



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500919-WX-26

Development

House and a domestic garage, new site entrance and access road surface upgrade with connection to main services (foul, storm and water) and all associated site works.

Location

Mauritiustown, Rosslare, County Wexford.

Planning Authority

Wexford County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

20251652W

Applicant(s)

Tom Kealy

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant(s)

Vincent Staples

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

18th May 2026

Inspector

Emma Gosnell

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description.....	3
2.0	Proposed Development.....	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0	Planning History	7
5.0	Policy Context	10
6.0	Natural Heritage Designations	15
7.0	EIA Screening	16
8.0	Water Framework Directive Screening.....	16
9.0	The Appeal.....	17
10.0	Assessment.....	19
11.0	Recommendation	27
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	27

Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening and Form 2 – EIA Preliminary Examination

Appendix 2 – AA Screening Determination

Appendix 3 – Screening for Water Framework Directive Assessment Determination

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site, which has a stated area of 0.088ha, is located on a private laneway and cul-de-sac located in the Rosslare Strand area in the southern environs of Rosslare town, c. 3.8km to the north-west of Rosslare Harbour in County Wexford.
- 1.2. The gravelled laneway is accessed c. 110m to the south-east of the appeal site via the Mauritiustown Road (L-7101) which is subject to a 50kmph speed limit. The south-west side of the site fronts the private laneway and turning area and it is adjoined by a single storey dormer bungalow to its south-east, by the rear gardens of the semi-detached dwellings at no's 34 and 35 The Cove and an incidental estate green area to its north-east, and by a grass verge to an internal public roadway within The Cove estate to its immediate north-west.
- 1.3. The built form on the laneway is characterised by detached dwellings, of varying forms and designs, on individual plots of similar dimensions to the appeal site. There are also a number of undeveloped infill sites on the lane which are overgrown by vegetation, with one being located opposite the appeal site. The wider area is residential in character and comprises predominantly of relatively low-density residential estates.
- 1.4. The rectangular site, which is relatively flat and firm underfoot, is devoid of any structures and is being used in part for the storage of construction related materials. It is entered via a splayed gated access in the centre of its south-western boundary fronting the laneway, with this comprising of a wall of approx. 0.6m in height inset with piers (same style of front boundary as adjoining site to south-east). Its south-eastern boundary is a block wall approx. 1.8m in height with the site's remaining boundaries comprising timber panel fencing approximately 2m in height. There are overhead power lines and some shrubbery along its boundary with The Cove and there is a large tree in the north-west corner of the site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development is described as the construction of a detached single storey 2-bed dwelling house (c. 125sq.m) which is to be located broadly centrally within the plot (setback c. 12m from rear boundary) with garden areas and associated soft landscaping to the front and rear (north-western side). The T-shaped dwelling, which

is of contemporary design, would feature a c. 20m wide front elevation and 2 no. pitched roofs with a max. ridge height of c. 5.56m, with a selected metal finish roof and porch canopy.

- 2.2. The proposed development also involves the construction of a detached single storey domestic garage (c. 24sq.m) with a max. height of c. 4.6m in the site's north-east corner, a permeable paved driveway, a new site entrance and access road surface upgrade (new concrete footpath and macadam finish to access laneway), new connection to the public mains (foul, storm and potable water) and all associated site works.
- 2.3. The proposal also includes for the removal of existing non-native bamboo along the north-eastern boundary and its replacement with flowering shrubs and perennials, which are also to be introduced along the site's south-eastern and north-western boundaries. The existing mature tree in the north-west corner of site is to be retained, and 3 no. new birch trees are to be planted in the front garden. No changes are proposed to the existing site access or front boundary.
- 2.4. Permission for a detached dwelling was recently refused by the Board on this site under ABP-319540-24 for 1 no. reason relating to capacity of Rosslare Strand WWTP. This refusal reflected an overall pattern of Board decisions in respect to the Rosslare Strand area which is outlined in Section 4.0 of this report.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission granted on 11/02/2026 subject to 10 no. conditions, generally of a standard technical nature. Conditions of note were as follows:

- No. 2 – The inter-site boundary finishes to the side of the dwelling shall be 1.8-metre-high rendered walls of concrete block construction.
- No. 3. – The dwelling shall be used as a permanent residence only.
- No. 6 – All surface water generated within the site boundaries shall be collected and managed in accordance with the plans submitted.

- No. 7 – The attenuation tank and hydro break shall be fully accessible at all times and should be maintained to ensure they are in full working order.
- No. 8 – The existing open drainage channel is to be kept clear at all times to ensure surface water run-off from the proposed hydro break is not restricted.
- No. 9 – The applicant or developer shall enter into water and/or wastewater connection agreement(s) with Uisce Eireann prior to the commencement of this development.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

1 no. planning report formed the basis of the planning authority's (PA) assessment:

Planner's Report (27/01/2026) – Initial Application Stage

Key points of note raised in the report are as follows:

- *Principle of Development* – site located in a built-up area of Rosslare Strand whose wastewater disposal is subject to ongoing constraint on account of amber status of Rosslare WWTP (with this issue being exacerbated during the summer season). Following recent assessment and reporting on this issue, PA understand that one-off dwellings can be permitted subject to condition requiring permanent occupancy.
- *Design & Layout* – proposal for a detached, single storey dwelling is acceptable having regard to its siting at end of lane and mixed built character on laneway. Design, scale and height of garage is in keeping with Section 3.2 of Volume 2.
- *Access* – noted proposal relies on access via private road which is not taken in charge by Wexford County Council. Junction of private laneway with public road features inadequate sightline when looking right on exiting. Notwithstanding, Road Dept. recommend a grant.
- *Servicing* – proposed water supply and foul drainage connections acceptable on basis for correspondence on file from Uisce Eireann and related conditions.
- *Drainage* – Roads Dept. are satisfied with applicant's drainage proposals.
- *Boundaries* – given site's urban setting, condition to be attached requiring side and rear boundaries to be 1.8m high block and capped wall.

- *Flooding* – site located in Flood Zone C with minimal flood risk arising.
- *AA and EIA* – not required.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Roads Department (08/01/2026) – recommends grant subject to standard sightline, construction management, maintenance and surface water management conditions, in addition to the requirement that existing open drainage channels be kept clear at all times to ensure surface water run-off from the hydro break is not restricted.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Eireann (15/01/2026) – recommends attachment of a condition requiring the applicant to enter into a connection agreement with Uisce Eireann in respect to their proposed service connection to the public water supply and wastewater connection network and to adhere to the standards and conditions of that agreement.

3.4. Third Party Observations

2 no. third party submissions were received from neighbouring residents.

