



Inspector's Report

PL-500886-WX-26

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Development | Alterations and extensions to house (Protected Structure WBC0016/ NIAH15500016). Gate into the railing to provide accessible vehicular access and level platform to give accessible level access to two doors serving the dwelling and associated site works. |
| Location | Townparks, Wexford Urban No. 3. |
| Planning Authority | Wexford County Council |
| Planning Authority Reg. Ref. | 20251606W |
| Applicant(s) | Jim McGee and Betty Ahern |
| Type of Application | Permission |
| Planning Authority Decision | Refuse Permission |
| Type of Appeal | First Party |
| Appellant(s) | Jim McGee and Betty Ahern |
| Observer(s) | None |
| Date of Site Inspection | 18 th May 2026 |
| Inspector | Emma Gosnell |

Table of Contents

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| 1.0 | Site Location and Description..... | 3 |
| 2.0 | Proposed Development..... | 4 |
| 3.0 | Planning Authority Decision | 4 |
| 4.0 | Planning History | 6 |
| 5.0 | Policy Context | 6 |
| 6.0 | Natural Heritage Designations | 12 |
| 7.0 | EIA Screening | 12 |
| 8.0 | Water Framework Directive Screening..... | 13 |
| 9.0 | The Appeal..... | 13 |
| 10.0 | Assessment..... | 17 |
| 11.0 | Recommendation | 25 |
| 12.0 | Reasons and Considerations | 25 |
| 13.0 | Conditions | 26 |
| Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening and Form 2: EIA Preliminary Examination | | |
| Appendix 2 – AA Screening Determination | | |

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site has a stated area of 0.062ha and comprises of No. 1 Glena Terrace (Protected Structure WCC Ref. WBC0016/ NIAH Ref. 15500016), Spawell Road in the Townparks area which is c. 600m to the north-west of Wexford town centre.
- 1.2. The site forms part of a terrace of eight uniform 3-storey redbrick properties which are considered to be representative of Wexford's late 19th century domestic built heritage. It is adjoined to the east by No. 1A Glena Terrace and is bordered to the immediate west by the setback entrance (Protected Structure WCC Ref. WBC0015/ NIAH Ref. 15500015 comprising of cut granite piers/plinths and cast iron railings) to and single-storey Gate Lodge (Protected Structure WCC Ref. WBC0014/ NIAH Ref. 15500014) serving Clifton House, a detached 3-bay 2-storey house (Protected Structure WCC Ref. WBC0013/ NIAH Ref. 15500013) set on extensive grounds which is also considered to be representative of Wexford's late 19th century domestic built heritage. To the north the site adjoins a large rear garden serving 'Ard Ruadh' a detached residential property accessed off Spawell Close to the south-east.
- 1.3. An expanse of on-street pay and display parking is located to the immediate south of the site along Spawell Road, with the extent of No. 1's frontage (c. 19m) corresponding with parallel parking for approximately 3 no. cars. There is extensive provision for public pay and display parking on the northside of Spawell Road, with more limited provision on its southside.
- 1.4. The property subject of this appeal is in residential use and dates from the late 19th century and comprises of an existing end-of-terrace, three-bay, 3-storey (with 2-storey rear return) rectangular plan redbrick Victorian townhouse with silver-grey granite dressings and 2-storey polygonal front bay windows. It is delineated from the street by box hedging and a cast iron railing on a low redbrick plinth wall which features a pedestrian access on its south-east side. A landscaped garden is provided to the front of the property with an area of decorative gravel and border planting provided on its west side. A patio area finished in paving slabs is provided to the rear (west) side of the structure (accessed via iron railings) and is delineated from the property's rear

garden by a capped redbrick wall. There are 2 no. separate double doors leading from this patio into the property with both featuring stepped access.

- 1.5. The appeal site has recently been the subject of refurbishment works permitted under P.A. Ref. 20240171.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal comprises of the following alterations and extensions to No 1 Glena Terrace (Protected Structure WBC0016/ NIAH15500016):

(a) insertion of new 2.84m wide gate into existing railing fronting Spawell Road in order to provide for accessible vehicular access to property.

(b) Creation of a new 1.8m x 1.8m level platform to rear side of dwelling in order to provide for accessible level access to two existing doors serving the dwelling.

(c) all associated site works.

- 2.2. While not specified in the published development description, the proposed works include the dishing of the public footpath; the regrading of the existing patio area to rear side of dwelling in order to ramp up to height of proposed level platform; and, the creation of in-curtilage parking area to west side of the property.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission refused on 06/02/2026 for 2 no. reasons:

1. *The works to the existing frontage boundary to form the proposed vehicular access would result in a negative impact on the character of protected structure WBC0016 and on the character of the other protected structures adjoining. Furthermore, insufficient details have been submitted on the nature of the works/development to form the level platform as also proposed in the application. As such the proposed development would be contrary to objective BH06 of Volume 1 and Section 7.2 of Volume 2 of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

2. *The proposed vehicular access would result in the loss of two on-street car parking space in a pay and display area of high demand close to Wexford town centre. As such the development would be contrary to Section 6.2.7 of Volume 2 of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

3.2. **Planning Authority Reports**

3.2.1. Planning Reports

1 no. PA report (02/12/2025) formed the basis of the decision.

- *Vehicular Access* – personal circumstances of applicant do not justify negative conservation impact of proposed vehicular access and loss of pay & display car parking. **Refusal Recommended.**
- *Platform* – insufficient information provided on design/ nature of works required.
- *Flood Risk* – site located in Flood Zone C. No risk arises.
- *EIA Screening* – project is sub-threshold for EIA. No EIAR required.
- *AA Screening* – project not likely to have a significant effect on any European site(s) either individually or in combination with other plans or projects.

