



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500920-LK-26

Development	Construction of two stables, access gateway, boundary wall and associated site works
Location	Coonagh East, Coonagh, Co Limerick
Planning Authority	Limerick City and County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560929
Applicant(s)	William Faulkner
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Roderick O'Connor
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	6 th June 2026
Inspector	Clare Clancy

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
3.1. Decision	5
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	7
3.4. Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History.....	8
5.0 Policy Context.....	8
5.1. Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028 (as varied)	8
5.2. Section 28 Guidelines	12
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations	12
6.0 EIA Screening.....	12
7.0 The Appeal	13
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	13
7.2. Applicant Response	15
7.3. Planning Authority Response.....	15
7.4. Observations.....	15
8.0 Assessment.....	15
8.1. Principle of Development	16
8.2. Waste Management.....	16
8.3. Flood Risk.....	18
8.4. Material Contravention.....	20

8.5. Other Matters 22

9.0 AA Screening..... 24

10.0 WFD Screening 24

11.0 Recommendation 25

12.0 Reasons and Considerations..... 25

Appendix 1 – Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening 27

Appendix 2 – Appropriate Assessment Screening 30

Appendix 3 – WFD Impact Assessment Stage 1..... 51

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The appeal site is located within Limerick City and Suburbs settlement boundary in a rural area approx. 3.7 km to the west of Limerick city centre, as the crow flies. The site is bounded to the east by Coonagh United FC and to the southwest by a dwelling. The Coonagh road adjoins the site to the west, and the site has a road frontage of approx. 99 m. There is an existing access to the site, and the roadside boundary is defined by a timber post fence. There is a public footpath adjacent to the boundary of the site extending to Connagh Roundabout which is located to the approx. 1.0 km to the northeast with speed bumps along the road. The site is level with the adjoining public road, and the general area is low-lying in nature. The surrounding area is characterised by extensive one-off housing along the local road and agricultural farms lands. Limerick Flying Club and runway are located to the south.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Permission is sought for the construction of 2 no. stables, fodder store, new access gateway and boundary wall. The following is noted:

- Site Area – 0.792 ha
- Gross floor area – 123 m²
- 2 no. stables and 2 no. storage areas as indicated on plans, drawings
- Max roof height 4.5 m
- Dung storage proposed on hardstanding area, dry wood shavings

2.2. Revised details were submitted in response to a Further Information (FI) request as follows:

- Revised drawings were provided to demonstrate that sightlines and stopping sight distances of 90 m can be achieved. There is no requirement to setback third party boundaries. Autotrack layout submitted and photos of the public road.
- Revised proposals submitted for planting, parking and drainage.

- The existing shipping container is used to store feed and will be removed once the stables are constructed.
- To address the unauthorised amendments to the roadside boundary, the existing boundary will be replaced with a low masonry wall on the roadside and landscaping is proposed internally with whitethorn hedge.
- Flood risk on site will be addressed by constructing the stable block in flood resistant materials, rendered concrete blockwork, steel corrugated roofing. Fodder will be stored on a raised area. Any electrics will be kept to shoulder height.
- Boundary treatments will be reinforced with native hedging and timber fencing for horses.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By Order dated 24th November 2025, Limerick City and County Council decided to grant permission subject to 8 conditions. In addition to standard conditions, the following conditions are noted:

- Condition 2 – Removal of container.
- Condition 3 – Sightlines.
- Condition 4 – Surface water management and provision of a drainage channel.
- Condition 7 – Farming activity to comply with European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2022 (as amended).
- Condition 8 – Management of farmyard manure.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

Planning Reports

Two Planning Reports form the basis of the assessment and recommendation as follows:

