



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-500225-LK-25

Development	Retention of conversion of agricultural shed to dwelling and associated site works. Construction of waste water treatment plant
Location	Griston East, Ballylanders, Co. Limerick
Planning Authority	Limerick City and County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560855
Applicant(s)	Michael Fitzgerald
Type of Application	Retention
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Retention
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Michael Fitzgerald
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	16th December 2025
Inspector	Clare Clancy

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	5
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	6
3.1. Decision	6
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	6
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	7
3.4. Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History.....	7
5.0 Policy Context.....	7
5.1. Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028 (as varied)	7
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	9
6.0 The Appeal	9
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	9
6.2. Planning Authority Response.....	10
6.3. Observations.....	10
7.0 Assessment.....	10
7.3. Site Suitability for Wastewater Disposal.....	11
7.4. Other Matters	14
8.0 AA Screening.....	15
9.0 EIA Screening.....	16
10.0 WFD Screening	16
11.0 Recommendation	17
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	17

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening 19
Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination 21
WFD – Stage 1 Screening..... 23

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site with a stated area of 0.280 ha, is located in the rural area in the townland of Griston East approx. 1.2 km to the southwest of Ballylanders village. The site comprises of an existing single storey structure that is in use as a dwelling with a shed attached and is setback c. 53 m from the public road. There is an existing access serving the site and an access track leads to the existing dwelling. A mature boundary comprising of trees and hedgerow defines the western boundary and the site is enclosed by a line of trees and hedgerow.
- 1.2. Ground conditions within the site at time of site inspection were noted to be wet and extensive rushes growth was observed throughout the site. There are open drains located along the western boundary of the site adjacent to the access tack, and to the rear of the dwelling.
- 1.3. The general surrounding area is low-lying in nature and grounds levels within the site are marginally lower relative to the public road to the north. The area is characterised as rural with a number of one-off dwellings to the west. To the east and south of the site, the area comprises of extensive forestry and bog land.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises of the following:
 - i. Permission for the construction of a new domestic wastewater treatment system.
 - ii. Retention of the conversion of an agricultural shed to a dwelling, domestic entrance and associated site works.

The following is noted:

- Area of site – 0.280 ha
- Gross floor area to be retained – 23 m²
- Existing connection to Group Water Scheme
- Surface water run-off – Proposed soakaway

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By Order dated 21st October 2025, Limerick City & County Council decided to refuse retention permission for the following reason:

- 1. It is considered that the subsoil, as indicated by tests, is unsuitable for the treatment of effluent, notwithstanding the proposed use of a proprietary wastewater treatment system. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would be contrary to Objective IN O11 of the Limerick development plan (2022-2028), which requires wastewater treatment systems to be in accordance with the EPA's Code of Practice for Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems 2021, would be prejudicial to public health, and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

One planning report forms the basis of the assessment and recommendation. The following is noted:

- The proposal is acceptable in principle as the site is located in a rural area defined as a 'Rural Area Elsewhere' whereby residential development is generally accommodated.
- No objectives raised in regard to the design, siting or scale.
- 90 m sight lines from the existing entrance are acceptable.
- Noted the report of the Environment Section and recommended to refusal on the basis that the grounds conditions on site were unsuitable due to poor percolation qualities.
- It was concluded that Appropriate Assessment and EIA were not required.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Environment Section

- Due to the soil type, the site is not suitable for a wastewater treatment system as effluent will not percolate down through peat and CLAY subsoil.
- Rushes, drains adjacent to the proposed development clearly indicate that the site is unsuitable.
- The plasticity and dilatancy as presented in the site characterisation report does not tally with the known characteristics of CLAY.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None.

4.0 Planning History

Appeal Site

- P.A. Ref. 25/60095 – Permission and retention permission refused for conversion of agricultural shed to dwelling, new wastewater treatment system. The grounds for refusal were in relation to the unsuitability of the site due to poor percolation quality (28th March 2025).

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028 (as varied)

➤ Chapter 4 Housing

- Appeal Site – Located in a rural area designated as ‘Rural Areas Elsewhere’.
- **Objective HO O21 Rural Areas Elsewhere**

It is an objective of the Council that to help stem the decline and strengthen Rural Areas Elsewhere, in general demand for permanent residential

development should be accommodated, subject to meeting normal planning and environmental criteria.

