent developments in the TRICS database 'nursery' category, with this being the assessment methodology used to estimate likely post development traffic flows – the crux of the issue for the purposes of this appeal. On this basis, I am satisfied that the TIA is sufficiently robust and has allowed me to make an informed assessment of the impact of the proposal in this regard.
- 10.5.8. The report concludes that the proposal will give rise to an increase in vehicle trips along the L-1264 (which is currently lightly trafficked (with no known congestion or queuing problems) with fewer than 100 vehicles per hour at peak) by up to 27% in the evening peak hour and up to 13% across the day, resulting in a total post-development flow of c. 141 vehicles per hour or just over 2 vehicles per minute (and specifically 24 no. and 22 no. two-way trips in the morning and evening peak hours respectively). Whilst I note that this is a material proportional increase in the traffic volume on the local road as per the TII Traffic and Transport Assessment Guidelines, I consider that is likely to give rise to a minimal, negligible impact on the capacity of the local road network, as per TII guidance, on the basis that the L-1264 will remain well below the capacity threshold for typical rural or lightly urban trafficked roads, which can

accommodate up to 500 vehicles per hour, per direction before capacity issues emerge.

10.5.9. In respect to the concern that the proposal gives rise to cumulative traffic congestion when combined with the neighbouring national school, I note that the report dealt with this issue the satisfaction of the PA who sought that the recommended Drop-Off and Collection Policy (DOCP - Section 3.4) to be adopted by the crèche operator be ensured by condition (No. 2). Having reviewed the report, I note the argument put forward that sessional childcare facilities (such as that proposed) do not have fixed start and end times in the same way that a national school does and, as such, pre-school children will typically be dropped off and collected over a broader timeframe, with the peak arrival (drop-off) and departure (collection) demand spread across longer time periods in the morning and afternoon/evening, thereby minimising the potential for cumulative traffic congestion. Whilst I wish to draw the Commission's attention to the citing of incorrect opening hours in the report (i.e. which references 7am-7pm opening times, when proposed facility opening times applied for are 8am to 6pm), I consider that it is likely to be the case that pre-school children will typically be dropped off and collected over a broader timeframe and at differing times to children attending the adjoining national school (where the school day comprises of a much shorter operating period of not less than 5 hrs and 40 mins in accordance with the DoE Circular 11/95 Time in School).

10.5.10. In light of the above considerations, the report recommends the implementation of a DOCP in order to ensure the suitable staggering of drop-offs and collection times (and related traffic) in order to avoid and/ or minimise localised traffic overspill onto the adjoining road. However, I would have concerns about the practical enforceability of a planning condition requiring same.

10.5.11. Therefore, whilst proposal will give rise to an increase in local traffic, having considered the likelihood of childcare drop-offs and collections being staggered/ taking place over a broader timeframe (relative to the peak periods of the neighbouring school), the appeal site's proximity to a large public car park, and recent improvements to drop-off and pedestrian infrastructure on the public road and in the adjoining school campus, on balance I am satisfied that the road network will continue to operate well within capacity and that the proposal will not give rise to an unacceptable, negative traffic impact.

Other

- 10.5.12. The appellant seeks to draw the Commission's attention to the recent removal of traffic calming measures in the vicinity of Ballapousta national school and to, what they consider to be, related increases in traffic speed. I consider that this matter, which they relateS to development on a third-party property (recent extension and refurbishment works to Ballapousta national school) and not to the subject proposal, to be outside the scope of the appeal before the Commission.

Parking

- 10.5.13. The GOA contend that the proposed parking (17 no. spaces where 8 no. are currently provided for) will cater mainly for staff of the facility and is not sufficient to meet customer needs. Whilst I note that no distinction is provided between staff and customer parking on the proposed site plan, I am satisfied that the quantum of parking provided is compliant with the parking standard of 1 no. parking space per 6 no. children set out under Section 13.16.12 of the LCDP (which incidentally does not set out any requirements in respect to the ratio of staff/ customer parking in this regard). Notwithstanding, in line with the requirements of the Childcare Facilities: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2001), I note that Section 3.0 of the Traffic and Transport Assessment Report submitted at FI stage states that the 12 no. set-down parking spaces to the front of the development are to serve customers with the 5 no. rear spaces serving staff (in place of the 3 no. currently provided for). I consider same to be acceptable.
- 10.5.14. Whilst not raised by the PA or in the GOA, I also note that the development will include ducting provision to the parking spaces for future electric vehicle (EV) charging points in compliance with LCDP Section 13.16.9 (Charging Points for Electric Vehicles) and 4 no. long stay cycle parking facilities for staff and 10 no. short term cycle parking spaces for visitors which accords with Table 13.12 of the LCDP.

