



Development	Extension to domestic shed
Location	Killinure North Td., Glasson, Co. Westmeath
Planning Authority	Westmeath County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	25/60520
Applicant(s)	Stephanie McCann
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission with Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Brendan & Una Donoghue
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	10 th April 2026
Inspector	Philip Maguire

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction	3
2.0	Site Location and Description	3
3.0	Proposed Development.....	3
4.0	Planning Authority Decision	4
5.0	Planning History.....	5
6.0	Policy Context.....	6
7.0	EIA Screening.....	8
8.0	The Appeal	8
9.0	Assessment	10
10.0	AA Screening.....	14
11.0	Water Framework Directive.....	15
12.0	Recommendation.....	15
13.0	Reasons and Considerations	15
14.0	Conditions.....	15
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	17
	Appendix 2: WFD Screening	19

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. This case relates to an appeal by B. & U. Donoghue under the provisions of Section 37 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended ('the Act'), following a grant of permission by Westmeath Co. Co. in accordance with Section 34 of the Act.
- 1.2. This Inspector's Report (IR) and recommendation is made pursuant to Section 146(2) of the Act. The Commission is required to consider both before determining the case.

2.0 Site Location and Description

- 2.1. Situated near the banks of Lough Ree, to the north of local road L5468, the appeal site is located in the townland of Killinure North, c. 3.5km northwest of Glasson village in southwest Co. Westmeath. The site is accessed via a private laneway which runs perpendicular to the public road and serves a farmhouse and outbuildings to the north of the appeal site. The lane also serves a new house under construction opposite the site. The surrounding area is characterised by farmland and dispersed rural housing.
- 2.2. The appeal site has a stated area of 0.22ha and is irregular shaped. It is located to the northern end of a rectangular shaped field, some 185m from the road edge. The site consists of a two-storey house and garage attached via a car port. It is defined by a timber post and rail fence save for a section of the eastern boundary which is open to the adjoining laneway. There is a meadow-style garden area to the front of the house, a small private area to the rear and a belt of mature trees as a backdrop beyond.

3.0 Proposed Development

- 3.1. Planning permission is sought for an extension to a domestic shed etc.
- 3.2. The proposed development is described in the statutory notices as:

"...to construct extension to existing domestic shed and associated works."
- 3.3. The application documents include an Architectural Design Statement (Brendan McGettigan & Associates, October 2025). It provides a design rationale, stating that the proposal will compliment the existing building forming a discrete seamless addition.
- 3.4. The planning application form indicates that the gross floor space of the proposed works would amount to 36sq.m with existing floor spaces indicated as 298sq.m.

4.0 Planning Authority Decision

4.1. Decision

4.1.1. Permission was granted on 16th December 2025 subject to 3 no. conditions, including:

Condition 2 garage/storage area shall not be used for human habitation, or any commercial activity or for any other purpose than a purpose incidental to the domestic and private enjoyment of the dwelling.

4.2. Planning Authority Reports

4.2.1. The Planner's Report (11/12/25) can be summarised as follows:

Assessment

- Proposed extension would result in a total floor area of c. 85-90sq.m, mirroring the established form and sitting comfortably within the layout and established curtilage.
- Proposed extension is subordinate to, and visually integrated with the existing buildings and does not give rise to overlooking, overshadowing or encroachment.
- Proposal represents a modest enlargement and is not expected to materially affect residential amenity or give rise to undue visual impact or affect the landscape.
- States that a Visual Impact Assessment is not required for a development of this nature and access arrangements along the private laneway are unchanged.
- States that the request for further information (FI) regarding access is outside the scope of the subject proposal, adding that it will not give rise to an intensification.
- Notes, however, that Condition 8 of the parent permission (PA ref. 14/7052) in relation to the provision of sightlines does not appear to have been complied with.

Appropriate Assessment

- Considers that the proposal, on its own or in combination with other projects would not have any impact on any European sites, including Lough Ree SAC and SPA.

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Determination

- Excludes the need for EIA at preliminary examination stage.

4.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- District Engineer (03/12/25) FI requested:

Not satisfied with the available sightlines – details to be provided as per Section 16.3.7 of the Plan.

4.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

4.4. Third Party Observations

4.4.1. The planning authority received 1 no. observation. Issues raised reflect third-party appeal grounds. Concerns, as summarised from the Planner's Report, relate to:

- Impact on residential amenity / landscape – obstruction of established lake views.
- Impact on visual amenity and landscape character of the lakeshore.
- Lack of integration and visually obtrusive.
- Scale and positioning of shed – leading to possible traffic hazard.
- Proposal would set an undesirable precedent along the lakeshore.
- Alleged non-compliance with sightlines and landscaping (PA ref. 14/7052).