➤ Chapter 6 Environment, Heritage, Landscape and Green Infrastructure

• **Objective EH O16 Septic Tanks and Proprietary Systems**

It is an objective of the Council to ensure that septic tanks/proprietary treatment systems, or other waste water treatment and storage systems which are required as part of a development, comply with the standards set out under EPA 2021¹ etc. and that they are constructed only where site conditions are appropriate. In respect of groundwater, it is a requirement that as part of the required site assessments the local groundwater conditions as identified in the groundwater protection scheme and the River Basin Management Plan 2022-2028² are properly assessed in informing the Groundwater Protection Response.

➤ Chapter 8 Infrastructure

• **Objective IN O11 Private Waste Water Treatment**

It is an objective of the Council to:

Private Waste Water Treatment It is an objective of the Council to:

- a) Promote the changeover from septic tanks to the public foul water collection networks where feasible and to strongly discourage the provision of individual septic tanks and domestic wastewater treatment systems, in order to minimise the risk of groundwater pollution.
- b) Ensure single house wastewater treatment systems in those areas not served by a public foul sewerage system comply with the EPA Code of Practice for Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems 2021 as may be amended or updated.
- c) Require non-domestic wastewater treatment systems in those areas not served by a public foul sewerage system to demonstrate full compliance with EPA Wastewater Treatment Manuals (Treatment Systems for Small Communities, Business, Leisure Centres and Hotels) as maybe amended or updated.

¹ Objective EH O16 specifically states 'EPA 2021 etc', but likely refers to The Environmental Protection Agency Code of Practice Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤10

² It is noted that the correct title is "River Basin Management Plan 2022-2027"

d) Ensure all private wastewater treatment systems shall be located entirely within the site boundary. Under no circumstances shall single domestic treatments units or septic tanks be shared between dwellings.

e) Ensure that private wastewater treatment facilities, where permitted, are operated in compliance with their wastewater discharge license, in order to protect water quality.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

There are no European Sites in the vicinity of the site. The nearest site is the SAC: 000646 - Galtee Mountains SAC which lies approx. 7.65 km to the east. Other sites proximate to the appeal site include the following:

- pNHA: 002035 - Glenacurrane River Valley – 5.86 km to the southeast.
- pNHA: 002087 - Ballynacourty Wood – approx. 6.4 km to the southwest.
- pNHA: 002089 - Ballyroe Hill & Mortlestown Hill – approx. 6.8 km to the southwest.
- pNHA: 000646 - Galtee Mountains – approx. 7.73 km to the east.
- SAC: 002037 - Carrigeenamronety Hill SAC – approx. 8.9 km to the southwest.
- pNHA: 002037 - Carrigeenamronety Hill – approx. 8.9 km to the southwest.
- SAC: 002257 - Moanour Mountain SAC – approx. 9.70 km to the northeast.
- SAC: 002137 - Lower River Suir SAC – approx. 11.9 km to the northeast.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A First Party appeal against the PA's decision to refuse retention permission has been received from Michael Fitzgerald. The grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

- A biocycle wastewater treatment system with a raised bed percolation area to the specification requirement is suggested. Two neighbours have this wastewater treatment system.
- One is a dwelling that the first party built between 2007-2008 and which he sold on his land at Griston East. The dwelling was a 4 bed bungalow with bore well located 7.0 metres from a water course.
- The appeal site is more elevated and has no bore well and is over 250 metres from watercourse.
- The shed was converted to a living space in 2015 and is the applicant's home.
- The second suggestion proposed is to pump wastewater from the dwelling 260 metres from a septic tank to an area on the landholding where the subsoil would be of a different nature and would pass all EPA standards.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

Response received from the PA noted no further comments to make outside of the assessment of the planning application.

6.3. Observations

Department of Housing Local Government & Heritage (02nd January 2026)

- Any works to trees and hedgerows should be undertaken outside of the bird nesting season 1st March to 31st August.
- Any trees proposed for felling suitable for bats require a survey.
- Ground works and wastewater works should ensure no adverse effect on waterbodies flowing to the Lower River Shannon SAC (002165).