Report concluded by recommending permission be refused as detailed in Section 3.1.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- *Conservation Officer (27/01/2026)* – recommends refusal on basis of setting of undesirable precedent and impact on the character & special interest of the protected structure.
- *Roads Department (06/01/2026)* – recommends refusal on basis of loss of 2 no. pay and display car parking spaces in an area of high demand.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

No comments received.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

None received.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Appeal Site

P.A. Ref. 20240171 – application by Jim McGee & Betty Ahern for retention for alterations to existing three storey/two storey dwelling (and permission to complete same) at Glena Ville, (being a protected structure WBC0016/NIAH 15500016). Alterations are as follows - replacement of existing windows, removal of modern internal stud partitions and associated works, removal of section of railings to front boundary to allow a temporary site entrance and all associated works, granted on 15/05/2024 subject to 3 no. conditions, including: “2. *The front boundary wall and railings shall be reconstructed within 3 months of the date of this permission using the originally removed materials in accordance with a detailed design and method statement for such (prepared by a suitably qualified person) which has received the prior written agreement of the Planning Authority. Reason: To restore the character of this protected structure and to allow for on-going use of existing on-street parking*”.

Enforcement File No. 0153-2023 - in respect to unauthorised works (removal of section of boundary wall and railing) was closed by PA following the grant of permission under P.A. Ref. 20240171.

P.A. Ref. W0005789 – application by Patrick M. McCarthy for proposed change of use of part of ground floor of existing building from residential accommodation to use as solicitors’ office, together with associated works, granted permission on 22/04/2003 subject to conditions.

P.A. Ref. W0002767 – application by Meyler to convert house into 5 no. flats & owners accommodation granted permission in 1994 (no further information available on planning register due to the age of this file).

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Policy

Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011):

Section 7.15 (Complying with the Building Regulations) - Parts of the Building Regulations which are particularly relevant to works in relation to historic buildings

include...Part M (Access for People with Disabilities)...Alterations, extensions and material changes of use affecting historic buildings may present particular problems, and approaches other than those contained in the TGDs may be appropriate in order to ensure compliance while protecting the character of the building. The difficulties that may arise in the application of the Building Regulations to existing buildings is acknowledged in the preamble to each TGD, where it is stated: *In the case of material alterations or changes of use to existing buildings, the adoption without modification of the guidance in this document may not, in all circumstances, be appropriate. In particular, the adherence to guidance, including codes, standards or technical specifications, intended for application to new work may be unduly restrictive or impracticable. Buildings of architectural or historical interest are especially likely to give rise to such circumstances. In these situations, alternative approaches based on the principles contained in the document may be more relevant and should be considered.*

Section 13.4 (Features within the Curtilage of a Protected Structure or its Attendant Grounds):

Boundary Features

13.4.1 - The features used to define the boundaries of a protected structure can often make an important contribution to the quality and character of the building and the surrounding streetscape or landscape...

Alterations to boundary features

13.4.3 - Proposals to remove or alter boundary features could adversely affect the character of the protected structure and the designed landscape around it. Widening an entrance or altering flanking walls or railings will alter the scale and visual impact of the gate and gate piers... While some minor changes may be granted planning permission, the cumulative effect on the character of the street or area of a series of incremental changes may not be acceptable.

Section 13.7 (Development Within Attendant Grounds):

Car Parking

13.7.8 - Where it is necessary to provide car parking, efforts should be made to minimise its impact by careful design and use of materials. The associated alteration

of boundary features should not be permitted unless the changes are considered not to be damaging to the character of a protected structure or of an ACA and would not result in inappropriate cumulative changes.

Section 17.4 (Means of Escape in Case of Fire) - There may be special requirements for providing means of escape for people with disabilities, which will also have to be considered.

Chapter 18 (Improving Access), Section 18.1 (Introduction):

18.1.1 - In the case of a material alteration, regard must also be had to the need to make adequate provision for access as required by Part M of the Building Regulations 2000.

18.1.2 - Careful consideration will be needed in the context of the architectural heritage, requiring innovative solutions and a degree of compromise from all sides. **A fair balance will need to be struck between accessibility and the preservation of the special qualities of a protected structure** and its setting or of an ACA. Improving access to a historic building will require a creative approach and flexibility on the part of owners, architects, planning authorities, building managers, users and others....

18.1.4 - Where it is proposed to improve access to a protected structure, the ability of the building and its setting to meet this requirement must be carefully assessed. If the application of universal design principles and measures to improve accessibility are likely to cause major problems and lead to unacceptable alterations of the character and fabric of the protected structure, the onus should be on the applicant to show that consideration has been given to exploring all possible options for enhancing the accessibility of the protected structure and its site. Applicants should actively seek innovative solutions and good designs which minimise intervention into the historic fabric.

18.1.5 - The ideal solution would minimise the alteration of original or fine building fabric and avoid works which would have an adverse impact upon the character of the exterior or interior of the building. whilst meeting the goals of improved access. The reversibility of proposals is an important conservation principle but should not be used to justify inappropriate interventions. Where barriers to access are found to exist, ways should be sought which avoid the obstacle rather than make alterations to it. For

example, where a flight of stairs inhibits access to the upper floors of a building for some users, a lift installation could be considered. When intervention is unavoidable, permitted proposals should minimise the loss and alteration of the historic fabric and protect the architectural integrity and special interest of the protected structure. Unnecessary change should always be avoided.