3.2.1. First Planning Report (06/11/2025)

- Principle of development is acceptable, the site is zoned 'Agriculture'.
- No issue raised regarding the siting and design of the stables.
- No impact on residential amenities due to separation distance.
- Noted that the roadside boundary was removed without planning permission and replaced with timber post fencing. Further Information (FI) required to submit revised topographical survey and to demonstrate sightlines and stopping sight distances of 90 m from proposed access.
- Site is located in Flood Zone A, is a less vulnerable development and requires a justification test and a commensurate assessment was requested.
- EIA and Appropriate Assessment are not required.
- Recommended FI in relation to the following:
 - i. Demonstrate sightlines and any site remedial works if required which might impact adjacent third-party boundaries along with written consent of adjoining landowners. A site plan to show details of access road, parking areas/ landscaping/ drainage infrastructure.
 - ii. Details in relation to storage of farmyard manure on site.
 - iii. Proposals to address unauthorised development on the site in regard to a shipping container.
 - iv. The submission of a commensurate assessment of flood risk for the site, however a full site-specific flood risk assessment was not required.
 - v. Indicate proposed boundary treatments on a revised site layout plan.

3.2.2. Second Planning Report (09/02/2026)

- The proposed access can achieve sight distances which the Roads Department reviewed and were satisfied with. A condition in regard to the provision of a permeable surface was recommended to address the access road, parking area, and area at front of stables. No site remedial works are required to third party boundaries.
- Proposals to manage farmyard manure were acceptable subject to conditions.

- The shipping container is to be removed following construction of stables A condition was included to this effect.
- The proposal to provide a 1.05 m high wall along the L-1430 backed by landscaping was deemed acceptable.
- Existing boundaries will be augmented with additional native hedging and reinforced with timber fencing.

3.2.3. Other Technical Reports

- Environment & Climate

First Report (05/11/2025) – Details required on the management of farmyard manure.

Second Report (09/02/2026) – No objection subject to conditions to comply with European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2022 (as amended) and no storage of farmyard manure between November 1st and January 15th.

- Roads

First Report (03/11/2025) – Revised details in regard to sightlines and stopping site distances of 90 m, boundary treatments and details on how storm water runoff will be disposed.

Second Report (07/02/2026) – No objection subject to conditions regarding sightlines to be achieved as per Drawing No. A100 Rev D, and surface water management.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Two Third Party observations were received from Rodrick O'Connor and Coonagh Sports and Social Club. The issues raised relate to the following:

- Unauthorised development.

- Flooding
- Surface water drainage issues.
- Scale of the proposed development and road traffic safety.
- Land ownership.
- Management of organic waste and runoff.

4.0 Planning History

Appeal Site – most recent:

- ABP Ref. 310221-21, P.A. Ref. 21299 – Permission refused for a dwelling. Grounds for refusal related to unsuitable ground conditions within site and consequent potential impact on the integrity of European sites, risk of flooding, and compliance with local housing need policy.
- Enforcement
 - DC-400-19 Enforcement notice issued for opening of an access.
 - DC-401-22 Warning letter issued for infilling of land, mobile home, container, rubble.

5.0 Policy Context

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

The relevant policy and objectives of the current development plan include the following:

5.1.1. Chapter 5 A Strong Economy

- Section 5.8.16 Agriculture

Objective ECON O36 Agricultural Developments

It is an objective of the Council to favourably consider proposals for agricultural development where:

- a) They are appropriate in nature and scale to the area in which they are located;
- b) The proposal is necessary for the efficient use of the agricultural holding or enterprise;
- c) The development is not visually intrusive in the local landscape and, where the proposal is for a new building(s) and there are no suitable redundant buildings, the proposal is sited adjacent to existing buildings;
- d) The proposal demonstrates that it has taken into account traffic, environmental and amenity considerations and is in accordance with the policies, requirements and guidance contained in this Plan.

5.1.2. Chapter 8 Infrastructure

- Section 8.7.4 Agricultural Waste and Farm Plastics

Objective IN O20 Agricultural Waste

b) Require that the disposal of agricultural waste is carried out in a safe, efficient and sustainable manner, having regard to protection of the environment and public health and in compliance with the Nitrates Directive, Good Agricultural Practice for the Protection of Waters) Regulations 2017 (SI 605 of 2017), the Habitats Directives and any other relevant statutory provisions.