5.0 Planning History

5.1. Appeal Site

5.1.1. PA ref. 14/7052 – in January 2015, the planning authority granted permission for a two-storey dwellinghouse with garage and associated treatment system (DWWTS) etc. Condition 3 requires the setting back of hedgerow and submission of a landscape plan. Condition 8 (i) requires sightlines of 2.4 by 90m prior to first occupation of the house.

5.2. Surrounding Area

5.2.1. PA ref. 22/129 – in September 2022, the planning authority granted permission for a single-storey dwelling with garage and DWWTS etc. opposite the appeal site. Condition 8 (a) requires sightlines of 2.4 by 90m prior to first occupation of the house.

6.0 Policy Context

6.1. Local Planning Policy

Westmeath County Development Plan 2021-2027

- 6.1.1. The Westmeath County Development Plan 2021-2027 came into effect on 3rd May 2021. The Plan was subject to a Ministerial Direction in September 2022 and Variation No. 1 in January 2026. The decision was made under the provisions of this Plan.
- 6.1.2. The Development Plan does not include a zoning objective for the application site.
- 6.1.3. The main policy objectives relevant to the proposal are set out under chapters 13 (Landscape and Lake Amenities) and 16 (Development Management Standards).
- 6.1.4. The following sections are also relevant:
- 13.9 – Character Area 6 Lough Ree / Shannon Corridor
 - 13.18 – Areas of High Amenity (High Landscape Value)
 - 13.19 – Lake Amenities
 - 13.20 – Lough Ree
 - 13.26 – Views and Prospects (Appendix 5)
 - 16.3.5 – Other Residential Development Types
 - 16.3.7 – Rural Housing
- 6.1.5. The following policy objectives are generally noted.
- | | |
|-----------|--|
| CPO 13.8 | Seeks to protect the landscapes and natural environments of the county and proposals unduly impacting such landscapes will not be permitted. |
| CPO 13.12 | Requires a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for proposals with potential to impact on significant landscape features in the county. |
| CPO 13.20 | Seeks to protect High Amenity areas from inappropriate development and reinforce their character, distinctiveness and sense of place. |
| CPO 13.30 | Seeks to protect the scenic quality of lakes from any inappropriate development between public roads and lakeshores that would interrupt a view of the lake or adversely affect its setting or wildlife habitat. |

- CPO 13.37 Seeks to maintain and preserve the aesthetic value of Lough Ree and its shoreline from inappropriate dispersed, highly visible development.
- CPO 13.81 Seeks to protect and sustain the established appearance and character of views listed in Appendix 5 from inappropriate development.
- CPO 16.27 Relates to alterations and extensions to existing dwellings:
- Extensions and/or alterations should respect the main dwelling.
 - Where contemporary designs are proposed, proposals should not detract from the visual amenities of the main dwelling or neighbouring properties.
 - Extension works should not encroach, oversail or otherwise physically impinge third party properties.
 - Proposals should be designed in such a way as to eliminate overshadowing or overlooking of adjoining property.
- CPO 16.33 Includes access and sightline criteria:
- Safe unobstructed sight distances should be provided and maintained thereafter from vehicular entrances onto the road network – Local Roads: 90 metres (subject to the discretion of the Planning Authority where a lesser distance is demonstrably adequate in terms of traffic safety).
- CPO 16.34 Relates to garages, sheds and stores:
- The design, form and materials should be ancillary to, and consistent with the main dwelling on site.
 - Structures should generally be detached and sited to the rear of the dwelling and be visually subservient in terms of size, scale and bulk.
 - Storage facilities should be used solely for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling and not for any commercial, manufacturing, industrial use or habitable space in the absence of prior planning consent for such use.

6.2. National Planning Policy / Guidelines / Guidance

Development Management Guidelines

- 6.2.1. Section 7.8 of the Development Management Guidelines (DEHLG, 2007) states that it is inappropriate in development management to deal with matters which are the subject of other controls, albeit in the context of other statutory codes / legislation.
- 6.2.2. Section 10.1 of the Guidelines notes that the enforcement of planning control is the responsibility of the planning authority and this is the case, of course, whether the planning decision, including conditions, was made by the Council or the Commission.

Geometric Design of Junctions (DN-GEO-03060) (TII, May 2023)

- 6.2.3. Guidance relating to the geometric design of junctions including direct accesses is set out in this TII publication. Table 5.4 details the X-distances on the minor road for visibility measurements and Table 5.5 details the required Y-distances on such roads.