Section 18.2 (Entering the Building)

18.2.1 - The conflict between improving access and the conservation of a historic structure is often most difficult to resolve at the entrance to the building. This is particularly so where there is a need to provide access to wheelchair users. Ideally, the principal entrance should be accessible to everyone, but compromise may be needed in sensitive cases.

External ramps, lifts and steps

18.2.3 - Sometimes a well-designed and sensitively sited ramp may be the easiest way to achieve access for wheelchair users. Permanent, integrated ramps of a sympathetic design and materials should be encouraged. However, when dealing with buildings or ACAs of high architectural quality or rarity, the installation of an access ramp against the façade of the building may not be an acceptable solution, particularly where a ramp would destroy the balance of a symmetrical or harmonious façade or damage significant architectural features. Where this is the case, the planning authority should encourage the applicant to explore alternative or more innovative solutions.

Re-grading the external ground level

18.2.7 - Where the differences in level are small, it may be possible to re-grade the ground immediately in front of the entrance, provided this does not result in the unacceptable visual loss of parts of the building's plinth or base and does not involve the loss of important paving or other surfaces. Re grading will not usually be an option in an urban context where entry is directly off a street.

Car parking

18.2.13 - Ideally, dedicated car parking for visitors with disabilities should be provided at a location easily accessible to the entrance. This may have implications for the character and setting of a protected structure. Generally, on larger sites, car parking is

often deliberately sited away from a protected structure in order to avoid impacting upon its immediate setting. In these cases, it may be necessary to permit separate dedicated parking nearer to the structure for users with disabilities. If this is not possible, suitable setting-down points for visitors may be an option.

5.2. **Regional Policy**

Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy for the Southern Region 2020-2032 – RPO 206 (Architectural Heritage) and RPO 204 (Better Public Access).

5.3. **Development Plan**

The Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 (WCDP) applies:

Volume 1 – Written Statement

Sections 13.4 (Built Heritage), 13.4.1 (Protected Structures) and 13.4.6 (Protection of Elements of Architectural Heritage Merit).

Objective BH01: To protect the architectural heritage of County Wexford and to include structures considered to be of special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical interest in the Record of Protected Structures.

Objective BH06: To protect the curtilage of Protected Structures or proposed Protected Structures from any works which would cause loss of, or damage to, the special character of the structure and loss of or damage to, any structures of heritage value within the curtilage or attendant grounds of the structure.

Objective BH07: To ensure development within the curtilage of a Protected Structure is compatible with its character. This does not preclude putting forward innovative contemporary designs that respect the context of the Protected Structure.

Objective BH11: To ensure that all applications for Protected Structures are assessed taking into consideration the advice contained in the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DAHG, 2011) and any subsequent guidelines.

Volume 2 – Development Management

Section 6.2.7 (New or widened vehicular parking area on the frontage of existing development): Where a new or widened access/egress point is proposed to facilitate

the provision of a new or widened parking area on the frontage of an existing development, the Planning Authority will also have regard to the following:

- Existing road conditions, including an assessment of whether on-street parking gives rise to safety hazards and/or undue obstruction of other road users.
- The potential impact of the new/widened access, boundary treatment removal and new/enlarged hard standing area on the visual amenities of the area and on surface water drainage.
- The degree to which the proposal would establish a precedent for similar development in the vicinity and an assessment of the cumulative impacts which may be generated from further similar development.

Section 6.3.4 and Table 6-9 (Dimensions of Parking Spaces and Loading Bays).

Section 7.2 (Protected Structures): The Planning Authority will consider proposals for development or alterations to a Protected Structure based on the conservation principles set out in the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities, (DAHG, 2011). Development proposals for works to a Protected Structure or within the curtilage of a Protected Structure may require a method statement that describes the proposed works in appropriate detail...

For all works to a Protected Structure, the Planning Authority will seek to ensure that:

- Alterations and interventions do not detract from the significance or value of the structure,
- Original features of architectural and historic interest are retained and that new features are not presented as original or older features and are legible...
- The special interest of the structure is not compromised when adhering to the requirements of Building Regulations. Regard should be had to the Advice Series on historic buildings published by the DEHLG...

In considering proposals to meet Part M accessibility requirements, regard should be had to the DAHG advice series 'Access: Improving the Accessibility of Historic Buildings and Places' 2011.

Volume 5 – Record of Protected Structures

5.4. Wexford Town Local Area Plan 2024-2030

A note on the Wexford County Council website states that the Wexford Town and Environs Development Plan 2009-2015 (as extended) has expired. A pre-draft consultation to inform the preparation of a new Wexford Town Local Area Plan (LAP) was undertaken in 2023 however no draft LAP has been published to date.

The land use zoning for the site under the expired plan was for 'town centre' which had the following objective: *"To protect and enhance the special physical and social character of the existing Town Centre and to provide for new and improved Town Centre facilities and uses."*

6.0 Natural Heritage Designations

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

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

- Wexford Harbour and Slobs SPA (Site Code 004076) – c. 250m to north.
- Slaney River Valley SAC (Site Code 000781) - c. 250m to north.
- Raven Point Nature Reserve SAC (Site Code 000710) – c. 5.5km to north-east.
- The Raven SPA (Site Code 004019) – c. 6km to north-east.
- Seas off Wexford SPA (Site Code 004237) – c. 7km to south-east.

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

- Wexford Slobs And Harbour pNHA (Site Code 000712) - c. 350m from the site.

7.0 EIA Screening

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

8.0 Water Framework Directive Screening

An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive.

Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, it is concluded that the proposal will not result in any risk of deterioration in the status of any water body, including surface waters (rivers and lakes), groundwater, transitional waters, or coastal waters. This applies to both qualitative and quantitative status, and in respect of temporary and permanent effects.

