



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-323697-25

Development

RETENTION: for the existing mobile homes on site along with hard-standing and access road.

PERMISSION to construct a dwelling house with all associated site works.

Location

Dromard Beg, Clonmore,
Templemore, Co. Tipperary.

Planning Authority

Tipperary County Council.

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2560667.

Applicant(s)

Nigel Flood.

Type of Application

Permission for Retention and
Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse retention and refuse
permission.

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant(s)

Nigel Flood.

Observer(s)

None.

Date of Site Inspection

8th December 2025.

Inspector

C. Daly.

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site, of area 0.46ha, consists of two mobile homes placed inside the rear half of the site and perpendicular to the main road, the R433 on to which the site is accessed. The site is relatively flat and is mainly covered in grass with a driveway access provided from the entrance gate. There are mature trees located along the south-west side boundary and there are also some along the north-east side boundary. There is no rear site boundary such that the site is part of a larger grass field. There is a wooden fence along most of the roadside boundary.
- 1.2. There is a detached dwelling separated by a small field c.80m to the south-west and there is a line of detached dwelling which commences c.150m to the north-east. There is a detached bungalow dwelling directly opposite the site. The rural site is c.5.7km north of the village of Templetuohy, c.7.7km north-east of Templemore and c.9km south-west of Rathdowney.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development, in summary, consists of the following:
- Retention permission on a temporary basis for the existing mobile homes on the site and hard standing and access road to the site.
 - Permission for the construction of a new dwelling house, entrance and effluent treatment system.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Tipperary County Council decided to refuse permission for retention and permission for one reason which related to failure to satisfy the requirements of Table 5.3 and Policy 5-11 of the Development Plan for a new rural dwelling at the location within an area under urban influence.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planner's Report assessment noted the location within an area under urban influence and that it is served by the R433 a non-strategic regional road. Based on the information submitted, it considered that the applicant had failed to demonstrate that he had resided in the rural area within 10km of the site for the required 10-year period.

It noted the design, scale and orientation of the dwelling to be satisfactory although F.I. is required in relation to external finishes. It also noted the overlap of the site with reg. ref. 2360043 and it advised that revised drawings should be sought. It noted sightlines of 160m from a 2.4m setback were demonstrated in accordance with policy.

It noted the requirement for an Uisce Éireann connection condition given the site is served by public water mains. The wastewater proposals were accepted. A small part of the site was noted to intersect with a pluvial flood risk zone and given that no development was proposed in this area, the flood risk was considered low. Refusal of permission was recommended for the reason summarised in section 3.1 above.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- District Engineer: No report received.
- Water Services Clonmel: No report received.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- Uisce Éireann: no report received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None.

4.0 Planning History

Subject Site

08/510669: Permission granted by the P.A. for a dormer dwelling house, new entrance and wastewater treatment system area. Never implemented.

04/510097: Permission granted by the P.A. for a dormer style dwelling house, domestic garage, new entrance and septic tank with percolation area. Never implemented.

Adjacent Site

2360043: Permission granted by the P.A. for the demolition of the existing derelict dwelling house and shed, and the construction of a new dwelling house, domestic garage and waste water treatment system.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Tipperary County Development Plan 2022-2028 (the CDP)

Volume 1

Table 5.3 sets out Housing Need Definitions under two headings, economic and social.

In relation to social, it states the following,

(a) A person who has resided in a rural area (as defined in Table 2.4 Chapter 2 Core Strategy):

(i) Within 5km of the site where they intend to build for a substantial period of their lives (10 Years) within a 'Primary Amenity Area',

(ii) Within 10km of the site where they intend to build, for a substantial period of their lives (10 Years) within an 'Area of Urban Influence' Or

(a) A person with a demonstratable housing need on the basis of exceptional medical circumstances. Any planning application must be supported by documentation from a registered medical practitioner and disability organisation, proving that a person requires to live in a particular environment, and in a dwelling designed and built purposely to suit their medical needs.

Policy 5-11 Facilitate proposals for dwellings in the countryside outside of settlements in accordance with NPF Policy NPO 19 for new Housing in the Open Countryside, and designations illustrated in Section 5.5.1, and Table 5.2: Rural Housing Technical Principles for Applicants.

In 'Areas Under Urban Influence' and 'Primary Amenity Areas', the Council will consider single houses for persons where the criteria set out in Category 1A or B, or Category 2 hereunder are met:

Category 1: 'Economic Need' A: The applicant must demonstrate an economic need to reside in the area through active employment in farming/agricultural activity (farming, horticulture, forestry, bloodstock). The farm must exceed 20ha in total....