6.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- 6.3.1. Nearest designated areas:
- Lough Ree pNHA (000440) – c. 0.2km west
 - Lough Ree SAC (000440) – c. 0.2km west
 - Lough Ree SPA (004064) – 0.21km west

7.0 EIA Screening

- 7.1. The proposed development is not a class of development set out in Schedule 5, Part 1 or Part 2 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended ('the Regulations'), and therefore no preliminary examination is required (see Appendix 1).

8.0 The Appeal

8.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 8.1.1. A third-party appeal has been lodged by Brendan & Una Donoghue. The appeal grounds reflect the observations made to the Council and are summarised as follows:
- Proposal would result in significant and permanent obstruction of existing lake view.

- Scale, height and positioning of the proposed structure would substantially diminish the visual amenity of appellant's dwelling and surrounding area.
- Proposal would negatively alter the visual character of the lakeshore by introducing a structure that is out of scale with the surrounding built form, contrary to the principles of protecting scenic views and sensitive landscapes as per the Plan.
- Proposal is inconsistent with the requirement to integrate with existing topography and notes that a Visual Impact Assessment has not been submitted, adding that the drawings do not sufficiently demonstrate how the impacts are mitigated.
- Overall area of 85-90sq.m far exceeds what is acceptable under local guidelines.
- Doors on east elevation may impede access by other users of the lane.
- Proposal may set an undesirable precedent for additional development along the lakeshore, leading to cumulative degradation of the area's visual quality.
- Access under PA ref. 14/7052 was never completed and the entrance currently provides no safe sightlines, nor has the applicant provided the landscaping.

8.2. Applicant Response

8.2.1. Brendan McGettigan & Associates responded on behalf of the applicant, Stephanie McCann. It can be summarised as follows:

- States that the living areas of the appellant's house are to the rear and thus views are not obstructed as stated.
- Rejects the suggestion the proposal is out of scale with the surrounding built form.
- Proposal is totally consistent with the scale of the existing shed and is subservient to the scale of the existing house and thus no significant impacts arise.
- States that there are no limits on the size of domestic sheds provided it is ancillary to the house, adding that side doors can open inwards without oversailing the lane.
- Since supposed intrusiveness is not the case, concerns of precedent do not arise.
- Non-compliance with the original consent will be rectified.

8.3. Planning Authority Response

None.

9.0 Assessment

9.1. Preliminary Points

9.1.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on the appeal file, including the appeal submissions and observations, and inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local, regional and national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal.

9.1.2. The issues can be addressed under the following headings:

- Amenity Impacts
- Other Issues

9.2. Amenity Impacts

9.2.1. As noted, the appellants submit that the proposal would obstruct an existing lake view and by virtue of its scale, height and positioning they suggest that it would substantially diminish the visual amenity of the appellant's house and the wider surrounding area. They also suggest that the overall garage would exceed what is acceptable locally.

9.2.2. The applicant, on the other hand, states that the proposal is consistent with the scale of the existing shed and is subservient to the scale of the existing house and thus no significant amenity impacts arise, adding there are no size limits on domestic sheds.

9.2.3. The appellant's submission raises both visual and residential amenity impact concerns, however it is important to note at the outset that their dwelling, as permitted in September 2022 (ref. 22/129), is under construction (near wall plate level) and yet to be occupied. This, in my opinion, raises some questions as to the exact magnitude of the impacts, as currently experienced by them, in light of the development as proposed. Simply put, the appellants have outlined perceived impacts and such impacts, in my opinion, would be difficult to quantify in the absence of their residence at this location.

9.2.4. This is considered further under 'other issues' below but sets the amenity context here.

Visual Amenity

9.2.5. The existing shed is attached to the house by a covered car port and gabled towards the public road, albeit some 175 metres from the road edge. It has a footprint of 4.5

metres by 11 metres and ridge height of 4.85 metres above finished floor level (FFL). It includes a W.C., a boiler room, a single continuous space and external covered area.