In addition, the proposed development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the protection, maintenance, and improvement of water body status, as required under the Directive.

Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

9.0 The Appeal

9.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal submission was received on the 03/03/2026. The grounds of appeal (GOA) are as follows:

General

- *Context* – proposal arises on account of applicant’s documented mobility and visual impairment issues will allow permanent occupancy of the property as a family home. The applicants have already undertaken extensive refurbishment works in order to reinstate the property’s character and original features.
- *Site Planning History* - proposal should be considered in context of same.
- *Conservation* – a supplementary Architectural Heritage Statement is provided as part of the GOA which seeks to address concerns raised by PA [I draw the Commission’s attention to the fact that this document was not provided as part of the GOA]. PA did not refer file to An Taisce nor The Heritage Council which suggests that proposal is of a minor/ inconsequential nature.

- *Access* – Road’s report does not include any traffic or transport assessment to set the context for their recommendation of refusal and does not identify any safety, visibility, obstruction or operational roads concerns.
- *Procedural Issues* – no policy based assessment is provided in PA report; PA conservation report was written by an Executive Planner and not by a Conservation Officer or a suitably qualified conservation specialist; it is unclear whether the PA referred the file to the National Monuments Service and PA did not refer file to An Taisce nor The Heritage Council with implications for evidential basis of PA’s decision to refuse; and, PA report focuses excessively on previous enforcement action rather than on the subject proposal which gave rise to an unbalanced assessment.

Response to Refusal Reasons

Refusal Reason No. 1 – Heritage Impact:

- Proposal does not propose to alter the architectural composition of the building, will not give rise to a material effect on character of the protected structure or terrace and will also not adversely affect elements that give rise to its special interest.
- Proposal constitutes limited, carefully designed and reversible modifications to secondary curtilage elements and do not involve removal/ fragmentation of historic fabric.
- Proposal will not undermine visual contribution of Glens Terrace to Spawell Road with architectural composition of terrace and streetscape remaining unchanged and fully legible.
- PA’s Conservation Report does not identify any heritage element that would be altered or lost, assumes any alteration to boundary railings equates to harm and does not present an evaluation of the degree of impact on defining characteristics.
- PA’s assessment does not outline how proposal conflicts with Objective BH06 or Section 7.2 of development plan.
- Refusal on basis of lack of technical detail (level access) is unreasonable – could have been addressed via further information request or by condition.

- Focus on previous enforcement is inappropriate given works were remedied and regularised by applicant – should have no bearing on conservation-led proposal.
- Precedent concern is unfounded given specific layout of appeal property in terrace, with no potential for cumulative erosion of character.

Refusal Reason No. 2 – Loss of On-Street Parking:

- Section 6.2.7 does not protect on-street parking in absolute terms and requires proposals for new vehicular accesses are assessed with regard to traffic hazard etc.
- Recommended refusal is disproportionate and not supported by any traffic hazard etc. related assessment, with no examination of how street would operate post-development.
- The safety, functionality and public amenity of Spawell Road would not be materially affected by proposal.
- Loss of parking spaces is not a traffic impact and high parking demand on road has not been qualified with quantifiable data (i.e. survey, capacity study etc.).
- Parking demand on Spawell Road has significantly reduced in recent years on account of land use changes in the locality/ development of additional parking facilities.
- Appellants require in-curtilage parking in order to charge electric cars as EV charging when parked on street presents logistical/ health & safety challenges.

9.2. Planning Authority Response

None received.

9.3. Observations

None received.

9.4. Prescribed Bodies

Response from Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage (DoHLGH) Development Applications Unit (received 06/05/2026).

- *General* – notes policy context for proposal and stance of PA. Applicants mobility and visibility issues as being rationale for proposal also noted.

- *Relevant Policy Guidance* – Sections 18.1.2, 18.1.4 and 18.2.7 of the 2011 Heritage Guidelines are specifically cited.
- *Architectural Character* – notes Glens Terrace is remarkably well intact incl. its external historic boundary treatments of reoccurring pattern of low brick walls with cast iron railings, posts and pedestrian gates (with the latter aligning with the front door) which correspond with the width of each property's front elevation. No. 1 differs from remainder of terrace on basis it has additional land to (west) side as part of its original historic configuration and therefore a longer front boundary span.
- *Proposed Access* – notes proposal for a vehicular access would not interfere with the property's pedestrian gate or brick wall & railing that spans the width of the front elevation and would only affect boundary treatment corresponding to land to side of the property. The section of boundary effected would also generally correspond with the section that was previously removed to facilitate temporary construction access [I refer the Commission to enforcement ref. 0153-2023 in this regard and subsequent reinstatement of same under P.A. Ref. 202420171].
- *Level Platform* – proposal comprises of regrading of existing ground level/ surface which exists as contemporary paving slabs, with no loss of historic fabric arising.
- *Design* – submitted Conservation Report does not set out whether other options (i.e. designated disabled parking facilities to front of property and/ or introduction of handrails etc. or access from rear laneway) would also adequately meet applicant's needs and Commission may wish to seek clarification on same.
- *Conditions* – in the event that the Commission are minded to grant permission, the DoHLGH recommend the attachment of conditions relating to the siting of the vehicular access, recording of boundary that will be altered and details of the schedules of works and proposed materiality – all to be agreed with the PA.

9.5. Further Responses

None received.

