



<b>Development</b>	Retention and completion of extension to dwelling, construction of new wall at entrance to the site, together with all associated site works.
<b>Location</b>	Scor Beg Td, Ballinameen, Co. Roscommon.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Roscommon County Council.
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	2560511.
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Marie Theresa Aslam.
<b>Type of Application</b>	Retention and Permission.
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Refuse Retention and Permission.
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party Normal Planning Appeal.
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Marie Theresa Aslam.
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None.
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	15 <sup>th</sup> April 2026.
<b>Inspector</b>	C. Daly.

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site, of area 0.978ha., consists of a pitched roof detached rural dwelling with an external extension on all four sides, a detached flat roof shed, a hard surface driveway leading from the entrance to the dwelling and over to the side towards the large shed there is a large area of hardstanding in addition to the sizeable hardstanding area in front of the dwelling. There are entrance piers and walls adjacent to the public road and the entrance is over a culverted stream. The site otherwise largely consists of grass cover and rushes and there are telegraph poles traversing the eastern side of the site and the rear area. There is a small number of mature trees towards the front of the site.
- 1.2. The rural site is accessed from local road L-5644 and is c.6km north-west of the village of Elphin. There is a stream adjacent to the local access road.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development, in summary, consists of the retention and completion of the following:
  - Extension to an existing dwelling house.
  - Connection to existing septic tank.
  - Construction of a new wall at entrance to the site.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

Roscommon County Council decided to refuse permission for two reasons which related to (1) the scale, form and design is incongruent and incapable of integrating with the dwelling and has eroded the character of the dwelling and is injurious to the visual amenities of the area and this is contrary to Section 12.8 (House Extensions) of the Development Plan and fails to reflect the rural design guidelines for the county; and (2) there is a lack of evidence to demonstrate the adequacy of the wastewater treatment arrangements.

## 3.2. **Planning Authority Reports**

### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planner's Report assessment noted that permission was refused previously for the retention of the extension and that the subject application is similar although it includes a number of design features requiring completion. The P.A. did not consider that the design features would remediate the extension. It considered that the extension does not respond to the architectural details and design of the dwelling and does not read as subordinate to the dwelling.

It noted that the original dwelling house has been subsumed by the flat roof extension which fails to integrate with the dwelling. It also noted a lack of evidence in relation to the existing wastewater treatment system to determine if it is to the required standard. It therefore recommended permission be refused for the reasons outlined above.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Environment Department: Further information required in relation to existing WWTS including in relation to capacity and type of development.

## 3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

- Uisce Éireann: No report received.

## 3.4. **Third Party Observations**

- None.

## 4.0 **Planning History**

**21/710:** Permission refused by the P.A. to retain extension and changes of design to existing dwelling house and connect to existing waste water treatment system.

Reasons for refusal related to (1) Extension is incapable of integrating with the dwelling on the site by reason of the design, scale and finishes which erode the character of the house and which is injurious to the visual amenities of the area contrary to policy on house extensions; and (2) lack of evidence to demonstrate the adequacy of the wastewater treatment system.

**UDR 2986:** Enforcement case ongoing.

## 5.0 Policy Context

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

#### Chapter 7 – Infrastructure, Transport and Communications

##### Section 7.8 – Water Services

ITC 7.46 *Ensure that private wastewater treatment plants, where permitted, are operated in compliance with EPA’s Code of Practice Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems Serving Single Houses (PE. ≤10) (2009), as may be amended.*

#### Chapter 10 – Natural Heritage

##### Section 10.4 Appropriate Assessment

##### Policy NH 10.9

Ensure that any plan or project that could have a significant adverse impact (either alone or in combination with other plans and projects) upon the conservation objectives of any Natura 2000 Site or would result in the deterioration of any habitat or any species reliant on that habitat will not be permitted unless in exceptional circumstances.