Vincent Staples (23/01/2026)

- Unauthorised filling/ ground and boundary works undertaken on the site.
- Works giving rise to surface water flooding on neighbouring properties.
- Non-compliance with hedge condition attached to a previous 2017 permission.
- Inaccuracies in submitted mapped information regarding on-site drainage infrastructure.

John Cooney (15/01/2026)

- Lack of consultation with neighbouring residents.
- Non-compliance with conditions attached to a previous 2017 permission relating to access/ footpaths, boundary treatments and drainage/ surface water management and applicant's reliance on same.
- Works on site giving rise to property damage, encroachment, localised flooding and biodiversity loss.

- Application lacks detail on housing proposal and on proposed drainage modifications and no documentation from Uisce Eireann is provided.
- Concerns raised regarding on-site surface water management and pluvial and fluvial flood risk to properties within The Cove estate.
- Landscaping proposals/ boundary are unacceptable and should be revised in agreement with neighbours (alternative treatments proposed).
- Concerns raised regarding treatment of/ modifications to the open drain on the lands and in respect to potential unauthorised development to the rear of neighbouring properties.
- Concerns raised regarding potable water connection to existing drainage network having regard to private status of the laneway/ condition of infrastructure.
- Concerns raised regarding capacity of foul mains and Rosslare WWTP and the implications for EIA screening of the project.
- Submitted SSFRA does not address flood risk from watercourse/ open drain on the site which has been piped and backfilled.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Appeal Site

P.A. Ref. 20230754 (ABP-319540-24) – application by Tom Kealy to construct a single storey dwelling house, garage, new site entrance, connect to public services, all ancillary site works and services, refused permission by PA and also on appeal on 16/07/2025 for the following reason:

“1. Having regard to the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 and the Uisce Eireann Wastewater Capacity Register, and noting that the proposed development proposes to connect to the Rosslare Strand Wastewater Treatment Plant, which does not consistently meet the requirements of its Environmental Protection Agency wastewater discharge licence, and which has an ‘amber’ status demonstrating a constrained capacity where overloading of the facility may occur, it is considered that where certainty of available capacity to facilitate the proposed development cannot be demonstrated, and in the absence of a completed ‘combined approach’ assessment

to demonstrate that the proposed development would not be prejudicial to public health, or potentially cause an adverse impact on the receiving environment, the proposed development would be premature due to the deficiency of the wastewater treatment facility to serve the proposed development, and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area”.

P.A. Ref. 20221004 – application by Tom Kealy to construct a single storey dwelling house, garage, new site entrance, connect to public services, all ancillary site works and services, refused permission on 08/03/2023 for 7 no. reasons relating to: 1. Absence of CoF from Uisce Eireann, 2. No evidence of consent to connect to 3rd party services on private laneway, 3. & 4. Proposed foul and surface water drainage issues/inadequacies and risk to public health, 5. Unknown condition of existing private watermains & surface water drains, 6. Lack of flood risk assessment, 7. Inadequate SuDS proposals.

4.2. Neighbouring Sites

Site to South-East (Adjoining Site)

P.A. Ref. 20170651– application by Anne Murphy to construct 1 no. single storey dwelling house, garage and all ancillary site services, refused on 24/08/2017 for 1 no. reason: *“The proposed development is serviced by a wholly inadequate access road in terms of surface condition, lighting and drainage. In the absence of precise details for the provision of a suitable access, it is considered that the proposed development is premature and would be contrary to the proper planning and development of the area”.*

P.A. Ref. 20171473 – application by Anne Murphy for construct 1 no. single storey dwelling house, garage, all ancillary site services together with all ancillary servicing & works required to existing access road including storm drainage and attenuation system, existing access road grading & surfacing and street lighting, as required, granted on 06/02/2018 subject to 7 no. conditions, those of note:

“5. All new side and rear boundaries shall be hedged with a mix of deciduous shrubs suitable for hedging and common to the locality (eg. Holly, hawthorn, blackthorn, field maple). The hedging shall be planted continuously in double rows at 400mm intervals along the boundaries of the site. A minimum of six deciduous trees (not dwarfed) species shall be included in the hedgerow or elsewhere in the landscaping of the site.

Suggested species include field maple, sycamore, silver birch, rowan, white beam, and space permitting, oak, beech or chestnut. The hedging plants and trees shall be maintained indefinitely and replace if failures occur. All landscaping shall take place in the first planting season following occupation of the dwelling. Reason: As provided in Section 34(4)I of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and in the interests of visual amenity.

6. The upgrade and improvement of the access laneway including resurfacing, drainage and public lighting, which is subject of this permission shall be carried out and completed prior to the occupation of the dwelling, and maintained thereafter. Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out and completed to an acceptable standard, and to ensure that the access laneway is maintained in a suitable condition”.

4.3. Other Relevant Decisions in Locality

P.A. Ref. 20260171W - application for a one-off house on the Mauritiustown Road (c. 100m to the south-west of the appeal site) granted by PA on the 01/04/2026 on basis that an assessment and a report has been carried out regarding the issue of the existing wastewater treatment facility for the area being on an Amber alert due to issues with limited capacity, with the PA being of the understanding that applications for one off dwellings can now be granted with a permanent residency condition.

I also note the following non-exhaustive list of relevant decisions of the Board in respect to recent cases in the locality where they refused permission on the basis of uncertainty over the capacity of Rosslare Strand WWTP to accommodate the proposed development without giving rise to overloading:

ABP Ref.	Description	Board Decision
319069 319072 319074	Construction of a house and all associated site works. Mauritiustown, Rosslare, Co. Wexford	Refuse Permission 19/12/2024
318940	Construction of a house and all associated site works. Mauritiustown, Rosslare, Co. Wexford	Refuse Permission 29/07/2024

318007	Construction of a house and associated works. Bearlough, Rosslare, Co. Wexford	Refuse 25/07/2024	Permission
318004	Construction of a house and associated works, Bearlough, Rosslare, Co. Wexford	Refuse 18/07/2024	Permission
318551	Permission for 4 no. two storey detached dwelling houses together with all associated site works and ancillary services. Walsheslough, Rosslare, County Wexford.	Refuse 18/07/2024	Permission
318945	3 houses, upgrading of private access laneway and all associated site works. Drimagh, Rosslare, Co. Wexford.	Refuse 18/07/2024	Permission
318939	Construction of a house and all associated site works. Mauritiustown, Rosslare, Co. Wexford	Refuse 10/07/2024	Permission

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Policy

Project Ireland 2040 – National Planning Framework (First Revision, 2025) – NPO 7 (deliver 40% new housing in existing built-up footprint of settlements) and NPO45 (increase residential density through infill development, increased height and more compact forms of development).