Category 2: 'Social Need' The applicant must demonstrate a social need to reside in the local rural area for social purposes in line with Table 5.3. And all the criteria set out below is met:

(i) Within a 'Primary Amenity Area', the applicant must have resided within 5km of the site where they intend to build for a substantial period of their lives (10 years),

*(ii) Within an 'Area of Urban Influence', the applicant must have resided within 10km of the site where they intend to build for a substantial period of their lives (10 years),
And*

(iii) The applicant does not, or has never owned a house in the open countryside. In 'Open Countryside' areas, the Council will consider single houses for persons where the development meets other relevant policies set out in the Plan, and where the proposed development is in accordance with all the criteria set out hereunder.

(i) The proposed development must meet the normal planning and environmental criteria and development management standards,

(ii) The applicant does not, or has never owned a house in the open countryside,

(iii) To prohibit speculative development in these areas, any application for a single permanent dwelling must be made in the name of the person for whom it is intended. An occupancy condition will be attached to any grant of permission,

(iv) An alternative site is not available within a settlement within 5km of the proposed site.

Policy 15-2 Require that all new septic tanks, proprietary effluent treatment systems and percolation areas to be located and constructed in accordance with the Water Services Guidelines for Planning Authorities (and any review thereof) and the Code of Practice for Domestic waste water treatment systems (EPA, 2021) (and any

amendment) and the development management standards of this Plan as set out in Volume 3.

Volume 3

6.1 Road Design and Visibility at a Direct Access

Table 6.1 outlines setback distance which for regional and local roads is required to be 2.4m in this case.

Table 6.2 outlines required sightline distances which for a road with an 80kph speed limit is 160m for a rural non-national road.

5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

In relation to designated sites, the subject site is located:

- c.7.km south of Nore Valley Bogs Natural Heritage Area (NHA) (site code 001853).
- c.8.4km north-east of Templemore Wood PNHA (site code 000942).
- c.11km south of Monaincha Bog / Ballaghmore Bog NHA (site code 000652).
- c.11.1km north-west of Galmoy Fen Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and PNHA (site code 001858).
- c.11.3km east of Kilduff Devilsbit Mountain SAC and PNHA (site code 000934).

6.0 **The Appeal**

6.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

The grounds of the first party appeal by Nigel Flood can be summarised as follows:

Exceptional Circumstances

- Exceptional medical, compassionate and local need grounds exist as an over-riding consideration for a family member with a stated condition that benefits from the quiet, safe and predictable rural setting in contrast to an urban/village environment.

- Safe access to outdoor space is required without the dangers of traffic or overstimulation of public space.
- Stability, consistency and minimal disruption are essential and displacement from this home would cause severe problems and continued occupation is a medical necessity.

Established Local Connections

- The family have lived in the area for over 10 years with links to Rathdowney noted and home life, social structures and social ties are within a 10km radius.
- Family support systems are in place in this location including for specialist support.

Planning History and Site Justification

- The site was purchased as it had previously been granted full planning permission which has since lapsed, and this demonstrates that a dwelling was already deemed appropriate.

Policy Conservations

- The Development Plan allows for exceptions on the basis of medical, health or compassionate circumstances and their family circumstances, as outlined, is within such exceptional circumstances.
- To refuse permission would prioritise technical policy criteria over the welfare of a child, family stability for a local family and where the location has already been accepted in principle.
- Supporting documentation is attached in respect of medical and educational documentation from various professionals confirming the necessity of the living environment for the family member.
- ACP should set aside the refusal of permission accordingly.

7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the report of the

local authority, and 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:

- Policy Considerations
- Design
- Wastewater Treatment
- Other Issues

7.2. Policy Considerations

- 7.2.1. I note in order for the principle of a dwelling to be considered acceptable on the site that the applicant must meet the criteria of Table 5.3 (Volume 1) and Policy 5-11 of the CDP. In the first instance, the applicant has effectively asserted that he has a social need to build a house at this location. In this regard he must have resided in a rural area (per Table 2.4) within 10km of the site for a substantial period (10 years). Based on the appeal documentation and the application documents, while I note that the settlement of Rathdowney is just within 10km of the site, it is an urban settlement in county Laois and not a rural area.
- 7.2.2. I note the address of the applicant is within the settlement where they own a property. Accordingly, I do not consider that the applicant has resided in a rural area for the 10 year required period. I note that if this was considered to be a rural area, then the applicant may be considered to have previously owned a rural dwelling. Table 5.3 alternatively allows a demonstrable housing need to be considered on the basis of exceptional medical circumstances. I note the supporting personal documentation submitted with the appeal to which I refer the Commission. In this regard, I note that the applicant has submitted that there are exceptional medical circumstances. However, based on the details submitted from medical and disability professionals, I note no specific requirement *“to live in a particular environment, and in a dwelling designed and built purposely to suit their medical needs”*.
- 7.2.3. I note that while the appellant asserts the therapeutic benefits of the rural environment and safe access to outdoor space, these are not mentioned as requirements by the professionals in the documentation submitted. In relation to the

need for stability and consistency, in my view moving from the current address would not aid this in the short term.