##### Section 10.10 Inland Waterways

Policy NH 10.20 *Protect waterbodies and watercourses from inappropriate development, including rivers, streams, associated undeveloped riparian strips, wetlands and natural floodplains. To this effect, consideration should be given to Inland Fisheries Ireland’s guidance document Planning for Watercourses in the Urban Environment (2020).*

#### Chapter 12 – Development Management Standards

##### Section 12.8 – House Extensions (Urban and Rural)

*Extending existing dwelling houses to meet changing family needs is an acceptable form of development which is viewed positively by the Council. In general terms the extension shall be:*

- *Subordinate to the existing dwelling in its size, unless in exceptional cases, a larger extension compliments the existing dwelling in its design and massing;*
- *Reflect the proportions, detailing and finishes, texture, materials and colour of the existing dwelling, unless a distinctive high quality contemporary and innovatively designed extension is proposed.*
- *Avoid unacceptable loss of private open space.*

*Where an extension increases the potential occupancy of the dwelling, the adequacy of the on-site sewage treatment (in unserviced areas) should be demonstrated in a planning application.*

#### Section 12.12 Wastewater Treatment

Section 12.24 Roads and Transportation includes a sightline standard of 90m in both directions along local roads from a 2.4m setback.

## 5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

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

- c.2.65km east of Ardagh Bog PNHA (site code 001222).
- c.4.5km east of Bella Bridge Bog NHA (site code 000591).
- c.3.6km south-east of Cloonshanville Bog SAC and PNHA (site code 000614).
- c.5km south-east of Cornaveagh Bog NHA (site code 000603).
- c.4.2km south-east of Tullaghan Bog (Roscommon) NHA (site code 001652).
- c.7.4km north-east of Bellanagare Bog SPA (site code 004105).
- c.7.4km north-east of Bellangare Bog SAC and PNHA (site code 000592).
- c.9km south-east of Lough Gara SPA (site code 004048).
- c.9km south-east of Lough Gara PNHA (site code 000587).
- c.12km south-east of Callow Bog SAC (site code 000597).

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of the appeal by Marie Theresa Aslam, the first party, can be summarised as follows:

- The rooms and facilities constructed are for disabled people.
- The completion of the existing pitched roof extension has been shown on the drawings.
- The elevation and fenestration comply with the County Roscommon Rural Design Guidelines contrary to refusal reason no. 1.
- The rear extension does not contain any additional bedrooms so there is no requirement to upgrade the existing septic tank and percolation area which has been inspected and found to be in good working order.
- The main entrance which crosses a culverted stream provide a safe entrance and parking facility with a stone clad new wall in keeping with the development plan guidelines
- A mix of indigenous trees and plants have been planted in the foreground on both sides of the driveway.
- They seek to finish the house in an architecturally acceptable manner.
- The appeal also includes a letter plea for mercy which states that the property is only used for living and the extra rooms are for disability activities and outlines the case made to elected representatives.
- A letter of support from neighbours is submitted.
- A report is enclosed from Sepcon Waste Water Services.
- The appeal requests an oral hearing.

## 6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

No response.

## 6.3. **Observations**

No observations.

## 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/s 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:

- Principle of Development
- Visual and Residential Amenity
- Wastewater Treatment
- Access
- Other Matters

7.2. I note that on the 4th March 2026, the Commission decided not to hold an oral hearing into this case.

### 7.3. **Principle of Development**

7.3.1. I note the proposed development is for an extension to an existing dwelling in a rural area which is not zoned for development. Given the established dwelling on the site, I consider that a residential extension to same is acceptable in principle in use terms and this is subject to the below assessment.

### 7.4. **Visual and Residential Amenity**

7.4.1. I refer the Commission to the plans and elevations submitted. I note the appeal has asserted that there are no significant issues with the design complying with the CDP. I note that an extension of 288sqm has been constructed around the original 100.5sqm pitched roof dwelling. This extension is of limited depth to the front of the dwelling and of greater depth to the sides and the rear where a disabled accessible activity / lounge room is located. There are limited sized window openings on all sides of the new extension. I note the applicant has effectively applied for a residential extension although the floor plans include provision for a disabled accessibility activity / lounge room and there is reference in the appeal to some non-residential type use. I will assess the proposal based on what has been applied for in the application.

7.4.2. I note that a new expanded pitched roof is proposed of somewhat greater depth and for the full width of the front part of the dwelling. I note that there would also be natural stone cladding towards the sides of each end of the front elevation. I note

that Section 12.8 (House Extensions (Urban and Rural)) of the CDP policy on extensions is relevant. Based on this, I do not consider that the extension can be considered subordinate to the existing dwelling as I note it is nearly three times the floor area of the existing dwelling.