7.0 Assessment

Introduction

- 7.1. This is a first party appeal in relation to the Planning Authorities (PA) reason for refusal which relates to the suitability of the site to safely and adequately dispose of effluent

arising from the existing development, which is in use as a dwelling. The development proposal comprises of two elements, retention permission for the existing development i.e. change of use from shed to dwelling, and permission for a new wastewater treatment system to serve the existing dwelling as described in Section 2.0 above. Given that the site is located outside of an area of special control, I note that the applicant was not required to demonstrate a local housing need in accordance with Objective HO O20 of the Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028. The PA was otherwise satisfied that the principle of the proposed development to retain the change of use from a shed to a dwelling was acceptable, subject to all other planning criteria being met. In this regard, I note that no objection was raised to the design and siting of the development. The use of the existing entrance was acceptable, and sightlines of 90 m were deemed to be achievable in both directions. However, the PA overall refused permission on effluent disposal. Having regard to the foregoing and having regard to my site inspection, I am satisfied that the proposed means of access is acceptable in terms of adequate sightlines and that the siting, design and scale of the existing development is acceptable. Notwithstanding, I consider that retention permission for the change of use of the existing shed to a dwelling is contingent upon planning consent for the proposed new wastewater treatment system to serve the existing dwelling, which I proposed to address in detail below.

7.2. In this regard, having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submission(s) received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local, regional and national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Site Suitability for Wastewater Disposal
- Other Matters

7.3. **Site Suitability for Wastewater Disposal**

7.3.1. Having regard to the appeal submission, I note that the first party applicant has put forth suggestions to address the PA's grounds for refusal. In this regard, it is suggested that a biocycle wastewater treatment system with a raised bed percolation area for the specification requirement could be provided. The second suggestion relates to a

proposal to pump wastewater from a septic tank to an area within the landholding where subsoil would be of a different nature and would pass the required EPA standards. I note that the area referred to is not identified on any accompanying drawing in the grounds of appeal.

- 7.3.2. Objective EH O16 and Objective IN O11 of the Limerick Development Plan require that where it is proposed to service a rural dwelling with a septic tank / proprietary treatment system or other wastewater treatment and storage system, proposals must comply with the EPA Code of Practice 2021, and are constructed only where site conditions are appropriate. Furthermore, in relation to groundwater, it is a requirement as part of the site assessment, the local groundwater conditions as identified in the groundwater protection scheme and the River Basin Management Plan 2022-2028 are properly assessed in informing the Groundwater Protection Response.
- 7.3.3. I note the reason for refusal of the PA and its assessment, in particular the assessment of the Environment Section.
- 7.3.4. Under the EPA Code of Practice 2021, the trial hole in locally important or poor aquifers, should be excavated to a depth of at least 2.1 m where possible. From the Site Characterisation Form, I note that the underlying aquifer category is indicated as 'Local Important Aquifer' and has a Low vulnerability rating (GSI mapping). The Groundwater Protection Response for this category is R1 (Table E1, Appendix E, EPA Code of Practice 2021).
- 7.3.5. The trial and percolation holes were opened either side of the access track which I note is in a location with a slightly higher ground level than the area in which is it proposed to locate the wastewater treatment system. There is an open drainage ditch running along the western boundary of the site, adjacent to the access track. The depth of the trial hole to bedrock was 2.1 m and the depth to the water table is indicated as >2.1 m. I note that no water ingress was recorded in the Trial hole test. The soil conditions from surface to 0.4 m is indicated as topsoil in 'A' horizon, and below to approx. 1.1 m, the subsoil encountered is described as sandy / gravel soil with a blocky soil structure and compact, brown in colour. Below that, the soil was recorded as clay soil in B horizon to the bottom of the trial hole which is described as firm / stiff and brown in colour.

- 7.3.6. In Section 3.3(a) of the Site Characterisation Report, the sub-surface T_{100} result is recorded at 220.67 which requires Step 5 Modified Method to be conducted. This arises where the T value is >210 minutes. I note that Step 4 Standard Method was carried out which recorded a sub-surface percolation value of 63.42 min/25 mm which deemed that the site was unsuitable for a septic tank. The comments of the site assessor indicate that it may be suitable for some form of a secondary treatment system and tertiary filter. I note however that the Step 5 Modified Method was not carried out.
- 7.3.7. In Section 3.3(b) of the report, I note that Surface Percolation Test for Soil was carried out. In this regard, the average T result was recorded at 207.67 which requires Step 4 Standard Modified Method to be carried out as the recorded T result is less than ≤ 210 minutes. The Step 4 Modified Method carried out recorded a Surface Percolation Value of 63.86 min/ 25 mm. The comments of the site assessor state that the site is suitable for a secondary wastewater treatment system and a tertiary filter.
- 7.3.8. Having regard to the foregoing, the percolation test results for surface is 63.86 and for sub-surface is 63.42. The recommendation based on the results and for a population equivalent (PE) of 4 is the provision of a tertiary treatment system and infiltration / treatment area and discharging to ground water.
- 7.3.9. Having carried out a site inspection and following a spell of dry weather, I observed the open drain on site containing water. The ground conditions on site were wet and there was extensive rushes growth throughout the site which is an indication of impeded drainage and/or elevated water table.
- 7.3.10. Having examined the Site Characterisation Form, concerns arise regarding the T value for sub-surface percolation. I note Step 5 Modified Method was not carried out and should have been based on the recorded T_{100} value. I have further concerns regarding the details of the trial hole log having regard to the photos of the trial hole itself. I am not satisfied that it is representative of what was observed on the ground when the trial hole was opened. The assessment was carried out in summer July 2025. Mottling would appear to be evident high in the soil profile as the photos clearly show clay indicated by smearing observed in the trial hole picture, and mottling observed by grey / orange colouration from approx. 300 mm to the base of the hole. This in my opinion is indicative of impeded drainage within the sub-surface and may correlate with the