- 9.2.6. It is proposed to extend the existing shed in a northerly direction from the rear gable. The proposed footprint is 4.5 metres by 10 metres and it will tie into the existing ridge at 4.85 metres above FFL. I note that the existing side opens to the covered external area would be repurposed as external pedestrian doors and the covered area would be relocated to the new gable end which also includes a pedestrian door. The new extension would include new windows and timber shed door openings on both the main elevations. The doors on the laneway elevation appear inward opening whereas they are outward opening on the opposite elevation to the rear of the house. A pair of roof light windows are shown on the western roof slope. Internally, the extended area is shown as a continuous single space but not connected internally to the existing shed.
- 9.2.7. The proposed floor space is stated as 36sq.m but this includes the covered external area. Thus, the extension would provide a similar floor space to the existing shed with identical ridge height and external finishes. It would integrate sufficiently with the existing built form and be unappreciable from a visual amenity perspective given its location to the rear of the house and existing shed. I also consider that views from Lough Ree would largely be covered by the western elevation of the existing house.
- 9.2.8. In this regard, I am satisfied that the proposal, and indeed the overall shed, respects the main dwelling and does not detract from the visual amenities of the main dwelling or neighbouring properties in accordance with CPO 16.27. Moreover, the resultant shed will remain visually subservient in terms of size, scale and bulk as per CPO 16.34.
- 9.2.9. Whilst the appellants also submit that the proposed development fails to integrate with the existing topography and refer to a lack of visual impact assessment (LVIA) in this regard; this is clearly unsupported by the facts as they appear on the ground. Notwithstanding the location of the appeal site near the banks of Lough Ree and within an Area of High Amenity where stringent policy tests apply, I do not agree that the proposed extension, which is of limited scale and form and benefits from an established treeline to the rear, would detract from the scenic quality of the lakes or wider area. I thus consider the proposal fully consistent with CPO 13.8, CPO 13.20 and CPO 13.37.
- 9.2.10. For clarity, CPO 13.12 requires the submission of an LVIA for proposals with potential to impact on significant landscape features in the county. To reiterate, the proposal

relates to a respectfully proportioned extension to a modestly scaled domestic shed which lends itself to the architectural balance of the house. There is no potential, in my view, to impact on significant landscape features in the area, including Lough Ree.

9.2.11. Finally in terms of visual amenity, I note that the nearest protected view, as detailed in Appendix 5 of the Development Plan, is of Lough Ree from Carnakill pier and Portlick Forest Walk, c. 0.50km west of the appeal site. This view, however, is in a south-south-westerly direction and there are no other relevant views in proximity to, or in the direction of, the appeal site. The proposal is consistent with CPO 13.81 in this regard.

Residential Amenity

9.2.12. The nearest occupied dwelling, the applicant's family home (as per the appellant's submission), is located c. 155 metres to the southeast. There is a farmhouse c. 130 metres north of the appeal site, and accessed via the same laneway, but it appeared unoccupied at the time of my site visit. Other residential properties are significantly removed from the site save for the appellant's which, as noted, is under construction.

9.2.13. In the absence of any identified visual amenity impacts, I am fully satisfied that there are no indirect or associated residential amenity impacts due to adverse visual effect.

9.2.14. Moreover, the proposed shed would be c. 30 metres from the nearest point of the appellant's house, when completed, with the latter elevated above the proposed FFL. Thus, no issues of overshadowing or overlooking would arise and in this regard, the proposal is fully consistent with CPO 16.27 insofar as it relates to adjoining property.

9.2.15. In terms of residential amenity, I note that Condition 2 of the planning authority decision ensures that the shed's use is incidental to the dwelling and I recommend that a similar condition be applied if the Commission are minded to grant permission. This would ensure compliance with CPO 16.34 insofar as it relates to the use of such structures.

Conclusion on Amenity Impacts

9.2.16. There is evidently no amenity issues arising from the proposed development, from either a visual or residential perspective and thus there is no risk of an undesirable precedent being set to the extent that it would degrade the visual quality of the area.

9.2.17. On this basis, I recommend the Council's decision be upheld and permission granted subject to standard finishes and usage conditions in accordance with that decision.

9.3. Other Issues

- 9.3.1. The appellant also raises concerns regarding the timber shed door openings, suggesting they will impact on other lane users and submits that the access permitted under PA ref. 14/7052 was not completed nor was the landscaping scheme provided.

Timber Door Openings

- 9.3.2. As noted above, the timber doors on the laneway elevation appear inward opening whereas they are outward opening on the opposite elevation to the rear of the house. In this regard, the applicant submits that the doors can open inwards without oversailing the laneway. Whilst the Commission may wish to consider conditioning inward opening doors, I do not consider it necessary as oversailing is highly unlikely given the distance to the lane and I note that Condition 1 would prevail, nonetheless.

Non-Compliance with Parent Permission

- 9.3.3. In relation to non-compliance, the applicant states that this will be rectified. Whilst I note the FI requested by the District Engineer, I agree with the Planner's Report that this is outside the scope of the application and is a matter for the planning authority.

Section 138 of the Act

- 9.3.4. Finally, I take this opportunity to remind the Commission that they have the absolute discretion to dismiss an appeal where they are of the opinion that the appeal is vexatious, frivolous or without substance or foundation, or is made with the sole intention of delaying the development etc. A dismissal may also be appropriate where the Commission is satisfied that, in the particular circumstances, the appeal should not be further considered having regard to its nature or any previous relevant permission.