Climate Action Plan (2024 & 2025) and National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBAP) 2023-2030 – Outcome 2A protection of existing designated areas & protected species.

Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes and Sustaining Communities (DoHLGH, 2007).

Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2007) – Chapter 7 (Planning Conditions, Subsection 7.9 (Conditions requiring matters to be agreed): situations where compliance conditions would not be appropriate.

5.2. Other Technical Guidance

Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets Version (2019) (DMURS) - Table 4.2: Reduced SSD standards for application within cities towns and villages.

5.3. Regional Policy

Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy for the Southern Region 2020-2032 – Rural Areas: RPO 34 (Regeneration, Brownfield and Infill Development).

5.4. Development Plan

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

Rosslare Strand

Site is located in a 'Coastal' landscape character area and in a 'Service/ Strategic Settlement' as per Figure 3-1 Core Strategy Map.

Section 3.5 (Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy), Table 3-2 County Wexford Settlement Hierarchy – Level 3a Service Settlements incl. Rosslare Strand and Section 3.6.3 (Level 3a Service Settlements).

Volume 3 – Settlement Plans and Specific Objectives, Section 4 (Rosslare Strand Specific Objectives):

Objective RS08: To require new infill developments to maximise opportunities for enclosure by ensuring continuity of existing buildings and forms where they exist and to address weaknesses in building lines through rationalisation as part of the infill development or redevelopment.

Objective RS13: To prioritise the development of vacant, infill and underutilised brownfield sites in the settlement plan area to achieve compact growth and sustainable development.

Objective RS19: To ensure that new residential developments comply with the relevant objectives and development management standards in Volume 1 and Volume 2 of the County Development Plan, in particular, those pertaining to density, unit type and mix,

private open space, public open space, permeability with an emphasis on walking and cycling provision, car parking and other relevant requirements.

Objective RS22: To have regard to the available capacity of the wastewater treatment plant and its seasonal capacity when assessing planning applications in the area.

Compact Growth/ Design

Objective TV33: To pursue a compact growth policy in our existing settlements and maximise their potential as places to live, work and visit.

Section 5.10.1 (Infill, Brownfield and Greenfield Development) – Infill Sites.

Objective TV43: To adopt a presumption in favour of the development of infill and brownfield sites and to apply flexibility in the application of development management standards allowing for the achievement of performance standards for issues such as the protection of adjoining residential amenities, privacy, light and amenity.

Objective TV44: To ensure the scale of infill development reflects the location of the site and the characteristics of the settlement. The Council will consider the scale of infill development having regard to the need to make efficient use of centrally located sites and the prevailing scale in the area. The Council will encourage development which intensifies the use of the land to at minimum the intensity of adjoining uses but optimally, subject to the appropriate protection of amenities of adjoining residences to a higher intensity.

Objective SH03: To seek to facilitate all households to access good quality housing appropriate to the household circumstances and in their particular community of choice.

Objective SH04: To ensure that new residential development minimises the use of natural resources and impacts on natural assets. The locations selected for residential developments should maximise the potential to use sustainable modes of transport such as walking, cycling and public transport to reduce dependence on fossil fuels. The design of residential units and associated services should maximise the use of renewable energy and minimise the use of water.

Objective SH06: To prioritise the provision of new housing in existing settlements and at an appropriate scale and density relative to the location in accordance with the

National Planning Framework, the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region and the Core Strategy and the Settlement Strategy in the Plan.

Chapter 5: Design and Place-making in Towns and Villages.

Volume 2 – Section 3.12.2 (Dwelling House Design) – defers to 2007 Sustainable Housing Guidelines. Table 3-4 Minimum Floor Area and Private Open Space for Dwellings (2-bed: 80sq.m floor area & 55sq.m garden to be located behind front building line). In general, a minimum distance of 22m should be achieved between opposing first floor windows at the rear of dwellings.

Volume 2 – Section 3.2 (Domestic Garages/Stores) to be ancillary to and in-keeping with dwelling house in terms of design and materiality, single storey only and with max. floor area of 80sq.m/ max. ridge height of 5m.

Volume 2 – Section 2.9 (Boundary Treatments): Boundary treatments must be appropriate to their setting-urban and rural.

Servicing

Section 9.5.1 (Public Water) and Table 9-1 (Irish Water Public Water Supplies and Capacities) which states that Rosslare Strand has “*Capacity available in the main networks serving the village and in the WRZ to cater for the 2027 population target*” [I note this table is based on March 2022 data].

Objective WS07: To require new developments to connect to public water supplies for drinking water where services are adequate or where they will be provided in the near future.

Section 9.6.1 (Public Wastewater Facilities) and Table 9-3 (Overview of Public Wastewater Infrastructure in Level 1-Level 4 Settlements) which states that Rosslare Strand has headroom of 2,826 on the basis of the 8,500 capacity of its WWTP [I note this table is based on April 2020 Uisce Eireann data].

Objective WW08: To facilitate the connection of existing developments to public wastewater services wherever feasible and subject to connection agreements with Irish Water and to ensure that any future development connects to the public wastewater infrastructure where it is available.

Table 9-5 which lists Irish Water Investment Plan Public Wastewater Projects 2020-2024 does not include Rosslare on the list.

Section 9.11 (Flood Risk and Surface Water Management).

Objective FRM06: To consider applications for minor developments such as change of use, extensions and infill development in accordance with the requirements of the Planning System and Flood Risk Management-Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DEHLG and OPW, 2009) and Circular PL2/2014, and any future update of these guidelines and the County Strategic Flood Risk Assessment in Volume 11.

Objective FRM14: To require the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) and nature-based solutions to minimise and limit the extent of hard surfacing and paving and require the use of sustainable drainage and nature-based techniques where appropriate, for new development or for extensions to existing developments, in order to reduce the potential impact of existing and predicted flooding risks, to improve water quality, enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure and contribute to climate mitigation and adaptation.

Objective SWM01: To require the application of SuDS in accordance with the CIRIA SuDS Manual 2015 and any future update of this guidance, or other best practice guidance as may be specified or required by the Council. The application of SuDS should prioritise the use of appropriate nature-based solutions where possible. All proposals should include a commensurate drainage assessment used to design the surface water management system for the site, and this assessment should outline the drainage design considerations/strategy in line with the flood risk, surface water management and climate change requirements and objectives of the County Development Plan and the County Strategic Flood Risk Assessment in Volume 11.

Objective RS54: To require developments to incorporate SuDS principles for surface water drainage proposals that adequately protect the Natura 2000 conservation sites that adjoin the village and to limit the discharge of appropriately treated surface water to two litres per hectare per second to an appropriate outfall (Volume 3).