10.0 Assessment

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

- Conservation
- Loss of Parking

10.1. Conservation

Vehicular Access

- 10.1.1. The PA considered that the works to the existing front boundary to form the proposed vehicular access would result in a negative impact on the character of the on-site protected structure and also on the character of adjoining protected structures, with this concern giving rise to their refusal reason No. 1 on the basis of the proposal's contravention of WCDP Objective BH06 and Section 7.2 (Protected Structures) of Volume 2.
- 10.1.2. The GOA set out a detailed rebuttal to this refusal reason which is detailed in Section 9.1 of this report. In short, the appellant argues that, as the proposal does not relate to the protected structure's primary defining elements, it does not have the potential to materially affect the character of same or of Glens Terrace as a whole. They also outline a range of concerns regarding the PA's assessment of this element of the proposal.
- 10.1.3. The appellant has raised procedural concerns with respect to the PA not offering An Taisce nor The Heritage Council the opportunity to comment on the application. I note that in April 2026 the first party appeal received by ACP was referred to The Heritage Council, An Chomhairle Ealaíon, Fáilte Ireland, An Taisce and the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage (DoHLGH) with a request for comment, with the DAU of the DoHLGH being the only entity to provide a response. I have given due consideration to this response as part of my assessment.

- 10.1.4. Section 18.2.13 (Car Parking) of the 2011 Architectural Heritage Guidelines provides that *“Ideally, dedicated car parking for visitors with disabilities should be provided at a location easily accessible to the entrance. This may have implications for the character and setting of a protected structure”* with Section 13.7.8 (Car Parking) stating that *“Where it is necessary to provide car parking, efforts should be made to minimise its impact by careful design and use of materials. The associated alteration of boundary features should not be permitted unless the changes are considered not to be damaging to the character of a protected structure or of an ACA and would not result in inappropriate cumulative changes”*.
- 10.1.5. WCDP Objective BH06 seeks to protect the curtilage of protected structures from any works which would cause loss of, or damage to, the special character of the structure and loss of or damage to, any structures of heritage value within the curtilage or attendant grounds of the structure. Similarly, Section 7.2 seeks to ensure that alterations and interventions do not detract from the significance or value of the structure and that the special interest of the structure is not compromised when adhering to the requirements of Building Regulations (including Part M).
- 10.1.6. In light of the foregoing policy considerations, the crux of the issue is whether or not the proposed works to alter the existing property boundary in order create a vehicular access to the side of the property would negatively impact on the special character and setting of the protected structure(s).
- 10.1.7. I note from the WCDP Record of Protected Structures and from the NIAH that the protected status arises from the architectural composition of the terrace as a whole (grouping of uniform buildings) together with the architectural expression of the buildings themselves.
- 10.1.8. The proposed works to the property’s existing front boundary comprise of the creation of a new 2.84m wide vehicular gate which will give access to a newly created in-curtilage parking area to the west side of the main dwelling. This will require the removal of a corresponding south-western section of the property’s original front railings and plinth wall. The design and materiality of the proposed double gates mirrors that of the existing original cast iron pedestrian gate on the south-east side of the property (i.e. colonette piers to perimeter having polygonal capping supporting crocketed cast-iron gate).

- 10.1.9. The assessment of impact set out in the Conservation Report (prepared by a Grade III Conservation Architect) submitted with the application states that the removal of a small section of the front boundary wall and railing to provide accessible access is minimal without disruption to the existing structure or finished fabric of the house.
- 10.1.10. I acknowledge that the property's existing historic boundary to Spawell Road makes an important contribution to the quality and visual character of the protected structure subject of this appeal and also to that of the wider terrace of protected structures (Glena Terrace), with its reoccurring pattern defining the streetscape at this location. However, whilst the property's boundary does contribute to the special interest of the protected structure(s), on account of its careful design & profile, visual integration and use of complementary materials, I am satisfied that the proposed access will not alter the scale, legibility or visual character of the existing boundary to Spawell Road to an extent that would give rise to a negative impact.
- 10.1.11. The proposal will result in the loss of a c. 2.84m section of the property's original c. 18.8m front boundary comprising generally of iron railings and plinth wall. As detailed in paragraph 10.2.3 of this report, the minimum width of a parking bay is 2.4m which corresponds with the standard width of a vehicle. On this on the basis, I consider that the total ope width of 2.84m proposed is reasonable on the grounds that it has sought to minimise the extent of loss of historic fabric and balances minimum access requirements with the additional mobility requirements of the applicants. Furthermore, in respect to the loss of historic fabric proposed, I note that the effected section of boundary was also subject to recent alteration when it was temporarily removed to facilitate a construction access (I refer the Commission to Section 4.0 of this report in this regard) and subsequently reconstructed/ reconstituted in accordance with Condition No. 2 attached to a grant of retention permission under P.A. Ref. 20240171. In light of the foregoing considerations, I am of the opinion that the loss of historic fabric proposed is acceptable in this particular instance.
- 10.1.12. I also note that, in considering the proposal, the DAU did not raise a specific concern with respect to the loss of this historic fabric and recommended conditions relating to the siting of the vehicular access (condition 1), recording of boundary that will be altered and details of the schedules of works and proposed materiality (condition 2). Where the Commission are minded to grant permission, I consider the attachment of

recommended condition 2 to be reasonable and proportionate given the protected status and special character of the property. However, in respect to condition 1, which relates to an amendment to the siting of the proposed access, I consider the DAU's recommendation to move the access closer to the brick pier on its left side may give rise to a traffic safety issue on account of the restriction in pedestrian-vehicular intervisibility that it would give rise to. On this basis, I recommend to the Commission that this element of the recommended conditions not be pursued.