- 7.2.4. I note that in addition to the requirements under Table 5.3 which in my opinion have not been demonstrated, the applicant must meet the requirements of Policy 5-11. The applicant's case is effectively based on Category 2 (Social Need). In relation to the criteria, the applicant is required to first demonstrate a social need to reside in the rural area. It appears that this may exist at least within and around Rathdowney, as stated by the applicant in the appeal. No requirement to reside in this particular (the) rural area is demonstrated.
- 7.2.5. The applicant is required to have never owned a house in the open countryside which is the case given the house he owns is within the urban settlement of Rathdowney. However, the applicant is also required to meet the other criteria which includes having resided in the area for 10 years which, as noted above, has not been demonstrated. Accordingly, based on this I am not satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated compliance with the criteria under Policy 5-11 of the CDP as required.
- 7.2.6. Based on the above, the case for the principle of a rural dwelling or for the two mobile homes on a temporary basis at the subject location has not been demonstrated. Based on the this I concur with the P.A. reason for refusal. The proposed development would therefore lead to demands for the uneconomic and provision of public services and communal facilities in the area and would constitute an unsustainable form of rural development contrary to policy.
- 7.2.7. This is notwithstanding the previous two decisions to grant permission for dwellings at this site, the most recent of which was in August 2008 which was never implemented. I do not consider these precedents to be applicable as they were assessed under previous Development Plans and I am required to assess the proposed development on its merits on the basis of current applicable CDP policy.
- 7.2.8. I also note that the appeal has asserted that technical policy should not be prioritised over the welfare of a child and family stability. In my opinion it is not open to me to over-ride CDP policy based on the applicable policies and objectives as written or based on the totality of the CDP including the core strategy and rural settlement policies.

7.3. Design

- 7.3.1. In relation to the design of the dwelling, noting its size and scale, including dormer rear and front facing gable wings, with simple form consistent with rural housing typologies, I consider that it would integrate with the site and the surroundings, particularly given the setback of over 31.5m from the roadside. In my opinion, given the separation distances and scale, it and the garage, would not give to rise undue negative visual impact or overshadowing, overbearing or overlooking of adjacent properties and in design terms I consider the dwelling to be acceptable subject to standard condition in relation to the agreement of detailed external finishes.
- 7.3.2. However, I note the site encompasses part of the adjacent site to the north (rear side) where permission was granted for a dwelling under reg. ref. 2360043. Based on this, similar to the P.A., I consider that further information is required in relation to this issue such that a grant of permission is precluded without clarification.
- 7.3.3. In relation to the two mobile homes to be retained on a temporary basis, having visited the site, notwithstanding their relatively modest scale, in my opinion they are not consistent with rural housing typologies and do not visually integrate with the site and surroundings and have been on the site for some time. I note no specified time period, other than “on a temporary basis” for retention is included in the application documentation.

7.4. Wastewater Treatment – New Issue

- 7.4.1. I note the submitted Site Suitability Assessment report prepared by Liam Judge Associates Ltd. I note that per the Site Characterisation Form the aquifer category is locally important with a high vulnerability noted. I note the trial hole depth is 2.0m with the depth from the ground surface to the water table noted to be 0.9m. I note the rock type is limestone. Per the results from the percolation tests, I note the surface percolation test result was 38 and the sub-surface percolation test result was 49. The groundwater protection response is noted to be R1.
- 7.4.2. Based on this, a secondary treatment system and soil polishing filter was recommended. The report noted that the existing ground for the percolation area will need to be raised by 450mm with imported tested suitable gravelly soil and the invert of the infiltration stones required to be positioned at the new level.