Access

Section 8.8 (Sightlines which Require Works): The Council will ensure that all developments are served by safe accesses onto public roads in accordance with the

standards contained in Volume 2 Development Management Manual. Following monitoring by the Planning Department in 2019 it became apparent that some vehicular accesses were constructed without the required sightline measures conditioned by the planning permissions. This issue was more prevalent where the achievement of sightlines necessitated works to lands outside the ownership of the applicant and required consent from an adjoining landowner. As a result the Council will now require the measures outlined in Objective TS79.

Objective TS79: Where works are required to achieve sightlines at a vehicular access, the following criteria must be complied with:

- The necessary works to achieve the required sightlines must be indicated within the site edged red submitted with the planning application.
- No construction of the dwelling shall take place until the sightlines are in place.

Section 6.2.6 (Siting and Design of Access/Egress Points) • B. Sightlines Road speed limit of less than 60 kph The Planning Authority will have regard to the principles, approaches and standards of DMURS in the assessment of appropriate sight distances where a new or materially intensified access/egress point is proposed to a public road where a speed limit of less than 60 kph applies. Where the proposed access/egress point crosses an existing or potential future footpath (generally in towns and villages) the access/egress point shall be designed to facilitate visibility of and by pedestrians, and other road users. This may require limits on the height of boundary walls/fences and/or landscaping where the boundary treatment directly adjoins an existing or potential future footpath as detailed on Figure 6-6 below. This requirement is in addition to vehicle intervisibility sightline considerations.

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:

- Seas off Wexford SPA (Site Code 004237) – approx. 500m to east.
- Wexford Harbour and Slobs SPA (Site Code 004076) – approx. 1.5km to west.
- Slaney River Valley SAC (Site Code 000781) – approx. 3km to north.
- The Raven SPA (Site Code 004019) – approx. 3.5km to north.

- Long Bank SAC (Site Code 002161) – approx. 5km to the east.
- Blackwater Bank SAC (Site Code 002953) – approx. 6km to the east.
- Carnsore Point SAC (Site Code 002269) – approx. 5km to the south-east.

The site is also proximate to the following Natural Heritage Areas and proposed Natural Heritage Areas:

- Wexford Slobs And Harbour pNHA (Site Code 000712) – approx. 700m to west.

7.0 EIA Screening

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

8.0 Water Framework Directive Screening

An assessment of the proposed development has been carried out in accordance with Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive and relevant EPA guidance, including best practice in sustainable drainage design.

The development incorporates appropriate surface water management measures, including Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in the form of swales and infiltration to grass area, designed to replicate greenfield runoff rates and provide treatment of surface water prior to discharge.

These measures ensure that there will be no increase in pollutant loading, no alteration of the receiving waterbody's hydrological regime, and no risk of deterioration in water quality or ecological status. Whilst any construction stage residual risks identified during the assessment are capable of being addressed through standard mitigation measures and best practice construction management, due to the uncertainty that remains regarding the site's foul water connection to Rosslare WWTP, residual risks arising at operational stage are uncertain.

In light of the foregoing, it has not been possible to conclude that the proposed development will not impact on the achievement of environmental objectives for any water body in compliance with the requirements of Article 4.

9.0 The Appeal

9.1. Grounds of Appeal

A third party appeal submission was received from Vincent Staples (03/03/2026), neighbouring resident, against the PA's decision to grant permission. The appellant's grounds of appeal (GOA) are the same as those raised in their observation at application stage and are elaborated on as follows:

- *History of Unauthorised Development on Site* – filling/ ground and boundary works undertaken to raise level of site to level of private access laneway and turning area in addition to covering/ removal/ infilling of pre-existing open drain/ drainage pipe to rear of site.
- *Surface Water Drainage* – replacement of pre-existing soil with impermeable materials on site has given rise to drainage issues and has exacerbated natural fall in levels toward point of site (its rear (north-east side) which adjoins No's 34 & 35 The Cove) where there was previously an open drain/ drainage pipe provided which all properties discharged their surface water to.
- *Compliance* – concerns raised regarding alleged non-compliance with condition attached to the permission granted in 2018 under P.A. Ref. 20171473 with regard to the height & nature of the shared south-eastern boundary. The nature/siting of the boundary constructed (blockwork wall) has obstructed the pre-existing surface water drainage regime and given rise to drainage issues in neighbouring properties in The Cove estate, which have particularly impacted on No's 34 & 35 (sited at lowest point).
- *Drawing Inaccuracies* – raises queries as to the accuracy of information provided on the nature and location of storm drainage infrastructure related to the site. Commission's attention is also drawn to map scale issues.

The appeal is accompanied by the following enclosures:

- 1. Letter dated 22nd June 2022 from WCC (addressed to Cllr Frank Staples) in respect to 'groundworks at Mauritiustown, Rosslare' stating that groundworks carried out on the site are not considered to involve development and there is no further role for planning enforcement with regard to the works.
- 2. A number of undated photographs of the appeal site taken from inside the site and also from a property to the rear of the site, with some showing surface water ponding.
- 3. An OSI map of the site and surrounding properties which includes annotations indicating the location of the '(old) open drain' and 'lowest point' referred to in the GOA in addition to indicating the topography of the locality.
- 4. A copy of the decision document in respect of P.A. Ref. 20171473 with condition No. 5 and advice note 1 (re: need to avoid infringing on rights of adjoining property owners) highlighted.
- 5. Two undated close-up photographs of a blockwork wall in the background with foliage/ brambles/ soil/ what appears to be a pipe in the foreground with the annotations 'foundation for bdy wall' and 'boundary fence of No. 35 (SE)'.
- 6. The Site Plan submitted at application stage with the scale highlighted.

9.2. Applicant Response

The applicant, in their response dated 30/03/2026, seeks to clarify the following:

- Applicant has engaged with the appellant to address their issues and has undertaken extensive survey work (FRA, CCTV survey etc.) in support of their application. They are willing to undertake further works as required.
- Applicant has installed some on-site drainage infrastructure (225 dia stormwater pipe in the location of the old open drain) to accommodate surface water run-off from No's 34-36 The Cove.
- Photographs submitted as part of the GOA are out of date and do not reflect existing condition of the appeal site. Likely photos were taken during construction works on the site and ponding shows would be consistent with site subject to construction. The level of flooding shown by the photos is considered to be minimal.
- Winter period September – December 2025 saw high volumes of rainfall in the area. Notwithstanding, there has been no evidence or reporting of local flooding.

9.3. **Planning Authority Response**

None received.

9.4. **Observations**

None received.