Servicing

- 10.5.15. The appellant is concerned that the proposed changes to the dual in/ out vehicular accesses serving the site and the provision of a single point of access and egress will give rise to additional servicing pressure on the public road as service providers, including bin collectors, will avoid/ be inconvenienced from entering the property.

10.5.16. Whilst I acknowledge this concern, I draw the Commission's attention to the proposed road layout plans and swept path analysis submitted at FI stage which illustrate that cars, delivery vans and fire tender/ larger vehicles will be able to access the site in order to undertake all necessary in-curtilage pick-ups and drop-offs. Therefore, having regard to the information on file and to the fact that the PA did not raise any issues with regard to same following the RFI, I do not consider that the proposal will give rise to additional servicing pressure on the L-1264 local road.

10.6. Other Matters

Water Supply

10.6.1. The GOA seek to highlight existing water pressures and local capacity issues. I note that the applicant's water supply proposals (via existing mains water connection) were to the satisfaction of the PA's Environment Section at application stage (as detailed in Section 3.2). In light of same, I am satisfied that the scheme's potable water servicing arrangements are a matter which can be addressed by condition should the Commission be minded to grant permission.

Wastewater

10.6.2. I note that the applicant addressed all issues in respect to the decommissioning of their existing wastewater system and in relation to design and siting of their proposed new on-site wastewater treatment system (to serve the increase in foul loading population equivalent arising from the proposal) to the general satisfaction of the PA at FI stage. Having reviewed the information on file, I am also satisfied as to the applicant's wastewater proposals and their compliance with policy objectives IU16 and IU17, and I consider that the scheme's foul water servicing arrangements are a matter capable of being addressed by condition (as per the PA's condition no. 2) should the Commission be minded to grant permission.

Surface Water

10.6.3. I note from the RFI that the proposal would give rise to a de-minimus increase of c. 7sq.m in the facility's impermeable area. I consider that this constitutes a negligible increase with no potential to materially impact the site's existing surface water drainage infrastructure or to necessitate the provision of SuDS infrastructure as per

policy objectives IU19 to IU23. This was also the view of the PA's Environment Section.

Procedural Issues

- 10.6.4. The GOA draw attention to the lack of contextual detail on the submitted drawings. Having inspected the site and its surrounds and having reviewed the information on file, I consider that there is sufficient information to allow me to continue to assess and make a determination on the appeal.

Property Value

- 10.6.5. I note the concerns raised in the GOA in respect of the devaluation of neighbouring property. However, having regard to the assessment and conclusion set out in Section 10.4 above, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area to such an extent that would adversely affect the value of property in the vicinity.

11.0 AA Screening

- 11.1.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 11.1.2. The appeal site is located c. 9km from the Stabannan-Braganstown SPA (Site Code 004091), c. 12.5km from the River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (Site Code 004232) and the River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (Site Code 002299) and c. 15km from Dundalk Bay SAC (Site Code 000455) and Dundalk Bay SPA (Site Code 004026). There are no watercourses on or immediately adjoining the site, with the closest watercourses being tributaries of the River Dee (EPA Code IE_NB_06D010670) which are located within c. 500m of the appeal site (and separated from the appeal site by a bank of agricultural land and intervening rural housing and institutional buildings). The River Dee is connected to Dundalk Bay SAC (Site Code 000455) or Dundalk Bay SPA (Site Code 004026) via its estuary at Annagassan c. 15km north-east of the appeal site.
- 11.2. I am satisfied that, due the significant separation distance and hydrological buffer, these Natura 2000 sites would not be within the zone of influence of a development of this nature and scale.

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

11.2. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have likely significant effects 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.

12.0 Recommendation

I recommend a GRANT of permission subject to the following conditions.