- 10.1.13. The submission of the DAU notes that the subject end of terrace property differs from the remainder of the terrace on account of its additional land to the side provided as part of its original historic configuration. In respect to the potential for the proposal to give rise to an incremental, cumulative effect on the character of the street at this location, given the specific layout and comparatively longer front boundary span which applies (only) to the appeal site, I am of the view that this risk is not applicable in this case as the reoccurring boundary pattern (of low brick walls with cast iron railings, posts and pedestrian gates) which corresponds to the width of the front elevation of main dwelling is being maintained, with no potential for any other properties in Glena Terrace to replicate the proposal on account of its exceptional layout. On this basis, I am satisfied that the granting of permission in this specific instance would not give rise to a planning precedent.
- 10.1.14. Section 13.7.8 of the 2011 Architectural Heritage Guidelines provides that associated alteration of boundary features should not be permitted unless the changes are considered not to be damaging to the character of a protected structure and would not result in inappropriate cumulative changes. I am satisfied that the proposed access, on account of its siting, design and materiality, would not give rise to damage to or a negative impact on the character of the protected structure or to Glena Terrace as a whole and would also not set an undesirable planning precedent for further such incremental development at this location. Therefore, whilst I acknowledge that this element of the proposal will give rise to a loss of historic fabric, on balance, I consider it to be acceptable having regard to the foregoing considerations.
- 10.1.15. Whilst not specified in the description of development in the statutory notices, a new in-curtilage parking area set-back off the road will be created on the west side of the main dwelling, with this area being laid out in gravel and delineated from the front

garden with paving stones. Having considered the existence of a c. 1.6m stone boundary wall on its west side together with the front boundary lined with box hedging to its east side together with the existing parallel parking arrangements on Spawell Road to the front of the terrace, the existence of this in-curtilage parking area is not likely to be visible visually prominent to such an extent that would detract from the character of the protected structure or terrace.

Level Access Platform

- 10.1.16. The PA's refusal reason No. 1 states that insufficient details have been submitted in respect to the nature of the works/ development to form the proposed level platform.
- 10.1.17. The GOA contend that a refusal on the basis of lack of technical detail is unreasonable when this matter was capable of being addressed via a further information request or by condition.
- 10.1.18. The submission from the DAU notes that the proposal for the provision of a level access platform comprises of the regrading of the existing ground level and surface, with the Dept. being satisfied that no loss of historic fabric arises.
- 10.1.19. Section 7.2 (Protected Structures) of WCDP Volume 2 states that, in considering proposals to meet Part M accessibility requirements, regard should be had to the DAHG advice series 'Access: Improving the Accessibility of Historic Buildings and Places' (2011), whilst Objective BH11 requires that applications for protected structures be assessed taking into consideration the advice contained in the 2011 Architectural Heritage Guidelines. Sections 18.2.3 (External ramps, lifts and steps) and 18.2.7 (Re-grading the external ground level) of these guidelines are particularly relevant to the proposal and specifically provide that "*Sometimes a well-designed and sensitively sited ramp may be the easiest way to achieve access for wheelchair users*" and "*Where the differences in level are small, it may be possible to re-grade the ground immediately in front of the entrance, provided this does not result in the unacceptable visual loss of parts of the building's plinth or base and does not involve the loss of important paving or other surfaces*".
- 10.1.20. The submitted plans illustrate that the proposed level access platform would be located on the north west side of the dwellinghouse at ground floor level and would provide access to the rear of the main house (via an existing double door to the property's office/ dining room) and to its rear return (via an existing double door to the

property's kitchen) via 2 no. minimum 1.8m x 1.8m clear areas adjoining these accesses. These clear areas, providing for wheelchair access to the property, would be set atop a larger graded 'landing' area that would connect the 2 no. doorways.

- 10.1.21. Section drawings of the level access platform were not provided as part of the GOA, nor were more detailed design and layout drawings. Notwithstanding, it is apparent to me that what is proposed is the reprofiling and/ or regrading of the existing ground level in this area to the rear side of the property, in accordance with Part M of the Building Regulations, in order to provide for a level access ramp to the 2 no. doorways to the rear of the property (which both currently feature stepped access) leading from the proposed in-curtilage parking area.
- 10.1.22. The rear patio area that would accommodate the proposed level access platform is located to the immediate rear of the main house and to the west of its rear return. This patio area is delineated from the front garden/ proposed courtyard parking by low iron railings on a brick plinth wall (non-original boundary element) and from the property's rear garden by a capped redbrick screen wall. Its western boundary comprises of an old, capped stone wall. The patio is laid out with contemporary paving slabs, with a small area of lawn to its west, and currently accommodates garden furniture with plant pots etc. lining its perimeter. Overall, I consider that the location of the level access platform is largely visually imperceptible from the public realm along Spawell Road.
- 10.1.23. Having considered the policy guidance set out under Sections 18.1.1 - 18.1.4 of the 2011 Architectural Heritage Guidelines together with the location, nature and materiality of this patio area and the fact that no changes are proposed to the rear elevation of the main structure or to that of the rear return, I am satisfied that there will be no loss or alteration of historic fabric, with no potential for this element of the proposal to negatively visually impact on the architectural composition or character of the protected structure or indeed on that of adjoining terraced structures.
- 10.1.24. The submission from the DAU states that the submitted Conservation Report does not set out whether other options, such as designated disabled parking to the front of the dwelling, the introduction of handrails etc. or access from rear laneway, would also adequately meet applicant's needs. Whilst I do acknowledge that this is the case, my assessment has focused on the development as applied for which is subject of

this appeal. Notwithstanding, I briefly deal with this point as follows: The change from pay and display parking to a designated disabled parking bay to the front of the property would appear to be a matter for the local authority, with such a facility needed to be publicly accessible and therefore not for the exclusive use of the appellant. In respect to the rear laneway, I note from my observations on site that the historic shared laneway to the rear of the property is very constrained in nature in terms of both its access and width with intervening built form to the rear of the property which may also constrain rear access to the property. Furthermore, whilst the introduction of mobility aids may be of general assistance to the appellant, they would not provide level access to the property.