9.5. **Prescribed Bodies**

No submissions 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:

- Principle of Development – New Issue
- Surface Water Drainage – New Issue
- Other

10.1. **Principle of Development**

10.1.1. The site subject of this appeal is located in a built-up predominantly residential area with the proposal for a detached single storey house being consistent with the existing pattern of development on the laneway.

10.1.2. The site is located in an area known as Rosslare Strand which is designated as a 'Level 3a Serviced Settlement' in the WCDP Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy. In this respect, Section 9.5.1 (Public Water) of the development plan states that this area has capacity available in the main networks serving the village to cater for its 2027 population target, with Section 9.6.1 (Public Wastewater Facilities) providing that Rosslare Strand has headroom of 2,826 on the basis of the 8,500 capacity of its WWTP. However, the aforementioned policy statements are based on 2022 and 2020 Uisce Eireann data respectively.

10.1.3. I note the site specific planning history under P.A. Ref. 20230754 (ABP-319540-24) where the Board recently refused permission for a single dwelling house in July 2025

for one reason relating exclusively to its proposed foul water connection to Rosslare Strand Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP). This WWTP was found to have an 'amber status' with constrained capacity and potential for overloading and, in the absence of a 'combined approach' assessment under Regulation 43 of the Waste Water Treatment Act of 2007 being completed by Uisce Éireann/ Wexford County Council in respect of the capacity of the WWTP to support further development in the Rosslare Strand area, the Commission determined that the proposed development would be premature due to the deficiency of the wastewater treatment facility to serve the proposed development.

- 10.1.4. Having consulted the Uisce Éireann wastewater treatment and water supply capacity registers for Wexford (accessed on 28/05/2026), I note that the Fardystown Water Resource Zone which serves same has potential capacity available (subject to a Level of Service agreement). In respect to the Rosslare Strand WWTP, the register still shows the plant as being 'amber listed' with a note stating that there is *"Potential spare capacity. Connection applications and enquiries currently being processed may impact on capacity availability. Connection applications will be assessed on an individual basis considering their specific load requirements, engagement with Uisce Éireann's Connections and Developer Services Team ahead of planning a project is required"*.
- 10.1.5. The most recent (May 2024) EPA Annual Environmental Report (AER) in respect of the Rosslare Strand WWTP (D0173-01) states that, whilst it is currently operating below capacity in terms of its average daily loads, it is likely that its capacity will be exceeded in the coming three year period (i.e. 2024-2027) with no specific improvements or upgrades planned for the plant. In respect to its ongoing performance, I note that the overall plant is failing in respect to its oxidised nitrogen emission limit value (ELV) discharges with its compliance status in this regard being 'non-compliant' albeit I also note that discharge from the WWTP is stated not to have an observable impact on water quality and coastal/ transitional water quality nor an observable negative impact on the Water Framework Directive status.
- 10.1.6. The PA addressed the matter of foul drainage in their report of 27/01/2026 by stating that *"There has been an ongoing issue with the existing wastewater treatment facility for the area which is on an Amber alert due to issues with limited capacity which is heightened during the summer months. It is understood that an assessment and a*

report has been carried out regarding the issue and applications for one off dwellings can be granted with an permanent residency condition placed on any grant". This was also the approach taken by the PA in respect to another recent application for a one-off house on the Mauritiustown Road (c. 100m to the south-west of the appeal site) which was granted on the 01/04/2026 under P.A. Ref. 20260171W.

- 10.1.7. I note that December 2025 email correspondence between the applicant's agent and Uisce Eireann in respect to a pre-connection inquiry for the site (Ref. No. CDS25009501) was provided as part of the application documentation. This stated that the technical feasibility of the proposed connection was undergoing assessment and that the applicant would be informed of the outcome in due course. A subsequent submission to the PA on the application was made by Uisce Eireann on the 15/01/2026 in its capacity as a Prescribed Body. This submission stated that Uisce Eireann had reviewed the proposed plans and particulars and requested that any grant of permission be conditioned as follows: *"The applicant shall enter into a Connection Agreement(s) with Uisce Eireann to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network and adhere to the standards and conditions set out in that agreement..."* (this was reflected in Condition No. 9 attached to the PA's grant of permission). However, I draw the Commission's attention to the fact that this submission did not constitute a standard 'Confirmation of Feasibility'.
- 10.1.8. Whilst I acknowledge that it appears from the PA's report and from the submission on file from Uisce Eireann that there may be sufficient capacity in Rosslare WWTP to cater for the proposed development subject to a condition limiting its occupancy to permanent only, no submission from the PA has been received on the appeal and no information on the nature, extent or findings of the combined assessment which is stated to have been undertaken in respect to the capacity of the Rosslare Strand WWTP is available to the Commission at this time.
- 10.1.9. Notwithstanding that the application subject of this appeal relates to a single dwelling house that is proposed to be connected to the public foul mains and to Rosslare Strand WWTP, I note the pattern of decisions and appeals in the locality and specifically the decisions of the Board in this regard whereby they have refused permission on the basis of uncertainty over the capacity of Rosslare Strand WWTP to accommodate the proposed development. I further note that the PA granted permission for the current

proposal on the basis of an assessment and report having been carried out regarding the capacity of the existing wastewater treatment facility serving the area. However, no details in respect to the assessment or report referenced by the PA in their planning report are available to the Commission. Therefore, having regard to the Board's previous refusal (under ABP-319540-24 in July 2025) in respect to the site subject of this appeal, and to the fact that there has been no change in the capacity status of the WWTP in the period since this preceding decision was made, I consider that the previous refusal reason has not been overcome.

10.2. Surface Water Drainage – New Issue

- 10.2.1. The appellant seeks to draw the Commission's attention to a pre-existing open drain/ drainage pipe to rear of site (adjoining No's 34 & 35 The Cove) which they contend was altered/ removed/ infilled by the application as part of alleged unauthorised works on site.
- 10.2.2. From my review of the GOA, it appears that the basis of the appellant's concerns relates to ongoing/ potential surface water flooding on neighbouring properties arising from the replacement of permeable soil on the appeal site with non-permeable materials (and related level changes/ increase in level of site relative to The Grove). The construction of a blockwork boundary wall to the south-east which may have altered the pre-existing local surface water drainage regime and also the aforementioned alteration to the drainage channel/ pipe are also cited as a basis for their concerns. The flooding issues raised are disputed by the applicant.
- 10.2.3. The Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment (SSFRA) carried out in respect of the proposal examined the hydrological regime of the area and did not identify any hydrological feature(s) in the immediate vicinity of the site. In respect to pluvial flooding arising from urban drainage, overland flows or blockages, the SSFRA did not identify any possible flooding mechanisms with no related flood risk arising from same. However, it is not clear whether this assessment was exclusively desktop based or was also informed by a site walkover.
- 10.2.4. Notwithstanding, I did not see any evidence of an open drain/ drainage ditch or watercourse on or directly adjoining the lands during my site inspection although I do acknowledge that this may be due to this portion of the site being overgrown and used for storage of miscellaneous building materials etc. However, I do note that

works to a pre-existing ditch/ drain were not raised as an issue by the PA in the context of their enforcement investigations or assessment of the subject scheme.