- 7.4.3. I note that the proposed elevations read as a significantly larger single storey dwelling that, in my opinion, would not reflect the proportions and other details of the existing dwelling, particularly in relation to its scale, massing and excessively small window treatments. I agree with the P.A. that the original dwelling house has effectively been subsumed by the flat roof extension and other interventions and that, if permitted, the proposed development would set an undesirable precedent for similar development. I consider this to be contrary to Section 12.8 of the CDP and I do not consider that the proposed landscaping scheme for new fruit trees in the front lawn area would significantly lessen my design concerns.
- 7.4.4. I also note the internal design layout whereby the new extension wraps around the old building such that the internal rooms of the dwelling do not have direct window access to the outside either for ventilation, daylight or view purposes. I do not consider this type of arrangement to be indicative of a reasonable standard of residential amenity for the occupants, particularly in relation to the kitchen/dining, living rooms and bedrooms.
- 7.4.5. Overall, I agree with the P.A. that the design of the extension for completion is incongruous as it relates to the original dwelling and the site. In my opinion it has significantly eroded the character of the original dwelling and would fail to assimilate with the original house. I note also a failure to reflect the design guidance of the Roscommon Rural Design Guidelines, for example in relation to avoiding excessive massing due to the excessive width/depth of the front elevation, side and rear elevations and through the absence of windows with appropriate proportions and vertical emphasis. I therefore recommend that permission be refused in relation to this matter.
- 7.4.6. In relation to the new walls and piers at the vehicular entrance, I note the excessive urban appearance of these structures with the use of concrete blocks and nap plaster finish proposed and I note that the stream at the site entrance has been culverted for a length of 57.57m along the site frontage. Having viewed the existing entrance on

the site, I am concerned that it has an excessive urban appearance in a rural setting given the significant length of wall used along part of the site frontage where hedging would be more appropriate. I also note the absence of elevation drawings such that I do not consider it appropriate to grant permission for this element by the use of a split decision.

## 7.5. Wastewater Treatment

- 7.5.1. I note the second refusal reason related to inadequate information provision to demonstrate the adequacy of the private wastewater treatment arrangements for the dwelling. From my site visit, I note the area to the rear of the dwelling in which the septic tank is located is a grass area with a significant number of rushes growing. While I note that no additional bedrooms are proposed, I note the report from the Council's Environment section noted surface water ponding, rushes and saturated soil across the site with a stream observed across the access. This report noted that the signage on the site refers to a community and spiritual centre in Accrington in the UK.
- 7.5.2. The Environment section report noted that the room on the drawings labelled "storage room" was previously labelled as a bedroom in the application under reg. ref. 21/710. It considered the scale of the extension to be compatible with a commercial/community purpose. It considered that the sewage system survey report *"does not provide sufficient information regarding the characteristics, the integrity and the capacity of the Domestic Waste Water Treatment System present on site, as it lacks of both evidence to support the declarations included in the document and details of the type, dimensions, percolation area, loading, testing records and detailed photographs including the dye test"*. The report concluded by requesting F.I. which mainly related to clarifying the number of bedrooms, whether the property is in use as commercial premises for community engagement and further detail in relate to user numbers, hydraulic load and evidence that the existing system is of adequate size and capacity.
- 7.5.3. The appeal states that the rear extension does not contain any additional bedrooms so there is no requirement to upgrade the existing septic tank and percolation area which has been inspected and found to be in good working order. I note that the appeal includes a Sewage System Survey report from Sepcon. This report notes that

the septic tank system was installed in 1980 for a population equivalent of 5. The report notes that the tank needs to be emptied and it noted no distribution box for effluent to flow into the percolation area. In relation to the percolation area it states that its size is unknown. It also answered “N/A” in relation to whether there is a maintenance contract for the system.