10.2. **Loss of Parking**

- 10.2.1. The PA's refusal reason No. 2 states that the proposed vehicular access would give rise to the loss of 2 no. on-street car parking spaces in a pay and display area of high demand - contrary to Section 6.2.7 (New or widened vehicular parking area on the frontage of existing development) of Volume 2 of the WCDP.
- 10.2.2. The appellant argues that Section 6.2.7 does not seek to protect on-street car parking in absolute terms and draws the Commission's to the reduced demand for parking on Spawell Road in recent years.
- 10.2.3. The submitted plans illustrate that the property subject of this appeal has a c. 18.8m frontage to Spawell Road to the south. I note from WCDP Table 6-9 (Dimensions of Parking Spaces and Loading Bays) that a parking space parallel to a kerb has dimensions of 6m x 2.4m. On this basis the property's frontage roughly equates to on-street parking for 3 no. cars.
- 10.2.4. It is proposed to provide a new 2.84m wide vehicular gate on the western side of the property's frontage with the proposed streetscape drawing showing the requirement for 1.5m of footpath dishing at either side of this new access. Whilst the submitted plans do not show the proposal in the context of the existing paid parallel parking bays to the front of the property, I am satisfied that it would give rise to the requirement for a clear area of at least c. 5.84m to the front of the property and would therefore displace 1 no. existing on-street car parking space at a minimum.
- 10.2.5. As noted in Section 1.0 of this report, there is extensive on-street parking available on the north side of Spawell Road, with more limited parking provided on the south

side of the road. The parking provided on the northeastern side of Spawell Road is pay and display and short term in nature, with longer term pay and display parking provided further west along the road.

10.2.6. During my site inspection, which was undertaken on a weekday morning, I generally observed a low rate of parking take-up along Spawell Road with many of the bays being devoid of cars. However, I did also note that where demand was evidenced, people chose to park on the northeastern end of Spawell Road (proximate to the appeal site) which is relatively closer to Wexford town centre. Notwithstanding, I do not consider my observations on site were consistent with the area being in high parking demand.

10.2.7. WCDP Section 6.2.7 sets out the policy requirements which are applicable when considering proposals for new access/ egresses to new parking areas as part of existing developments. It requires regard to be had to existing road conditions and the potential for safety hazards/ obstruction of road users; the impact of the proposal on the visual amenities of the area and on surface water drainage; and, the degree to which the proposal would establish a precedent for similar development in the vicinity and an assessment of the cumulative impacts which may be generated from further similar development. I note that the loss of on-street car parking is not included as a relevant consideration and, as such, I am not satisfied that refusal reason no. 2 can be substantiated in this regard.

10.2.8. Whilst I have dealt with the matter of precedent in paragraph 10.1.13 above. I consider the other stated requirements of Section 6.2.7 further below:

Existing road conditions and potential for safety hazards/ obstruction of road users

10.2.9. Spawell Road is a 50kmph two-way road with footpaths on either side. It functions as one of the main vehicular routes leading into Wexford town. It has a straight geometry and provides for excellent pedestrian and driver visibility. I note from my site inspection that, despite its design speed, traffic slows as it reaches the eastern end of the road (which adjoins Glens Terrace) on account of its proximity to the junction with Hill Street (R-769).

10.2.10. The proposed vehicular access is setback over 2m from the property's western boundary and c. 13m from its eastern boundary. The gate to the access would be comprised of c. 1.1m high iron railings to match the character of the property's

existing iron railings which are set on a low plinth wall. Having inspected the site and its surrounds and having considered the materiality of the existing and proposed boundary, I am satisfied that adequate driver visibility would be provided for on entering and exiting the property with no potential for the proposal to unduly obstruct other road users or to give rise to pedestrian or traffic hazard.

Impact of the proposal on the visual amenities of the area and on surface water drainage

- 10.2.11. I consider the impact of the proposal on the visual amenities of the area in Section 10.1 of this report where I conclude that it has no potential to negatively or materially affect same. In respect to surface water drainage, I note from my site inspection that the courtyard car parking area to the west side of the property is finished in gravel with boundary planting, with the front garden being laid out as lawn. Whilst no SuDS measures are put forward as part of the proposed design, no new impermeable or impervious surfaces have been proposed, and I note that existing grass and planting areas function as nature-based solutions to the management of surface-water run-off with gravel also possessing good drainage characteristics. Therefore, I am satisfied that there is no potential for the proposal to negatively impact on the area's surface water drainage arrangements.
- 10.2.12. In light of the foregoing considerations, I am satisfied that the proposal complies with Section 6.2.7 of Volume 2 of the development plan.