- 7.4.3. I note that per Table 6.3 of the EPA Code that the results of the Site Characterisation Form and the measures proposed are consistent for the R1 groundwater protection response. Per Table 6.4, I note that the percolation values observed on the site are suitable for the proposed secondary treatment system and soil polishing filter. I note that per Table 6.2 it is not clear that the minimum required separation distances would be achieved in relation to the permitted adjacent dwelling and its percolation area. I note that the subject site area appears to encompass part of the adjacent site for the permitted dwelling.
- 7.4.4. I also note that the Site Characterisation Form refers to the proposed development of a new dwelling with 5 bedrooms and does not include any reference to or provision for the mobile homes on the site. I draw the attention of the Commission to the absence of proposals for wastewater treatment for the mobile homes for retention on the site.
- 7.4.5. If a grant of permission is to be contemplated, I consider that this issue would first need to be clarified by the applicant. I therefore consider that it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would comply with the EPA Code and with Policy 15-2 of the CDP. I note the site location c.11.1km from the nearest European site such that I have no concerns in relation to impact on same (See AA Screening below). I consider this to be a new issue and the Commission may wish to seek the views of the parties. However, having regard to the substantive reason for refusal set out below, it may not be considered necessary to pursue the matter.

7.5. Other Issues

- 7.5.1. In relation to the proposed vehicular access from the R433, I note that the required 160m sightlines have been demonstrated and that the Planner's Report had no issue in this regard.
- 7.5.2. In relation to drainage, given the site size and layout I note no significant issues that cannot be dealt with by condition should permission be granted. I note water connection is available via the public mains. Should permission be granted I recommend a condition to require a connection agreement be submitted to the public mains prior to commencement of development.

8.0 EIA Screening

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

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located c. 11.1km from the Galmoy Fen Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (site code 001858), the closest European site. The proposed development comprises a dwelling, retention of two mobile homes and on-site wastewater treatment system. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.2. 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 relatively small-scale nature of the development.
 - The distance from the nearest European site and lack of ecological connections thereto.
 - Taking into account the screening determination by the P.A..
- 9.3. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
- 9.4. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. I note designated waterbodies must be improved to at least good ecological status per the requirements of the Water Framework Directive. I have carried out a screening assessment in Appendix 3 in relation to impacts related to the requirements of the Water Framework Directive. I note the proximity of the Clonmore Stream (Suir)_010 (IE_SE_16C111000) (status “poor”) and the Templemore (IE_SE_G_131) ground waterbody (status “good”).
- 10.2. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The small scale and domestic nature of the development with compliance noted with the EPA Code in relation to separation distances from water courses and noting that the site characterisation tests indicate that the site is suitable for on-site treatment and disposal.
 - The distance from the nearest surface water bodies and the absence of direct surface water hydrological pathways to the surface waterbodies.
- 10.3. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardize any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission is refused for the below reason.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The proposed development is located in an area identified in the Tipperary County Development Plan 2022-2028 as being under urban influence for development. Having regard to the information submitted to the planning authority, and to An Coimisiún at appeal stage, it has not been demonstrated that the requirements of the Development Plan in relation to rural housing need set out in Section 5.5.2, Table 5.3 and Policy 5-11 of Volume 1 of the Development Plan, areas are met. It is considered therefore that the proposed development would, if granted permission, lead to demands for the uneconomic and provision of public services and communal facilities in the area and would constitute an unsustainable form of rural development contrary to policy. The proposed development would, therefore, contravene Table 5.2 and Policy 5-11 of the Development Plan and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

Ciarán Daly
Planning Inspector

17th December 2025

Appendix 1

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-323697-25
Proposed Development Summary	Retention for the existing mobile homes on site along with hard-standing and access road. Permission to construct a dwelling house with all associated site works.
Development Address	Dromard Beg, Clonmore, Templemore, Co. Tipperary.
	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 type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

<p>development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	<p>Part 2, Class 10(b)(i). Threshold: Construction of more than 500 dwelling units.</p>

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

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 2

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ACP-323697-25
Proposed Development Summary	Retention for the existing mobile homes on site along with hard-standing and access road. Permission to construct a dwelling house with all associated site works.
Development Address	Dromard Beg, Clonmore, Templemore, Co. Tipperary.
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 (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed. New dwelling (266.4sqm.), two mobile homes of total floor area 74.9sqm. On site wastewater treatment system not to EPA Code and connection to public water mains. Site area 0.46ha.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed The site is a significant distance from sensitive designated sites and there are no sites of social or cultural interest in the vicinity.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects. Modest scale, domestic nature and failure to demonstrate wastewater treatment system to EPA Code such that pollution impacts could arise from the operational phase of development. However, I do not consider the scale of such potential pollution relative to

	the EIA the screening threshold (500 no. dwellings) to be significant either individually or cumulatively.
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: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix 3