5.1.3. Chapter 9 Climate Action, Flood Risk and Transition to Low Carbon Economy

- *Section 9.3 Flooding, Flood Risk Management and Water Management*

The Section 28 Planning Guidelines The Planning System and Flood Risk Management (DHPLG/OPW, 2009) and associated Technical Appendices and Circulars, are the basis of the Council's policy in relation to development and flood risk management. It plays a key part in informing zoning decisions and decisions on individual planning applications, where flood risk is identified as a factor. The guidelines ensure that the key principles of flood risk management and sustainable planning are adopted. The sequential approach to managing flood risk within the planning system is one of the first aspects to consider and where uncertainty exists, the precautionary approach is taken.

Objective CAF O20 Flood Risk Assessments

It is an objective of the Council to require a Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for all planning applications in Flood Zones A and B and consider all sources of flooding (for example coastal/tidal, fluvial, pluvial or groundwater), where deemed necessary. The detail of these Site-Specific FRAs (or commensurate assessments of flood risk for minor developments) will depend on the level of risk and scale of development. The FRA will be prepared taking into account the requirements laid out in the SFRA, and in particular in the Plan Making Justification Tests as appropriate to the particular development site. A detailed Site-Specific FRA should quantify the risks, the effects of selected mitigation and the management of any residual risks. The assessments shall consider and provide information on the implications of climate change with regard to flood risk in relevant locations.

5.1.4. Chapter 11 Development Management Standards

- Section 11.6.8 Agricultural Buildings, Re-use of Redundant Farm Buildings, Farm Diversification – this section provides guidance for prospective development. The following is of note:
 - Agricultural buildings and associated works (walls, fences, gates, entrances, yards etc.), while accepting the need to be functional, are required to be sympathetic to their rural surroundings - in scale, materials and finishes. Traditionally this was achieved by having the roof darker than the walls. Appropriate roof colours are dark grey, dark reddish brown or a very dark green; dark reddish brown or a very dark green;
 - The grouping of agricultural buildings will be encouraged and use of existing landscaping, in order to reduce their overall impact in the interests of visual amenity;
 - Buildings should be located a minimum of 100m from the nearest dwelling other than the applicant's/landowner's dwelling;
 - It should be demonstrated that there are no suitable redundant buildings on the farm holding to accommodate the proposed development.
- Some agricultural developments are exempt from planning control. However, no new building or structure on a farm is exempt from planning permission

unless it has adequate effluent storage facilities. The Planning Authority will require adequate provision for the collection, storage and disposal of effluent produced from agricultural developments. Developers are required to adhere to the Department of Agriculture Guideline entitled Guidelines and Recommendations on the Control of Pollution from Farmyard Wastes and the following slurry storage and slurry disposal/ recycling requirements:

- All effluent storage tanks should be constructed to Department of Agriculture and Food specifications;
- The capacities of all slurry, effluent and soiled water tanks and all other tanks for pollutants shall comply with the current Department of Agriculture Guidelines and any subsequent documents/ guidelines;
- The applicant may be required to demonstrate that sufficient lands of suitable nutrient status are available within a reasonable distance for the disposal/recycling of organic waste from a proposed agricultural development. A Nutrient Management and Disposal Plan will be undertaken by a suitably qualified professional and submitted as part of the planning application to be assessed by the Council;
- Agricultural waste shall be managed in an environmentally sustainable manner in accordance with the principles set by the Rural Environment Protection Scheme, the Farm Waste Management Scheme and relevant EU and national legislation (in particular, the EC Good Agricultural Practice for the Protection of Waters Regulations 2017) (SI 605 of 2017).

5.1.5. Chapter 12 Land Use Zoning Strategy

Land Use Zoning

The appeal site is zoned 'Agriculture'

Objective: To protect and improve rural amenity and provide for the development of agricultural uses.