- 9.3.5. As alluded to above, in the absence of the occupation of the appellant's property, which I accept is under construction, there is evidently no residential amenity impacts nor are there any overt visual amenity effects on the immediate or wider area given the set-back from the road edge and location to the rear of the existing shed. In these particular set of circumstances, I consider there is reasonable grounds for dismissal.

Conclusion on Other Issues

- 9.3.6. The above assessment represents my *de novo* consideration of all planning issues material to the proposed development for a small-scale domestic shed extension.

10.0 AA Screening

Screening the need for Appropriate Assessment: Screening Determination (Stage 1, Article 6(3) of Habitats Directive)

I have considered case PL-500572-WH-26 in light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

The proposed development is located to the rear of an existing shed and comprises a minor, 36sq.m, extension thereto.

The closest European sites, part of the Natura 2000 Network, are Lough Ree SAC (000440), c. 200m from the proposed works site, and Lough Ree SPA (004064) which is located c. 210m from the site.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the proposed development 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:

- Small scale and domestic nature of the development;
- The location of the development within an established residential curtilage, distance from European sites and agricultural nature of intervening habitats, absence of ecological pathways to any European site; and
- Taking into account the screening determination of the LPA.

I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

11.0 Water Framework Directive

11.1. A screening for the purposes of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) has also been carried out. On the basis of objective information, I conclude that the proposal 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 waterbody in reaching its WFD objectives. Therefore, it can be excluded from any further assessment (Appendix 2).

12.0 Recommendation

12.1. I recommend that permission be **granted** for the reasons and considerations below.

13.0 Reasons and Considerations

13.1. Having regard to the provisions of the Westmeath County Development Plan 2021-2027, as varied, the location of the proposed development within the curtilage of an existing house, the small scale nature of the proposal in the context of the appeal site and surrounding area, and the prevailing pattern and character of development in this area, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity, would not endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard or impact on public health. The proposal would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

14.0 Conditions

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

Reason: In the interests of clarity.

2. The external finish shall match the existing garage / shed / store in respect of materials and colour unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area.

3. The garage / shed / store shall not be used for human habitation or for commercial purposes or for any purposes other than for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling.

Reason: To protect the residential amenities of the area.

4. Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

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

Philip Maguire

Inspectorate

14th April 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500572-WH-26
Proposed Development Summary	Extension to domestic shed
Development Address	Killinure North Td., Glasson, Co. Westmeath
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	

<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 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>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: WFD Screening

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Coimisiún Pleanála ref.	PL-500572-WH-26	Townland, address	Killinure North Td., Glasson, Co. Westmeath
Description of project	Extension to domestic shed.		
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening	<p>Irregular shaped brownfield site with stated area of 0.22ha.</p> <p>Site consists of two-storey dwelling with garage attached via covered car port.</p> <p>Watercourse (Portlick Stream) some 160 metres to the northwest.</p> <p>Site situated within an established residential curtilage served by proprietary well, DWWTS and surface water soakpit.</p> <p>No other surface water drainage vectors evident i.e., ditches, streams etc.</p>		
Proposed surface water details	'Soakpit' ticked in Section 20 of the Planning Application Form.		
Proposed water supply source & available capacity	'Existing' 'Private Well' ticked in Section 20 of the Planning Application Form.		
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues	'Existing' 'Conventional septic tank system' ticked in Section 20 of the Planning Application Form.		
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 runoff, drainage, groundwater)
Lake Waterbody	c. 285m west	Ree IE_SH_26_750a	Moderate	Not at risk	None identified	No –stormwater discharges to soakpit. No additional DWWTS loading.
River Waterbody	c. 160m northwest	SHANNON (Upper)_110 IE_SH_26S0216 60	Poor	At risk	Ag, HYMO, At	No –stormwater discharges to soakpit. No additional DWWTS loading.
Groundwater Waterbody	Underlying site	Inny IE_SH_G_110	Poor	Not at risk	None identified	Yes – stormwater discharges to soakpit but no additional DWWTS loading.

Step 2: 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.	Ground	Inny IE_SH_G_110	New – via exposed soils i.e., foundation trenches and excavations.	Siltation, pH (Concrete), hydrocarbon spillages.	None - standard construction practice anticipated.	No	Screened out

OPERATIONAL PHASE

1.	Ground	Inny IE_SH_G_110	Existing / new via soakpit.	Siltation, hydrocarbon spillages.	None required – standard SW condition.	No	Screened out
----	--------	---------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	--	----	--------------

DECOMMISSIONING PHASE

1.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

This page is intentionally left blank.