Water Framework Directive Screening and Assessment

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING			
<p>Step 1: The proposed development is for the retention of the two existing mobile homes on site along with hard-standing and access road. Permission to construct a dwelling house with all associated site works.</p> <p>Site Area 0.46ha</p> <p>New dwelling (266.4sqm.), two mobile homes of total floor area 74.9sqm. The site is within a serviced urban area for water provision but not for wastewater treatment services.</p> <p>There are no surface water bodies running through the site. The subject site is located c.80m south-west of the Clonmore Stream (Suir)_010 (IE_SE_16C111000) (status “poor”) and is above the Templemore (IE_SE_G_131) ground waterbody (status “good”).</p>			
An Bord Pleanála ref. no.	ACP-323697-25	Townland, address	Dromard Beg, Clonmore, Templemore, Co. Tipperary.
Description of project		The proposed development consists of the retention of the two existing mobile homes on site along with hard-standing and access road and permission to construct a dwelling house with all associated site works.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		The site is mainly flat and while mainly in grass. The site is otherwise surrounded by grassland fields being in a rural area.	

	The proposed rural development would be located c.80 south of the nearest surface water body and would be above a ground water body as noted above.					
Proposed surface water details	The site is not located close to a flood risk zone and a stormwater soakaway is proposed to the rear of the dwelling although I note pluvial risk to part of the site is identified in the Planner's Report.					
Proposed water supply source & available capacity	Public network with no pre-connection agreement supplied.					
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues	On-site wastewater treatment system proposed with soil polishing filter.					
Others?						
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	Identified pressures on	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)

				risk, review, not at risk	that water body	
River Waterbody	c.80m to the north-west, with intervening field between it and the site.	Clonmore Stream (Suir)_010 (IE_SE_16C111000)	Poor.	At risk.	No pressures.	Potentially via surface run-off and groundwater.
Groundwater Waterbody	Underlying site	Templemore (IE_SE_G_131) ground waterbody (status "good")	Good	At risk.	No pressures.	Surface run-off and wastewater treatment output to groundwater.

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	Waterbody receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.
1.	Surface	Clonmore Stream (Suir)_010 (IE_SE_16C11 1000)	Potential link via groundwater.	Siltation, pH (Concrete), hydrocarbon spillages.	Standard construction practice measures can be conditioned.	No, best practice construction measures, significant distance and intervening lands between site and surface waterbody	Screened out
2.	Ground	Templemore (IE_SE_G_13	Pathway exists	Spillages.	As above	No, best practice construction measures.	Screened out

		1) ground waterbody					
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
3.	Surface	Clonmore Stream (Suir)_010 (IE_SE_16C11 1000)	Potential link via groundwater.	While surface water drainage could be contained within the site, potential for untreated wastewater may enter the groundwater and pass to the river as wastewater treatment has not been demonstrated to EPA Code.	Potential link could give rise to risk.	Yes	Screened in
4.	Ground	Templemore (IE_SE_G_13 1) ground	Pathway exists	Potential link to water body via wastewater	Potential link could	Yes	Screened in

		waterbody (status “good”)		output draining to ground. Wastewater treatment has not been demonstrated to EPA Code.	give rise to risk.		
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
5.	N/A						
STAGE 2: ASSESSMENT							
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	<u>Objective 2 :</u> <u>Groundwater</u> Protect, enhance and restore all bodies of groundwater, ensure	<u>Objective 3:Groundwater</u>			Does this component comply with WFD Objectives 1, 2, 3 & 4? (if answer is no, a	

	of the status of all bodies of groundwater	a balance between abstraction and recharge, with the aim of achieving good status*	Reverse any significant and sustained upward trend in the concentration of any pollutant resulting from the impact of human activity	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:	

Development Activity 3: Operation phase, surface water	Use of SUDS measures sufficient for surface water drainage however on-site wastewater treatment system not demonstrated to comply with EPA Code.	On-site wastewater treatment system to EPA Code. While this has not been demonstrated, subject to compliance with the code given that the site characterisation tests indicate that the site is	On-site wastewater treatment system complies with EPA Code in relation to separation distances from water courses.	Yes
--	--	--	--	------------

		<p>suitable for on-site treatment and disposal with no issues noted in relation to separation distances from watercourses, I am satisfied that this would mitigate effects on the groundwater.</p>		
<p>Development Activity</p> <p>4: Operation phase, groundwater</p>	<p>Use of SUDS measures sufficient for surface water drainage however on-site wastewater treatment system not demonstrated to comply with EPA Code.</p>	<p>On-site wastewater treatment system to EPA Code.</p> <p>While this has not been demonstrated, given that the site characterisation tests indicate that the site is suitable for on-site treatment and disposal with no issues noted in relation to</p>	<p>On-site wastewater treatment system complies with EPA Code in relation to separation distances from water courses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

		separation distances from watercourses, I am satisfied that this would mitigate effects on the groundwater subject to compliance with the EPA code.		
--	--	---	--	--