Purpose: Protect rural amenity and agricultural lands from urban sprawl and ribbon development and provide a clear demarcation to the adjoining built up areas. Uses which are directly associated with agriculture or rural related business activities which have a demonstrated need for a rural based location

and which would not interfere with rural amenity are open for consideration. Compliance is required with the criteria for Small Scale Home-Based Businesses. One off dwellings will only be considered on agriculturally zoned land outside of Flood Zones A and B, subject to the terms and conditions of the rural housing policy as set out in this Plan. Dwellings are categorized as 'highly vulnerable development' in the Section 28 Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2010) and will not be permitted in flood zones.

5.2. Section 28 Guidelines

5.2.1. The Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (November 2009)

- The purpose of the Guidelines is to provide planning authorities with detailed procedural and technical guidance needed to properly assess flood risk at development level, and to ensure all planning decisions comply with national policy of avoiding or managing flood risk. The Guidelines set out how flood risk must be assessed and integrated into planning decisions, and ensure that planning authorities follow the risk-based sequential approach.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- SAC: 002165 - Lower River Shannon SAC – lies approx. within 1.0 km to the north, west and south of the site.
- SPA: 004077 - River Shannon and River Fergus Estuaries SPA – lies approx. within 1.0 km to the north, west and south of the site.
- pNHA: 002048 - Fergus Estuary and Inner Shannon, North Shore lies approx. within 1.0 km to the north, west and south of the site.

6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is

also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

One Third Party appeal was received from Roderick O'Connor. The grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

Unauthorised Development

- There is a 40 ft container on site for over 18 months, and construction and demolition waste was illegally dumped on the site resulting in a large hardcore area c. 100 m².
- Condition 2 requires the removal of the container and site reinstated within one month of use of permitted stables. The council are unreliable in enforcing planning conditions due to lack of enforcement concerning the container.
- Condition 3(e) will not be adhered to as pre-existing natural boundaries i.e. trees, hedgerow, earth mounds have been replaced with timber fencing.
- Where a road opening licence is required, as referred to in the decision, it is unlikely that this will be adhered to as the pre-existing roadside boundary of the site was removed and replaced with a timber fence.

Zoning

- The intended use of the proposed development materially contravenes the zoning objective for the site as it does not directly relate to agriculture, and the proposed stables does not 'protect, retain and enhance lands for agriculture and agricultural use'.

Flood Risk

- The applicant did not consider it necessary to submit a site-specific flood risk assessment which is erroneous as the council had previously raised flood risk on the site in relation to previous planning applications. The proposed development is approx. 75% the floor area of an application refused previously.

- Policy WS.8 Flood Protection sets out the council's objective in regard to address flooding. The proposed development does not fall within any of the listed criteria as described in the policy, and no flood risk assessment of the site was carried out.
- Even if the development is deemed to be agriculture in nature, due to its proximity to three existing dwellings and the community pitch, the development does not adhere to the Flood Risk Management Guidelines. The nature of the flood risk is set out in the Planning Inspector report ABP Ref. 310221-21 pages 9-17. The applicant acknowledges that significant infilling of the site is required to avoid potential flooding.
- A justification test was not undertaken in accordance with Flood Risk Management Guidelines. This is a sensitive site and understanding the effects of flooding in the event of break of current flood defences is essential. The proposed development would be contrary to Policy WS.8.

Ribbon Development

- There is extensive one-off housing in the immediate area and ribbon development to the northeast of the site and to the south. This point was made by a Planning Inspector in relation to ABP Ref. 310221-21.
- NPO 15 of the National Planning Framework seeks to support the sustainable development of rural areas by managing growth of areas that are under strong urban influence to avoid overdevelopment.

Effluent and Wastewater Treatment

- Bedrock may be found on the site (0.6 m) and ponding of water occurs and there is low permeability. There is a serious public health concern due to discharge of animal waste from the proposed stables as the site is a flood plain. Other than conditions 5, 6, 7 and 8, no conditions have been included to mitigate these factors.
- Potential leachate from stored animal feed, silage and potentially manure spreading would be significantly hazardous on a designated flood plain, with potential for runoff into adjoining properties and natural drains which were not taken into account.