13.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the location of the site beside a national school in the rural node of Ballapousta and to the planning policies, objectives and development standards of the Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027, and specifically to Sections 4.11 and 13.12.1 and to policy objectives SC35, SC37 and SC38, to the Planning Guidelines on Childcare Facilities issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government (2001), and to the nature, scale and design of the proposed development relative to adjoining dwellings (and particularly the dwelling to the immediate south), and to the existing pattern of development in the wider area, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development is an acceptable form of development at this location, would not seriously injure the amenities of adjoining properties, and would therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

14.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further information received by the planning authority on the 6th August 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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The proposed childcare facility shall not operate outside the period of 0800 to 1800 hours Monday to Friday inclusive except public holidays, and shall not operate on Saturdays, Sundays or public holidays.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.</p>
3.	<p>The number of children to be accommodated within the premises shall not exceed 94 at any time on any day.</p> <p>Reason: To limit the scale of development in the interest of residential amenity.</p>
4.	<p>The following infrastructure requirements shall be complied with;</p> <p>(i) Prior to the commencement of development, the existing vehicular entry point shall be upgraded to a two-way access point, 6 metres wide, to facilitate cars entering and leaving simultaneously, in accordance with Drawing No. 251032-X-XX-XXX-DR-CE-102 – Proposed Sightlines Layout – Rev 00 received on 6th August 2025.</p> <p>(ii) The area within the visibility splay shall be cleared to provide a level surface no higher than 250mm above the level of the adjoining carriageway and shall be retained and kept clear thereafter. No other works shall commence on site until the visibility splays have been provided.</p> <p>(iii) Entrance gates shall be set back at least 5.5m from the road edge, wing walls shall be splayed back at an angle of 45 degrees and gates shall open inwards.</p> <p>(iv) Road drainage across the entrance and along the public road shall not be impeded or interrupted in any way.</p>

	<p>(v) Prior to operation of the proposed development, all roadways and footpaths serving the said development shall be finished with the proposed permanent durable surface. The roadway shall be applied with line markings and road signage as per furnished drawings.</p> <p>(vi) Prior to operation of the proposed development, the car parking areas shall be constructed and demarcated.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of traffic safety.</p>
5.	<p>The external material finishes of the proposed development shall be agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of orderly development and the visual amenities of the area.</p>
6.	<p>(i) The Wastewater Treatment & Disposal System shall comply with the EPA Code of Practice: Treatment Systems for Small Communities, Business, Leisure Centres and Hotels (1999).</p> <p>(ii) The existing well in the northwest corner of the site shall be decommissioned and all water serving the facility shall be via the existing mains water connection.</p> <p>Reason: in the interests of public health.</p>
7.	<p>Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreement (s) with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply network.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water facilities.</p>
8.	<p>Notwithstanding the provisions of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, no advertisement signs including any signs installed to be visible through the windows, advertisement structures, banners, canopies, flags, or other projecting elements shall be displayed or erected on the retail units or within the curtilage of the site, unless authorised by a further grant of planning permission.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the visual amenities of the area.</p>
9.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays Deviation</p>

	<p>from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.</p>
10.	<p>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 Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>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.</p>

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

Emma Gosnell

Planning Inspector

19th December 2025

Appendix 1

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-323651-25
Proposed Development Summary	Permission for the development of first floor extension to the rear of existing childcare facility and all site works.
Development Address	Mary's House, Drakestown, Ballapousta, Ardee, Co. Louth, A92C437.
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road 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. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 2

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING

Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality

An Bord Pleanála ref. no.	ACP-323651-25	Townland, address	Mary's House, Drakestown, Ballapousta, Ardee, Co. Louth, A92C437
Description of project		The proposal comprises of the development of first floor extension to the rear of existing childcare facility and all site works – see Section 2.0 of Inspector’s Report for further details.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		Brownfield, relatively flat site in rural node. Located in Flood Risk Zone C. Tributaries of River Dee (DEE_060, IE_NB_06D010670, Moderate WFD Status and At Risk) are located within c. 500m of the appeal site. No watercourses on site. Ardee Groundwater Body (IE_NB_G_018) – Good WFD Status & Not at risk.	
Proposed surface water details		Utilise existing SuDS/ surface water management regime on site.	
Proposed water supply source & available capacity		Public mains (via existing connection).	
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues		Installation of on-site waste water treatment system - BAF Secondary Treatment Unit followed by a Sand filter with discharge to ground via a gravel base.	
Others?		n/a	
Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection			

Identified water body	Distance to (m)	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)
The River Dee (transitional)	c. 500m	River Dee (DEE_060)	Moderate	At Risk	Agriculture etc.	No direct pathways. Potential indirect pathway via groundwater/ foul drainage.
Ardee Groundwater Body (groundwater)	Below site	Ardee IE_NB_G_018	Good	Not At Risk	Agriculture etc.	Direct pathway via groundwater (foul drainage).