water level observed in the open drain along the western boundary of the site. The observed water in the open drain is also an indication of poor drainage within the site and the growth of rushes evident throughout the site would be supported by water being retained in the soil. As a consequence of this, it would be expected to observe mottling in the soil profile of the trial hole. The trial hole log indicates no water ingress or mottling.

- 7.3.11. I note the report of the Environment Section and would concur that clay holds water and does not easily allow water to pass through resulting in poor drainage and as already noted above would correlate with the mottling evident in the photos. Where mottling is evident above 500mm below ground level, the site would usually be deemed unsuitable for discharge to ground as this mottling is taken to be that of the water table or periodic saturation, unless site improvement works can be demonstrated. In this instance they have not.
- 7.3.12. Notwithstanding that the recorded sub-surface and surface values have indicated that the site would be suitable for a tertiary treatment system and infiltration / treatment area, concerns arise in regard to the information presented. T₁₀₀ for the sub-surface test required the testing to proceed to Step 5. This was not carried out and as such, the sub-surface percolation value cannot be relied upon as it does not comply with the EPA 2021 COP prescribed process for percolation testing. Therefore, I am not satisfied that grounds conditions within the site can safely and adequately attenuate & dispose of effluent to groundwater in a manner that would not be prejudicial to public health. Having regard to the foregoing, I conclude that the proposed development would be prejudicial to public health and would contrary to the provisions of Objective EH O16 and Objective IN O11 of the development plan and I recommend refusal on this basis.

7.4. Other Matters

- 7.4.1. The applicant in the grounds of the appeal has put forward options to overcome the reason for refusal. One proposal relates to a biocycle wastewater treatment system with raised bed and percolation area. It is submitted that this wastewater treatment system was used on a site within the applicant's landholding for a dwelling which he built and sold c. 2007-2008. Another example of its use is cited also. In this case, the

point is made that the site was serviced by a bore well and was located 7.0 m from a water course, while the appeal site is at a higher elevation and is located c. 250 m from a water course and serviced by group water scheme.

- 7.4.2. It is further proposed to pump wastewater from the existing dwelling from a septic tank (260 m) to an area within the landholding where it is submitted that subsoil would be of a different nature and would pass EPA standards.
- 7.4.3. In regard to these proposals, i.e. an alternative effluent treatment system and an alternative site, the process of site characterisation is required to be tested separately with its own Site Characterisation Assessment in each case in order to determine if the site is suitable, and if suitable, the type of on-site domestic wastewater treatment system including discharge options that are suitable for the site. I would further note that since the period of 2007-2008, new EPA Code of Practice for domestic wastewater treatment systems are in place since 2021. Therefore, it is a requirement, as set out in Objective EH O16 of the development plan that any such proposals comply with the standards of the EPA Code of Practice 2021. I acknowledge the suggestions of the applicant put forward, however these proposals cannot be considered within the scope of this appeal. The subject appeal has to be considered and assessed on its own merits and on a site-specific basis, having regard to the information presented on the application file, local planning policy and other relevant planning standards. In this regard, the Commission need not consider these proposals.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 8.2. I note the observation of the Department of Housing Local Government & Heritage (02nd January 2026). I note that there are no proposals indicated to fell trees on site.
- 8.3. The appeal site is located in a rural area and is not designated for any conservation purposes. The closest European designated sites are the SAC: 000646 - Galtee Mountains SAC which lies approx. 7.65 km to the east and the SAC: 002037 - Carrigeenamronety Hill SAC – approx. 8.9 km to the southwest. The SAC: 002137 - Lower River Suir SAC lies approx. 11.9 km to the northeast.