- 10.2.5. Undated photographs submitted with the GOA show some areas of surface water ponding on the site. I note that these photographs do not reflect the existing condition of the site, and I observed no evidence of surface water ponding during my inspection.
- 10.2.6. Whilst not readily apparent during my site inspection, I note from the Site Plan submitted that the adjoining properties at No's 34 & 35 The Cove appear to be located at a lower ground level than the appeal site (c. 7.3 O.D. versus c. 7.4 O.D. respectively) which is relatively flat. This plan also illustrates the location of 225 dia existing storm pipe which travels along the party boundary with The Cove estate. The first party response to appeal clarifies that this on-site drainage infrastructure is in the location of the 'old open drain' and serves to specifically accommodate surface water run-off from No's 34-36 The Cove.
- 10.2.7. The PA, who had sight of the abovementioned third party concerns, were satisfied with the applicant's drainage proposals, with the Roads Dept. recommending a grant of permission subject to standard maintenance and surface water management conditions, in addition to the requirement that existing open drainage channels be kept clear at all times to ensure surface water run-off from the hydro break is not restricted.
- 10.2.8. The applicant now proposes to construct a storm attenuation tank with hydro break (in the front garden on the north-west side of the dwelling) which the storm pipe would feed into before being discharged into the public network. Surface water on lands to the front of the property (which includes a permeable paved driveway) would drain into the same attenuation tank with surface water on lands to the rear of the property being directed into proposed swales which adjoin the site's boundaries with The Cove. These swales would function to hold the run-off before allowing it to slowly release into the soil. Whilst the provision of SuDS on site is compliant with Objectives RS54, SWM01 and FRM14 of the development plan, there is no information on file regarding the percolation value of the underlying soil or evidence that percolation testing was undertaken in support of the proposal (this is despite the cover letter submitted with the application referring to a 'Soil Test Report'). This is problematic on account of the issue of ponding and surface water drainage affecting neighbouring

properties raised by third parties. However, whilst I am not satisfied that sufficient information has been put forward to demonstrate that the underlying soil has the ability to attenuate future surface water run-off, I consider that matter of inadequate information being available on the percolation characteristics of the soil is capable of being resolved and would not in itself warrant a refusal of permission.

10.3. **Other**

Residential Standards

- 10.3.1. The PA did not raise an issue in respect to the layout or sizing of the proposed house. Whilst I note that, at c. 125sq.m, it greatly exceeds the target size requirement of 70sq.m for a 2-bed/ 4-person 1-storey dwelling set out under the 2007 Quality Housing Guidelines (compliance with same required under WCDP Volume 2 - Section 3.12.2 (Dwelling House Design)) with its living and dining areas also being generously sized, the submitted floor plans illustrate that the 2 no. proposed double bedrooms (at c. 10.88sq.m in area) are undersized relative to the 11.4sq.m area required by the same guidelines for a double bedroom. Whilst I do not consider this underperformance to be de minimus, I am satisfied that this matter could be easily addressed by condition requiring the redesign of the bedroom wing to provide for 2 no. adequately sized double bedrooms.

Access

- 10.3.2. The proposal relies on a private access road that is not taken in charge by Wexford County Council. Issues with regard to the condition of the roadway have been raised by third parties in the context of non-compliance with C.6 attached to P.A. Ref. 20171473 (the neighbouring site which is now stated to be in the applicant's ownership).
- 10.3.3. The submitted site plan shows this access road within the application red line and I note that, in answer to Q. 10 on the planning application form regarding legal interest in the land, it is stated that the applicant is the landowner.
- 10.3.4. I note from my site inspection that the access road is gravelled and devoid of footpaths, with the applicant proposing to resurface the laneway to tarmacadam and to introduce footpaths and a raised table etc. The PA did not raise any issues with

the applicant's proposals in this regard and consider that the upgrade of the laneway would be a planning gain.

10.3.5. WCDP Objective TS78 and Section 6.2.6 (Volume 2) require compliance with DMURS where the design speed of a road is less than 60kmph. The Mauritiustown Road (L-7101) is subject to a 50kmph speed limit. A sight stopping distance of 49m applies to such roads under DMURS. However, given the proposal comprises of an intensification in the use of the existing access off the L-7101, the PA did raise an issue with regard to the junction of the laneway and public road featuring inadequate sightlines when looking right (south-west) on exiting. I observed no such material obstruction when exiting the site following my site inspection and I am satisfied that visibility at the junction is adequate.

10.3.6. Having inspected the site and its access arrangements, I did not see evidence of obstruction at the aforementioned junction and on that basis, I am satisfied with regard to the proposed access arrangements.

Servicing via Private Laneway

10.3.7. A third party has raised concerns regarding the proposal's connection to the existing drainage network having regard to the private status of the laneway and the unknown condition of its underground infrastructure.

10.3.8. As detailed above, the information on file provides that the private laneway is in the ownership of the applicant and for this reason, I am satisfied that there should be no issue facilitating connections to the in-situ piped infrastructure. In respect to the condition of the existing infrastructure, I note that the applicant has undertaken a CCTV inspection survey in support of their application. The resulting report was submitted as part of their application and provides that the laneway's existing servicing infrastructure is in reasonable condition with connections being technically feasible.

Unauthorised Development

10.3.9. The GOA raise various issues in respect to alleged unauthorised development (groundworks and removal of open drain etc.) having been carried out on the appeal site. Whilst unauthorised development falls outside the remit of the Commission and is ordinarily a matter for the PA to address via their planning enforcement

mechanisms, I note from the information on file that the matters highlighted have already been investigated by WCC who determined that no enforcement action would be taken on the basis that the groundworks carried out on the site are not considered to involve development.

Drawing Inaccuracies

- 10.3.10. The appellant has raised concerns in respect to the accuracy and scale of submitted site plan drawings. Whilst I acknowledge the concerns raised and have addressed those relating to the site's drainage infrastructure under Section 10.2 of this report, having inspected the site and reviewed the information on file, I am satisfied that I have sufficient information before me to continue to assess the development subject of this appeal.