11.0 Recommendation

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

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the status of the property subject of this appeal as a protected structure which forms part of a terrace of protected structures within the Townparks area of Wexford town, to the planning policies, objectives and development standards of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 and to the provisions of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011), to the siting, nature, scale and design of the proposed development relative to neighbouring

dwellings, to the existing pattern of development in the wider area and to the planning history related to the lands, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would constitute an acceptable form of development at this location, would provide for an acceptable standard of future residential amenity and would not seriously injure the amenities of adjoining properties, and in particular would not give rise to significant impacts on the character and setting of the on-site protected structure or the adjoining protected structures within Glena Terrace, and would not undermine the servicing of public parking demand in the surrounding area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

| | |
|----|---|
| 1. | <p>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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p> |
| 2. | <p>Vehicular access arrangements, including the dishing of the footpath on Spawell Road, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and orderly development.</p> |
| 3. | <p>Prior to the commencement of works the applicant shall submit the following for the written agreement of the planning authority:</p> <p>(a) A detailed written and photographic record of the boundary subject to alteration.</p> <p>(b) A schedule of works for the dismantling of the existing boundary wall and railing.</p> <p>(c) A schedule of works and material specifications required to make good the boundary wall and railings as part of the proposed works.</p> <p>(d) Material specifications for the proposed new gate/ pier/ railings as relevant.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of orderly development, conservation heritage and the visual amenities of the area.</p> |
| 4. | <p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays Deviation</p> |

| | |
|----|---|
| | <p>from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.</p> |
| 5. | <p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Commission Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.</p> |

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

Emma Gosnell
 Planning Inspector
 8th June 2026

Appendix 1

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

| | |
|---|---|
| Case Reference | PL-500886-WX-26 |
| Proposed Development Summary | Alterations and extensions to house (Protected Structure WBC0016/ NIAH15500016). Gate into the railing to provide accessible vehicular access and level platform to give accessible level access to two doors serving the dwelling and associated site works. |
| Development Address | 1 Glena Terrace Spawell Road, Townparks, Wexford, Y35 CD62 |
| | 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 | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road 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) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p> | <p>Part 2, Class 10(b)(iv) - Urban development – 10 hectares (built-up area). Site is c. 0.062 ha.</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: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Case Reference</p> | <p>PL-500886-WX-26</p> |
| <p>Proposed Development Summary</p> | <p>Alterations and extensions to house (Protected Structure WBC0016/ NIAH15500016). Gate into the railing to provide accessible vehicular access and level platform to give accessible level access to two doors serving the dwelling and associated site works.</p> |
| <p>Development Address</p> | <p>1 Glana Terrace Spawell Road, Townparks, Wexford, Y35 CD62</p> |

This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.

Characteristics of proposed development

(In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).

The development is for the following small scale alterations and extensions to a Protected Structure (WCC Ref. WBC0016/ NIAH Ref. 15500016): the provision of a new pedestrian gate into the existing front railing to provide accessible vehicular access and the provision of a level platform to the rear side of the property in order to provide accessible level access to two doors serving the dwelling and all associated site works.

It comes forward as a standalone project, does not involve the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance.

The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.

Location of development

(The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).

The development site, which is located at Glena Terrace on the Spawell Road in the Townparks area of Wexford, constitutes an existing end-of-terrace three-bay 3-storey redbrick townhouse which is delineated from the street by cast iron fence on a low redbrick wall.

The Coolree Stream (EPA Code: IE_SE_12C130100) also known as the 'Farnogue Stream' is located c. 600m to the west of the appeal site. This watercourse outfalls into Wexford Harbour c. 650m to the north-west of the site via the Lower Slaney estuary. However, it is considered that there is no realistic pathway from the appeal site to this river or estuary on account of the nature of the proposal, intervening distance and land uses involved and lack of any new hydrological connectivity – see Appendix 2 for further details.

The development is generally removed from sensitive natural habitats and designated sites identified significance in the County Development Plan. The property's status as a protected structure (and within a terrace of protected structures) together with the site's location within an ACA is dealt with as part of the Planning Assessment in the main body of the Inspector's Report.

Whilst material concerns are raised by the PA regarding the impact of the proposal on the fabric of the protected structure and on the site's built heritage character, it is concluded that no significant impacts on the character of the protected structure(s) or ACA are likely.

Having regard to the above and the nature and limited scale of the proposed development, I am satisfied that

| | |
|--|---|
| | impacts on environmental sensitivities can be adequately assessed in this case without the need for EIA. |
| Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation). | <p>Due to the nature and scale of the development, the construction stage will not be significant in terms of duration or complexity.</p> <p>The main operational impacts would be limited to impact on built heritage character and would be subject to standard assessment/design. I am satisfied that this matter can be assessed without potential for significant environmental effects that would require EIA.</p> <p>There would be no significant cumulative impacts with other projects.</p> <p>Having regard to the nature of the proposed development, its location removed 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 environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.</p> |
| Conclusion | |
| Likelihood of Significant Effects | Conclusion in respect of EIA |
| There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. | EIA is not required. |

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required).

Appendix 2 – AA Screening Determination

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

I have considered the proposal comprising alterations and extensions to house (Protected Structure WBC0016/ NIAH15500016). Gate into the railing to provide accessible vehicular access and level platform to give accessible level access to two doors serving the dwelling and associated site works at 1 Glens Terrace Spawell Road, Townparks, Wexford, in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located relative to:

- Wexford Harbour and Slob SPA (Site Code 004076) – c. 250m to north.
- Slaney River Valley SAC (Site Code 000781) - c. 250m to north.
- Raven Point Nature Reserve SAC (Site Code 000710) – c. 5.5km to north-east.
- The Raven SPA (Site Code 004019) – c. 6km to north-east.
- Seas off Wexford SPA (Site Code 004237) – c. 7km to south-east.

No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project in a town centre location, 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 relatively small scale of development which has existing connections to the public mains.
- The location of the development within a terrace of existing properties located within a built-up and serviced urban area, its distance from European Sites and the urban nature of intervening habitats and the absence of ecological pathways to any European Site.
- Taking into account screening report/ determination by PA.

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 (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.