Appropriate Assessment

- The Lower River Shannon SAC (Site Code 002165) and the River Shannon and River Fergus Estuaries SPA (Site Code 004077) lie to the west and to the south of the site and the site lies in a flood plain. Section 7.5 of the Planning Inspector's report for ABP Ref. 310221-21 applies.

Inaccurate Site Boundaries

- The boundaries of the site are incorrect. The site has annexed a pre-existing public road area measuring approx. 10 m in width along the road frontage of the site which is still visible on the site in question.

A copy of photos and a copy of LCCC's ePlan for P.A. Ref. 5260929 are appended to the appeal submission.

7.2. Applicant Response

None.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

None.

7.4. Observations

None

8.0 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, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Waste Management

- Flood Risk
- Material Contravention
- Other Matters

8.1. Principle of Development

- 8.1.1. I note for the Commission that this third-party appeal refers specifically to the Planning Inspector's report related to ABP Ref. 310244-21 and draws on its content in the context of the subject appeal. This case related to a proposal for a new dwelling and was assessed under a previous development plan. Notwithstanding, the matters raised in the grounds of appeal will be considered in the context of the proposed development and in accordance with the provisions of the current operative development plan and relevant national Guidelines.
- 8.1.2. The appellant contends that the nature and use of the proposed development for equine use does not directly relate to agriculture and is at variance with the zoning objective for the site.
- 8.1.3. The appeal site is zoned 'Agriculture' the objective for which is to 'protect and improve rural amenity and provide for the development of agricultural uses'. The proposed development comprises of a 2 no. stable block and ancillary storage. Such structures by their nature relate to agricultural development and the equine sector in my view would be classified as an agricultural activity. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development is required to be located in a rural area and complies with the zoning objective for the site.

8.2. Waste Management

- 8.2.1. The grounds of appeal refer to conditions 5, 6, 7 and 8. Conditions 5 and 6 relate to surface water management and conditions 7 and 8 relate to agricultural activities including management of farmyard manure.
- 8.2.2. The appellant makes reference to the bedrock dept within the site noting that it is only 0.6 m. I note that this statement appears to be derived from the Inspector's report related to ABP Ref. 310221-21. In this case, a domestic wastewater treatment system was proposed under that application for permission. It is also noted by the appellant

that ponding and low permeability are characteristic of the site and that the generation and storage of animal waste and the storage of animal feed will give rise to a serious public health risk due to runoff, as the site is a flood plain. It is submitted also that the PA did not include conditions to mitigate for these issues.

- 8.2.3. In relation to condition 7 of the PA's decision, I note that the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2022, as amended, is a legal regulatory framework that governs farming practices to protect water quality caused by slurry/ manure, fertilisers, and runoff. It is applicable to all farming activities including land spreading of organic waste. This has been superseded by new Good Agriculture Practice Regulations which came into effect on December 2025 (S.I. No. 588/2025 – European Union (Good Agriculture Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2025 (GAP Regulations, 2005). Condition 8 of the grant does not permit farmyard manure to be stored on land or land spreading during November 1st and January 15th.
- 8.2.4. The applicant clarified in their response to the FI request that dry manure would be stored on site under a canopy attached to the building, however the plans and drawings have not indicated the location of the proposed covered dung stead. It was also stated that spreading would occur during open season and weather permitting. Both the PA and the Environment and Climate Action section of the council were satisfied with the response and recommended the inclusion of conditions 7 and 8 which are generally standard conditions that are applied to agricultural developments that generate organic waste.
- 8.2.5. The storage of farmyard mature is a common practice within farmyards until land spreading is permitted. Therefore, it is required to be stored properly in a dungstead or a suitable storage facility until the closed period ends before land spreading can commence. In this case, organic waste will be stored on site and will be land spread. I note that other additional lands are not identified as being in the applicant's landholding in terms of land spreading, however I note that the applicant is legally obliged to adhere to the GAP Regulations, 2025, when undertaking land spreading. Therefore, I am satisfied that once land spreading is carried out in accordance with these Regulations, that no risk of water pollution arises. In the event of a grant, I recommend the inclusion of a condition requiring adherence to these Regulations and the inclusion of condition 8 of the PA's decision. I consider these conditions

appropriate to address organic waste generation by the use of the proposed stable and to manage farm activities of the site in accordance with the applicable legislative framework. As it was not identified where the proposed covered dung stead would be located, I recommend that the Commission include a pre-development condition requiring that details and drawings are provided to clarify this.