Boundary Issues

- 10.3.11. The GOA seek to draw the Commission's attention to the alleged non-compliance with Condition No. 5 attached to the grant of permission to an Anne Murphy under P.A. Ref. 20171473 which required that all new side and rear boundaries to that property shall be hedged with a mix of deciduous shrubs suitable for hedging and common to the locality. This permission was granted to a different applicant and relates to the neighbouring site to the south-east. Notwithstanding, I do acknowledge that the concerns raised by the appellant relate to a party boundary to the appeal site and, as such, ordinarily the nature and materiality of this boundary would be capable of being addressed by condition. However, in this particular case, the existing boundary (a blockwork wall) is already in-situ, and I consider that it would be unreasonably onerous to require its removal in place of native hedging, particularly given the appellant's proposals for the planting of flowering shrubs, perennials and wall hydrangea etc. along this boundary. I also consider the existing fencing along the site's other boundaries to be acceptable and in-keeping with its context and not in need of replacement with a boundary wall.
- 10.3.12. The appellant also draws the Commission's attention to potential infringements on the rights of adjoining property owners but does not provide any additional details with regard to same. Notwithstanding, I note that any such infringements would be a civil matter for resolution between the parties themselves.

Materials and Finishes

- 10.3.13. I consider that inadequate details are submitted in respect to the dwelling's proposed materials and finishes, which appear from the submitted drawings to comprise of rendered elevations with a selected metal finish porch canopy and roof (which would be generally in keeping with the architectural character of the area). I consider that the lack of information provided can be addressed by condition where the Commission are minded to grant permission.

Consultation

- 10.3.14. I note a third party raised an issue regarding the failure to consult with neighbouring residents. It is stated in the first party response to the appeal that the applicant has sought to engage with the appellant. Notwithstanding, applicants are not obligated to engage with neighbours prior to lodging an application for permission, with the requirement to publish and erect statutory notices in respect to the development proposal and the subsequent five week statutory period allowed for submissions on the application serving as the statutory public consultation period. I note from the PA's report that no procedural issues in respect to this process were raised and it does not appear that any party was unduly prejudiced in this regard.

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 and the Uisce Eireann Wastewater Capacity Register, and noting that the proposed development proposes to connect to the Rosslare Strand Wastewater Treatment Plant, which does not consistently meet the requirements of its Environmental Protection Agency wastewater discharge licence, and which has an 'amber' status demonstrating a constrained capacity where overloading of the facility may occur, it is considered that where certainty of available capacity to facilitate the proposed development cannot be demonstrated, and in the absence of available information in respect to a 'combined approach' assessment to demonstrate that the proposed development would not be

prejudicial to public health, or potentially cause an adverse impact on the receiving environment, the proposed development would be premature due to the deficiency of the wastewater treatment facility to serve the proposed development, and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area

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

Emma Gosnell

Planning Inspector

8th June 2026

Appendix 1

Form 1 – EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500919-WX-26
Proposed Development Summary	House and a domestic garage, new site entrance and access road surface upgrade with connection to main services (foul, storm and water) and all associated site works.
Development Address	Mauritiustown, Rosslare, County Wexford.
	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)	☒ Yes, it is a ‘Project’. Proceed to Q2. ☐ 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)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
☒ 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?	
☐ 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.	
No Screening required.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.	
EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
☒ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	Part 2, Class 10(b)(i) Infrastructure – dwelling units – 500 units. Proposal is for refurbishment of building to provide 1 no. dwelling unit. Part 2, Class 10(b)(iv) – Urban development – 10 hectares (built-up area). Site is c. 0.088 ha.

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)?	
Yes ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2 – EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-500919-WX-26
Proposed Development Summary	House and a domestic garage, new site entrance and access road surface upgrade with connection to main services (foul, storm and water) and all associated site works.
Development Address	Mauritiustown, Rosslare, County Wexford.
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	The development is for a one-off dwelling which would be connected to the public mains, garage and related works on a site of 0.088ha in an existing built-up area. Its design and form are consistent with the pattern of development in the immediate area.

resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	The development is significantly below the class threshold of 500 dwellings. The project due to its size and nature would not give rise to significant use of resources or production of waste during both the construction and operation phases. 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 proposed development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, and is not 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 site is located in the urban area of Rosslare Strand. There is similar low-density housing in the wider area. The nearest Natura 2000 sites are the Seas off Wexford SPA (Site Code 004237) – approx. 500m to east; Wexford Harbour and Slobbs SPA (Site Code 004076) – approx. 1.5km to west; Slaney River Valley SAC (Site Code 000781) – approx. 3km to north; Long Bank SAC (Site Code 002161) – approx. 5km to the east; Blackwater Bank SAC (Site Code 002953) – approx. 6km to the east; and, Carnsore Point SAC (Site Code 002269) – approx. 5km to the south-east. The site is located in a ‘Coastal’ landscape character area and in a ‘Service/ Strategic Settlement’ as per Figure 3-1 Core Strategy Map. The development is generally removed from sensitive natural habitats and designated sites identified significance in the County Development Plan. There is no other nationally designated site on or in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. The site is not within a designated ACA and there are no Protected Structures or other Cultural Heritage sites on or immediately adjoining the site. Tributaries of the Rosslare Milltown (010) River are located c. 200m to the north and c. 200m to the south of the appeal site with this river flowing in a north-westerly in the general direction of Wexford Harbour and also Wexford Harbour and Slobbs SPA (Site Code 004076) and the Slaney River Valley SAC (Site Code 000781).

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).	Due to the nature and scale of the development, the construction stage will not be significant in terms of duration or complexity. The main operational impacts would be limited to traffic, visual amenity, surface water and the wastewater emissions arising from the site. These elements would be subject to standard assessment/ design and while I have outlined concerns with regard to proposed foul drainage and surface water management arrangements as per Section 10 of this report, I am satisfied that these can be assessed without potential for significant environmental effects that would require EIA. There would be no significant cumulative impacts with other projects. 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.
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 for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics Case file: PL-500919-WX-26	
Brief description of project	Normal planning appeal. Proposal to construct a house and a domestic garage, new site entrance and access road surface upgrade with connection to main services (foul, storm and water) and all associated site works at Mauritiustown, Rosslare, County Wexford – see Section 2.0 of Inspector’s Report for further details.
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	The site is located on a private laneway and cul-de-sac located in the Rosslare Strand area in the southern environs of Rosslare town, c. 3.8km to the north-west of Rosslare Harbour in County Wexford. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character as detailed in Section 1.0 of the Inspector’s report. The development involves the construction of a single storey detached house and ancillary garage and all ancillary works etc. There are no watercourses or other ecological features of note on the appeal site that would connect it directly to European Sites in the wider area. Tributaries of the Rosslare Milltown (010) River are located c. 200m to the north and c. 200m to the south of the appeal site (separated from the site by intervening urban land uses) with this river flowing in a north-westerly in the general direction of Wexford Harbour and also Wexford Harbour and Slobbs SPA (Site Code 004076) and the Slaney River Valley SAC (Site Code 000781). The site’s swale SuDS features are to discharge to groundwater (Bridgetown groundwater body). All surface and foul water is to connect to the existing surface water drain and foul water drain at the private laneway – full details in Section 10 of Inspector’s Report – which in turn connect to the public mains and to Rosslare Strand WWTP which is located further north of the site at junction of station road and the rail line and discharges to the Irish Sea and into the Seas off Wexford SPA (Site Code 004237).
Screening report	No
Natura Impact Statement	No
Relevant Submissions	No
Planning Authority	No objections raised on AA grounds – determined that Stage 2 assessment not required.
Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model	