- 7.5.4. Having noted the contents of the appeal, I note there is at least a suggestion that the property is not solely used for residential purposes. I note that Section 2.2 of the EPA’s Code of Practice Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (PE. ≤10) (2021) provides that “if retrofitting existing systems that do not comply with this CoP, where the site is unsuitable, the proposed upgrade must provide improved treatment and reduced environmental impact as in many cases site improvement works will not be sufficient to enable the site to be used for a system incorporating discharge to ground”.
- 7.5.5. I note the absence of an explanation of the current use of the extension in the context of the large floor area, parking area and the findings of the Council’s Environment report. I also note that no upgrade of the existing on-site treatment system is proposed and that there is a lack of information in relation to its current adequacy for the existing dwelling including in relation to the size of the percolation area. Noting this and that the ground conditions suggest poor drainage conditions, I agree with the P.A. that there is a lack of information on the file to demonstrate the adequacy of the private wastewater treatment arrangements. In my opinion this constitutes a failure to comply with Section 2.2 of the EPA Code of Practice as it applies to retrofitting existing systems. I therefore consider that the applicant has failed to comply with Policy ITC 7.46 of the CDP and that permission should accordingly be refused in relation to this issue.

## 7.6. **Access**

- 7.6.1. I have noted above my significant concerns in relation to the visual impact of the new entrance walls in the rural setting. In relation to road safety matters, I note that adequate sightlines have not been demonstrated on the submitted drawings for the new entrance arrangement along the local road L-5644. I consider this to be a new issue such that I do not propose to include it as an additional refusal reason. I note

there is also a lack of information provided in relation to the part culverting of the stream for the new entrance area.

## **7.7. Other Matters**

7.7.1. I note the dwelling is served by an existing connection to the public water mains such that I have no concerns in relation to water supply.

7.7.2. In relation to pre-planning (ref. no. 3916) and alleged advice given to the applicants, I note that I have assessed this case de novo on its merits as required and that in any event pre-planning discussions do not in any way bind the P.A. or the Commission in carrying out its functions.

## **8.0 EIA Screening**

8.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Act).

## **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.3.6km south-east of Cloonshanville Bog SAC (site code 000614), the nearest European site.

9.2. The proposed development comprises retention and completion of an extension to a house, connection to septic tank and new roadside entrance wall. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

9.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am not satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could have an effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The distance from the nearest European site and indirect connection thereto via groundwater to surface water channel.

- The failure to demonstrate that the wastewater treatment system would comply with the EPA Code of Practice (2021) for Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (P.E. <10).

- 9.4. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that it cannot be ruled out that the proposed development would have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
- 9.5. Likely significant effects cannot be excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is required. In the absence of the information required to carry out AA, I recommend that permission be refused as this would be contrary to Policy NH 10 of the CDP.

## 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 2 in relation to impacts related to the requirements of the Water Framework Directive. Noting that the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the on-site wastewater treatment system complies with the EPA Code, I have concluded that it cannot be ruled out that the proposed development would not pose a risk to surface and ground water bodies in the vicinity.
- 10.2. The Given the proximity of the Carrick on Shannon groundwater body (IE\_SH\_G\_048) (status “good”) and the adjacent Breedoge\_010 river waterbody (IE\_SH\_26B090300) (status “good”), the proposed development may prevent the future maintenance or attainment of a ‘Good’ water status and may result in the deterioration of existing water quality of the ground and surface water bodies which would not be consistent with the Water Framework Directive. Accordingly, this would be contrary to Policy NH 10.20 of the Development Plan and I recommend that permission be refused in relation to this issue.

## 11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that permission be refused.

## 12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028, the proposed development by reason of its scale and massing which would not be subservient to the existing dwelling, the form, proportions, finishes and design arrangement would not reflect the existing dwelling. This would be incongruous by comparison with the existing dwelling and would significantly erode the character of the dwelling and would fail to assimilate with the dwelling and the site. This would be contrary to Section 12.8 (House Extensions (Urban and Rural)) of the Development Plan and would fail to reflect the design guidance of the Roscommon Rural Design Guidelines and would set an undesirable precedent for other similarly inappropriate development and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. Having regard to the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 and Policy ITC 7.46 thereof, insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate how the existing on-site wastewater treatment system would comply with the EPA's Code of Practice for Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems Single Houses (PE. ≤10) (2021). This would be contrary to Policy NH 10.20 of the Development Plan. It has not been demonstrated that there would be no negative impact on Natura 2000 sites due to water quality impacts contrary to Policy NH 10.9 of the Development Plan. The proposed development therefore has the potential to be prejudicial to public health 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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