- 8.2.6. Conditions 4, 5 and 6 relate to the prevention of surface water runoff arising from hard surfaces and roofs from entering onto the public footpath and public road and to prevent flooding. I note that condition 4 requires the provision of a drainage channel to be constructed along the proposed access. These are generally standard conditions included by the PA to manage surface water runoff arising from the proposed development onto the public road. As I did not observe existing drainage channels or other mechanism in place to address surface water runoff from the site, I consider it appropriate to include these conditions or similar, should the Commission be minded granting permission.

8.3. Flood Risk

- 8.3.1. The grounds of appeal have raised that no site-specific flood risk assessment was carried out of the proposed development, despite previous concerns raised by the PA regarding flooding on the site. It is further submitted that the proposal does not comply with Policy WS.8 (Flood Protection) as it does not meet the criteria stated in the policy.
- 8.3.2. Having regard to Map 5 in Volume 2 of the Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028 (as varied), I note that the appeal site is located in Flood Zone A. The appellant refers to Policy WS.8 (Flood Protection), however I note for the Commission that the policy referred to was contained in the previous Limerick City Development Plan 2010-2016. This development plan has expired, and the current planning policies and objectives as contained in the operative Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028 (as varied) therefore apply.
- 8.3.3. The PA raised the matter of flood risk in its request for FI and determined that the proposed development was a minor development and requested the provision of a commensurate assessment to address flood risk, in accordance with Section 5.28 of the Guidelines. Although stating in the planner's report that a justification test for the

proposed development was required, they advised the application that a full site-specific flood risk assessment was not required.

- 8.3.4. Section 5.28 of the Guidelines outlines the approach for the assessment of minor proposals in areas of flood risk, however I note for the Commission that it does not apply to new development proposals. It relates specifically to existing buildings where minor development ancillary to such existing development is proposed e.g. an extension to an existing dwelling. I note that the applicant response did not contain a proportionate, evidence-based assessment of the development. Rather, it indicated that the proposed stables would be of concrete block construction with corrugated steel roofing and that the fodder would be kept on a raised area. In my view what is described by the applicant are flood mitigation measures which the PA accepted. It has not demonstrated that the development would not increase flood risk elsewhere.
- 8.3.5. I note that the general area of Coonagh is low-lying, and that it was designated by the OPW as 'benefiting lands'. I note from the Site Layout DWG No. A100 submitted in response to the FI request that the ground levels of the site decrease marginally from the level of the adjoining public road to the rear of the site however I observe at time of site inspection that the topography of the site is generally flat and consisted with the immediate area. While the FFL is not stated, it is indicated on the plans and drawings that the proposed stable block would be built 0.15 m above ground level. There will be a hardstanding area to its west and parking for 3 no. spaces is provided adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. There is reference made by the appellant that infill of the lands was carried out which I noted at time of site inspection. Infilling had taken place in the area around the shipping container and along the roadside boundary and in other parts but was covered by vegetation. This I note was raised in the Planning Inspector's report related to ABP Ref. 310244-21, however there is no reference made to this by the PA, nor was it raised as an issue.
- 8.3.6. Having regard to the planning history of the site and in particular to ABP Ref. 310244-21, I note that a site-specific flood risk assessment of this site for a dwelling was previously undertaken, however a justification test was not included and this issue was one of the grounds for refusal.
- 8.3.7. Having regard to The Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines (2009) I note from Table 3.1 that land and buildings used for agriculture and forestry