Having regard to the source-pathway receptor-model, I consider that there is 1 no. European site which has the potential to be affected by the proposal. I have excluded all other European sites on the basis of their physical separation from the appeal site, the nature and extent of intervening land uses and due to the absence of realistic pathways connecting the appeal site to same.

European Site (code)	Qualifying interests ¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development	Ecological Connections ²	Consider further in screening ³
Seas off Wexford SPA (Site Code 004237)	Red-throated Diver (Gavia stellata) [A001] Fulmar (Fulmarus glacialis) [A009] Manx Shearwater (Puffinus puffinus) [A013] Gannet (Morus bassanus) [A016] Cormorant (Phalacrocorax carbo) [A017] Shag (Phalacrocorax aristotelis) [A018] Common Scoter (Melanitta nigra) [A065] Mediterranean Gull (Larus melanocephalus) [A176] Black-headed Gull (Chroicocephalus ridibundus) [A179] Lesser Black-backed Gull (Larus fuscus) [A183] Herring Gull (Larus argentatus) [A184] Kittiwake (Rissa tridactyla) [A188] Roseate Tern (Sterna dougallii) [A192] Common Tern (Sterna hirundo) [A193] Arctic Tern (Sterna paradisaea) [A194] Guillemot (Uria aalge) [A199] Razorbill (Alca torda) [A200] Puffin (Fratercula arctica) [A204]	approx. 500m to east.	Yes Potential indirect hydrological connections via the Rosslare Strand WWTP and via SuDS to groundwater.	Yes

	Sandwich Tern (Thalasseus sandvicensis) [A863] Little Tern (Sternula albifrons) [A885] Source: NPWS website accessed 22/05/2026.			

Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination) on European Sites
AA Screening matrix

Site Name	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
Seas off Wexford SPA (Site Code 004237)	<u>Direct:</u> None <u>Indirect:</u> potential weak, indirect hydrological connections via SuDS swale discharge to groundwater body which also underlays the specified SPA and via discharge from Rosslare Strand WWTP into the Wexford's coastal waters. This may lead to a potential impact on water quality in terms of increased nutrients. Rosslare Strand WWTP is already the subject of exceedances to its emission limit values.	The contained nature of the site (serviced, defined site boundaries, no direct ecological connections or pathways) and distance from receiving features connected to the SPA which would give rise to dilution effects are all factors which make it highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality within the SPA for the SCIs listed in the table above at either construction or operation stage. No possibility of significant effects on account of proposed connection to Rosslare Strand WWTP which is subject to EPA environmental licensing.
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No	

Step 4 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site

I conclude that the proposed development (alone or in combination with other plans and projects) would not result in likely significant effects on a European Site. No further assessment is required for the project. No measures specifically intended to avoid or reduce harmful impacts of the proposed development on European sites were taken into account in reaching this conclusion.

Screening Determination

Finding of no likely significant effects

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on European Sites, namely Seas off Wexford SPA (Site Code 004237), in view of this site's Conservation Objectives, and Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.

This determination is based on:

- The urban location, relatively minor scale of the development and lack of impact mechanisms that could significantly affect a European Site.
- Distance from and weak indirect connections to the European Sites.
- No potential for ex situ impacts.

Appendix 3 – Water Framework Directive Determination

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT SCOPING TABLE			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Bord Pleanála ref. no.	PL-500919-WX-26	Townland, address	Mauritiustown, Rosslare, County Wexford.
Description of project		Normal planning appeal. Proposal to construct a house and a domestic garage, new site entrance and access road surface upgrade with connection to main services (foul, storm and water) and all associated site works – see Section 2.0 of Inspector’s Report for further details.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		The infill site is located at the terminus of a private residential laneway in the built-up area of Rosslare Strand. Located in Flood Risk Zone C. No watercourses on site. Tributaries of the MILLTOWN ROSLARE_010 River (EPA Code IE_SE_12M860440, Moderate Status and Under Review located c.200m to the north at the opposite side of The Cove estate and 200m to the south. This river flows north-west towards Wexford Harbour. The appeal site is also underlain by Bridgetown groundwater body (EPA Code IE_SE_G_022) which has a Good status and is Not at Risk.	
Proposed surface water details		Existing surface water sewer runs along boundary of the site. Surface water to front of property will be collected into underground attenuation tank and will discharge into the public surface water system via an existing drain on the private laneway. Surface water to rear of property will be disposed of via swales which will discharge to groundwater. See Section 10 of Inspector’s Report for further details.	
Proposed water supply source & available capacity		Public mains - capacity available without requiring upgrade. See Section 10 of Inspector’s Report for further details.	
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues		Public wastewater network. Whilst Uisce Eireann did not raise objections to the proposal and recommended the attachment of conditions in the event of a grant of planning permission, I note that there is no Confirmation of Feasibility on file from Uisce Eireann. It is not clear from the information	

	before the Commission whether there is sufficient foul capacity available without requiring upgrade. See Section 10 of Inspector's Report for further details.
Others?	n/a

Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection							
Identified water body	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) (Consider all phases)	Mitigation Measures proposed	Is mitigation sufficient? Will there be any residual impacts?
River	MILLTOWN ROSLARE_010 River (EPA Code IE_SE_12M860440)	Moderate	Under Review	Agriculture (significant)	Not hydrologically connected to surface watercourse.	Standard construction mitigation measures.	Mitigation sufficient. No residual impacts predicted.
Groundwater	Bridgetown groundwater body (EPA Code IE_SE_G_022)	Good	Not at Risk	None	SuDS swales discharging to groundwater.	n/a	n/a

Coastal	Southwestern Irish Sea (EPA Code IE_SE_010_0000)	Good	Not at Risk	None	Foul drainage connection.	Connection to Rosslare Strand WWTP which is subject to EPA licensing.	Residual impacts arising cannot be ruled out on account of foul water capacity issues raised in Section 10 of Inspector's Report.
---------	--	------	-------------	------	---------------------------	---	---