---

Ciarán Daly

Planning Inspector

22<sup>nd</sup> April 2026

## Appendix 1

### Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	PL-500633-RN-26
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Retention and completion of house extension, new access wall and connection to wastewater treatment system.
<b>Development Address</b>	Scor Beg Td, Ballinameen, Co. Roscommon.
<b>IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK</b>	
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(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)	

<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	<b>State the Class here</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>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?</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. <b>No Screening required.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. <b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b>	<b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.	<b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b>

<p><b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b></p>	
<p><b>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)?</b></p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><b>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</b></p>
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b></p>

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix 2

<b>WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING</b>			
<b>Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality</b>			
<b>An Bord Pleanála ref. no.</b>	PL-500633-MO-26	<b>Townland, address</b>	Scor Beg Td, Ballinameen, Co. Roscommon.
<b>Description of project</b>		Retention and completion of house extension, new access wall, entrance area and culverting of stream beneath and connection to wastewater treatment system.	
<b>Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,</b>		Relatively flat rural site includes areas of rushes within the grassland.	
<b>Proposed surface water details</b>		Roof water and hard surface water can be drained to a soakage area and discharged to groundwater.	
<b>Proposed water supply source &amp; available capacity</b>		Mains supply.	
<b>Proposed wastewater treatment system &amp; available capacity, other issues</b>		Connection to existing septic tank.	
<b>Others?</b>		Not applicable	

Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection						
Identified water body	Distance to (m)	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)
River Waterbody	Adjacent to site	Breedoge_010 (IE_SH_26B090300) river waterbody	Good	Not at risk.	Wastewater treatments systems, agricultural run-off. Channelisation of waterways and industry run-off from peat, quarrying and forestry.	Possible via groundwater to surface water

Groundwater waterbody	Underlying site	Carrick on Shannon groundwater body (IE_SH_G_048) (status "good") and the adjacent	Good	Not at risk	Agricultural run-off, pathogens from wastewater treatment systems, extract industry run-off such as sedimentation and ammonia, urban pressures such as contaminants from road surfaces.	Possible and slow draining soil conditions.
-----------------------	-----------------	--	------	-------------	---	---

**Step 3: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage.**

**CONSTRUCTION PHASE**

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

1.	Surface	Breedoge_010 (IE_SH_26B090300) river waterbody	Via groundwater	Hydrocarbon Spillages	Standard Construction Measures / Conditions	No	Screened out
2.	Ground	Carrick on Shannon groundwater body (IE_SH_G_048) (status "good")	Drainage	Hydrocarbon Spillages	Standard Construction Measures / Conditions	No	Screened out
<b>OPERATIONAL PHASE</b>							
3.	Surface	Breedoge_010 (IE_SH_26B090300) river waterbody	Via groundwater drainage	Untreated wastewater to ground and on to adjacent surface water body	On-site wastewater treatment system to EPA Code	Yes	Screened in
4.	Ground	Carrick on Shannon groundwater body (IE_SH_G_048) (status "good")	Drainage	Untreated wastewater to ground	On-site wastewater treatment system to EPA Code	Yes	Screened in
<b>DECOMMISSIONING PHASE</b>							

5.	N/A						
<b>STAGE 2: ASSESSMENT</b>							
<b>Details of Mitigation Required to Comply with WFD Objectives – Template</b>							
<b>Groundwater</b>							
<b>Development/Activity</b> e.g. abstraction, outfall, etc.	<b><u>Objective 1: Groundwater</u></b> Prevent or limit the input of pollutants into groundwater and to prevent the deterioration of the status of all bodies of groundwater	<b><u>Objective 2 : Groundwater</u></b> Protect, enhance and restore all bodies of groundwater, ensure a balance between abstraction and recharge, with the aim of achieving good status*	<b><u>Objective 3: Groundwater</u></b> Reverse any significant and sustained upward trend in the concentration of any pollutant resulting from the impact of human activity	<b>Does this component comply with WFD Objectives 1, 2, 3 &amp; 4? (if answer is no, a development cannot proceed without a derogation under art. 4.7)</b>			
	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 1:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 2:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 3:				
Development Activities 3 and 4	On-site wastewater treatment system to EPA Code	On-site wastewater treatment system to EPA Code	On-site wastewater treatment system to EPA Code	No, failure to demonstrate on-site wastewater treatment system to EPA Code			