are categorised as a 'less vulnerable development'. Therefore agricultural buildings such as a stable block would not require a Justification Test for Flood 'Zone A - High Probability of Flooding'. However, such a proposal must still follow the sequential approach and may need a site-specific flood risk assessment. This is a requirement of Objective CAF O20 (Flood Risk Assessments) of the development plan 'where deemed necessary'. In this case, such an assessment should likely have been carried out due to the footprint of the proposed development and the site's conditions (including infilling, open drains and nearby housing) to evaluate potential flood risks, particularly the possibility of displacing flood risk elsewhere. Although the applicant proposed measures to protect the proposed development itself, they did not address the PA's main concern which was properly assessing broader flood risk, which may still have warranted a justification test and which the PA considered to be necessary.

8.3.8. I therefore consider that in the absence of a Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment of the proposed development in accordance with Objective CAF O20 (Flood Risk Assessments), that there is insufficient information on file to enable the Commission to determine, that if a flooding event occurs, whether or not the proposal would give rise to possible displacement of flood waters from the site or flood risk else where. Although it is a less vulnerable use, this would be best practice and, in my view, and would be in accordance with the Guidelines and the provisions of the development. I therefore recommend that permission is refused in this case as the proposed development would be contrary to Objective CAF O20 (Flood Risk Assessments) of the development plan.

8.4. **Material Contravention**

8.4.1. The matter of material contravention has been raised in the grounds of appeal with respect to the land use zoning of the site. In this regard, it is submitted that the proposed development materially contravenes the land use zoning which is 'Agriculture'.

8.4.2. The objective for the zoning is *'to protect and improve rural amenity and provide for the development of agricultural uses'*. The purpose of the zoning objective is *'protect rural amenity and agricultural lands from urban sprawl and ribbon development and provide a clear demarcation to the adjoining built up areas. Uses which are directly*

associated with agriculture or rural related business activities which have a demonstrated need for a rural based location and which would not interfere with rural amenity are open for consideration. Compliance is required with the criteria for Small Scale Home-Based Businesses. One off dwellings will only be considered on agriculturally zoned land outside of Flood Zones A and B, subject to the terms and conditions of the rural housing policy as set out in this Plan. Dwellings are categorized as 'highly vulnerable development' in the Section 28 Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2010) and will not be permitted in flood zones.

- 8.4.3. In the Zoning Matrix, agricultural buildings are identified as 'generally permitted' on land that is zoned for 'Agriculture'.
- 8.4.4. It is contended that the use of the proposed development which is for equine use, is not directly related to agricultural use and that the provision of stables and ponies grazing does not protect, retain and enhance lands for agriculture and agriculture use.
- 8.4.5. The proposed development consists of a stable block intended for the keeping/breeding of horses. I note that the definition of 'agriculture' in Section 2 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, includes for the breeding and keeping of livestock, training of horses and the rearing of bloodstock, and the use of the land as grazing land.
- 8.4.6. The development plan therefore does allow for the proposed development to be considered, which in principle, can be considered in this case. The zoning objective is therefore, not in my view, restrictive to warrant the conclusion that the proposed development would materially contravene the development plan.
- 8.4.7. As the proposed development is a standard rural structure designed for horses, in my view it seeks to directly facilitate the primary purpose of the land i.e. agriculture, and therefore it complies with the core land use. It is therefore consistent with the rural character of the area, aligns with the zoning matrix of the development plan, and therefore is not contrary to the zoning objective of the site. It is therefore my opinion that the proposed development would not constitute a material contravention of the Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028 (as varied).
- 8.4.8. Having regard to the foregoing assessment, as the Planning Authority did not refuse permission in this case, and as I do not consider that a material contravention of the

development plan arises, I therefore submit that the Commission is not constrained by the terms of Section 37(2)(b) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

8.5. Other Matters

Unauthorised Development

- 8.5.1. I note the issues raised regarding the shipping container on site and the enforcement of planning conditions. The matter of enforcement falls under the jurisdiction of the planning authority and thus need not concern the Commission for the purposes of this appeal. However, I note that condition 2 of the decision to grant requires that the shipping container is removed within one month of the construction or first use of the stables. Given that the PA consider that the existing shipping container is unauthorised development, I consider it appropriate to include this condition or similar, should the Commission decide to grant permission, in the interest of orderly development.