Step 4: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage.

CONSTRUCTION PHASE

No.	Component	Water body receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.

1.	Silt-laden surface water discharges/ contaminated surface water discharges	River Dee (DEE_060) Ardee IE_NB_G_018	Foul Drainage/ Surface water system	Silt/Hydrocarbon s /Cement products spillages discharging Water pollution	Best Practice Construction/ Site Management.	No	Screened Out - No Remaining Risk
2.	Contaminated groundwater discharges	River Dee (DEE_060) Ardee IE_NB_G_018	Foul Drainage/ Surface water system	Silt/Hydrocarbon s /Cement products spillages discharging Water pollution	Best Practice Construction/ Site Management.	No	Screened Out - No Remaining Risk
3	Alterations to natural hydrology, hydraulic conditions, functioning, and hydrogeology	River Dee (DEE_060) Ardee IE_NB_G_018	Foul Drainage/ Surface water system	No.	N/a	No	Screened Out - No Remaining Risk
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
4.	Surface water/ groundwater pollution events from plant/ storm overflows	River Dee (DEE_060) Ardee IE_NB_G_018	Foul Drainage (new)/ Surface water system (existing)	Water pollution.	Attachment of condition to ensure that the design and installation of the proposed WWTS complies with the EPA Code of Practice: Treatment Systems for Small Communities,	No	Screened Out - No Remaining Risk

					Business, Leisure Centres and Hotels (1999).		
STAGE 2: ASSESSMENT							
Details of Mitigation Required to Comply with WFD Objectives							
Surface Water							
Development/Activity e.g. culvert, bridge, other crossing, diversion, outfall, etc	<u>Objective 1:Surface Water</u> Prevent deterioration of the status of all bodies of surface water	<u>Objective 2:Surface Water</u> Protect, enhance and restore all bodies of surface water with aim of achieving good status	<u>Objective 3:Surface Water</u> Protect and enhance all artificial and heavily modified bodies of water with aim of achieving good ecological potential and good surface water chemical status	<u>Objective 4: Surface Water</u> Progressively reduce pollution from priority substances and cease or phase out emission, discharges and losses of priority substances	Does this component comply with WFD Objectives 1, 2, 3 & 4? (if answer is no, a development cannot proceed without a derogation under art. 4.7)		
	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 1:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 2:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 3:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 4:			

Construction/ Site Clearance Works	Best Practice Construction/ Site Management.	Best Practice Construction/ Site Management.	N/A	N/A	Yes
Surface Water measures (existing)	Standard, best practice design, installation and maintenance.	Standard, best practice design, installation and maintenance.	N/A	N/A	Yes
Details of Mitigation Required to Comply with WFD Objectives					
Groundwater					
Development/Activity e.g. abstraction, outfall, etc.	<u>Objective 1: Groundwater</u> Prevent or limit the input of pollutants into groundwater and to prevent the deterioration of the status of all bodies of groundwater	<u>Objective 2 : Groundwater</u> Protect, enhance and restore all bodies of groundwater, ensure a balance between abstraction and recharge, with the aim of achieving good status*	<u>Objective 3:Groundwater</u> Reverse any significant and sustained upward trend in the concentration of any pollutant resulting from the impact of human activity		Does this component comply with WFD Objectives 1, 2, 3 & 4? (if answer is no, a development cannot proceed without a derogation under art. 4.7)
	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 1:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 2:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 3:		
Construction/ Site Clearance Works	Best Practice Construction/ Site Management.	Best Practice Construction/ Site Management.	N/A		Yes
Surface Water (existing)	Standard, best practice design, installation and maintenance.	Standard, best practice design, installation and maintenance.	N/A		Yes
On-site wastewater treatment system that will discharge to groundwater	Attachment of condition to ensure that the design and installation of the proposed	Attachment of condition to ensure that the design and installation of the proposed	N/A		Yes

	WWTS complies with the EPA Code of Practice: Treatment Systems for Small Communities, Business, Leisure Centres and Hotels (1999).	WWTS complies with the EPA Code of Practice: Treatment Systems for Small Communities, Business, Leisure Centres and Hotels (1999).		
--	--	--	--	--