- 8.4. The planning authority considered that there was no requirement for appropriate assessment, the project was screened out due to the lack of ecological or hydrological connection between the development site and any European site.
- 8.5. 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 limited scale of the development and lack of impact mechanisms that could significantly affect a European site,
 - Distance from and lack of pathways to European sites,
 - Taking into account the screening determination of the PA.
- 8.6. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (Stage 2) under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) is not required.

I consider that the proposed development, individually or in-combination with other plans or projects, would not be likely to have a significant effect on any European designated site(s). As appropriate assessment is therefore not required.

9.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 appended to 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.

10.0 WFD Screening

- 10.1. The appeal site is a rural area approx. 1.2 km southwest of Ballylanders village.

The nearest water body relative to the appeal site is the Monrningstar River (c. 565 m to the east) MORNINGSTAR_010 (IE_SH_24M020200) and is recorded as 'Good' status and 'Not at Risk'.

The nearest ground water body is Charleville (IE_SH_G_055) and is recorded as at 'Good Status'.

10.2. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal or by the PA in its assessment.

10.3. I have assessed the proposal and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature and scale of the development proposed.
- Distance from the nearest relevant water bodies.

10.4. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission and retention permission is refused for the proposed development.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. In the absence of a full and complete site suitability assessment in accordance with the EPA's Code of Practice for Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems

(PE <10) (EPA 2021), and having regard to ground conditions within the site, the Commission is not satisfied that it has been adequately demonstrated that effluent arising from the subject development can be satisfactorily treated and disposed of on the site in accordance with the EPA's Code of Practice for Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (PE <10) (EPA 2021). Therefore, the proposed development would be at variance with Objective EH O16 (Septic Tanks and Proprietary Systems) and Objective IN O11 Private Waste Water Treatment Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028 (as varied), would be prejudicial to public health and would therefore, 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.

Clare Clancy

17th February 2026

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500225-LK-25
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of conversion of agricultural shed to dwelling and associated site works. Construction of waste water treatment plant
Development Address	Griston East, Ballylanders, Co. Limerick
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 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>Class 10(b) of Part 2, Infrastructure projects, 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>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-500225-LK-25
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of conversion of agricultural shed to dwelling and associated site works. Construction of wastewater treatment plant (wwtp)
Development Address	Griston East, Ballylanders, Co. Limerick
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
<p>Characteristics of proposed development</p> <p>(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).</p>	<p>Development comprises retention of a conversion of shed to a dwelling and construction of a new wwtp.</p> <p>No demolition works are required or the use of substantial natural resources or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance.</p> <p>The development by virtue of its type does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster or is vulnerable to climate change.</p>
<p>Location of development</p> <p>(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).</p>	<p>The development is located in a rural area and is served by a GWS supply. Surrounding land uses are predominantly agricultural, one-off housing and forestry, bog land.</p> <p>Not environmentally sensitive as removed from pNHAs and European sites. Area not designated for the protection of natural heritage, no built heritage/archaeological features.</p> <p>It is not considered that any significant cumulative environmental impacts will result when considered in accumulation with existing developments.</p> <p>There are no identified risks of accidents or disasters, nor is there an obvious risk to human health that results from the proposed development.</p> <p>The proposed development will not give rise to the production of significant waste, emissions or pollutants.</p>
<p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</p> <p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity,</p>	<p>The site is located within a rural environment.</p> <p>Having regard to the modest nature and low impact characteristics of the proposed development, its location which is at a remove from sensitive habitats/features likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects and absence of in combination effects there is no potential for significant effects on the environment.</p>

duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	
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.
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

WFD – Stage 1 Screening

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Comisiún Pleanála ref. no.	PL-500225-LK- 25	Townland, address	Griston East, Ballylanders, Co. Limerick
Description of project	Retention of conversion of agricultural shed to dwelling and associated site works. Construction of wastewater treatment plant		
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,	Existing dwelling and shed, proposed wastewater treatment system		
Proposed surface water details	Proposed soakaway		
Proposed water supply source & available capacity	Existing connection to group water scheme		
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues	Proposed wastewater treatment system		
Others?	Not applicable		