Proposed Access

- 8.5.2. Pursuant to site inspection, I have assessed the proposed new access and I am satisfied that adequate sight distances can be achieved from same for the 50 km/hr design speed of the road. I note that the PA did not include a condition in relation to the closure of the existing access serving the site. I therefore consider it appropriate to include a condition requiring the permanent closure of this access, should the Commission be minded granting permission. I would also recommend that Condition 3 of the PA's decision is included as it specifically addresses requirements for the footpaths both existing and proposed, and surface finishes which the Roads Department considered were necessary in terms of road traffic safety.
- 8.5.3. Reference is made by the appellant to compliance with a road opening licence if required. Such a licence would be required prior to commencement of works on or near a public road/ footpath. In this regard, in the event that planning conditions are included where permission is granted concerning works related to the public road, the onus is on the applicant/ developer to obtain such a licence from the council. I note for the Commission that a Road Opening Licence is a separate legislative code from planning and is managed by the council and therefore does not concern the Commission for the purposes of this appeal.

Appropriate Assessment Screening

- 8.5.4. Reference is also made to the Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening carried out for ABP Ref. 310244-21 and the conclusion that an Appropriate Assessment Screening should have been submitted. As the proposed development is a project, this warrants a Stage 1 Screening in accordance with Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive. I have carried out an AA Screening of the development proposed which is contained in Appendix 2 of this report and a screening determination which is set out in Section 9.0 below.

Inaccurate Site Boundaries

- 8.5.5. It is submitted that the boundaries of the site are incorrect due to the removal of the roadside boundary along the sites frontage resulting in a pre-existing public road area being annexed. I note the red line boundary of the appeal site and that the applicant has indicated in the application form that they are the owner of the property. Limerick City and County Council is the local authority that is legally responsible for maintenance, improvement, construction and management of public roads. I note that the council did not raise any issue in relation to the site boundaries of the application. On that basis I am satisfied that the site boundaries are as per the ownership of the applicant as submitted with the application details.

Ribbon Development

- 8.5.6. The grounds of appeal refer to the Inspector's report related to ABP Ref. 310244-21 page 8 which refers to the growth of areas that are under strong urban influence and the impact of ribbon development. National Policy Objective 15 of the National Planning Framework is also referenced with respect to the sustainable development of rural areas. In this context, I would note that ribbon development refers to the dispersed nature of one-off housing in rural areas along local roads. The Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines 2005 define ribbon development where 5 or more houses exist on any one side of a given 250 metres of road frontage.
- 8.5.7. While I acknowledge the point being made by the appellant and would agree that there is extensive ribbon development along the local roads in the area, in this case, the proposed development relates in an agricultural development and does not give rise to ribbon development or can be considered to contribute to the exacerbation of ribbon development in the area in this context.

8.5.8. I would further note that the National Planning Framework has been revised and updated as of April 2025 since ABP Ref. 310244-21 was decided.

9.0 AA Screening

9.1.1. 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 the Lower River Shannon SAC (Site Code 002165) and on the River Shannon and River Fergus Estuaries (SPA 004077) in view of the conservation objectives of these sites, and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

9.1.2. This determination is based on:

- The relatively minor scale of the proposed development and lack of impact mechanisms that could significantly affect a European Site.
- The distance from European sites and lack of direct connections weak indirect connections to the European sites.
- Taking into account the screening determination of the 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.

9.1.3. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, is not required.

10.0 WFD Screening

10.1.1. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken in accordance with Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC), as transposed by the European Communities (Water Policy) Regulations 2003, as amended, and with regard to the Eastern/South Eastern River Basin Management Plan 2022–2027.

10.1.2. The receiving water environment has been identified and assessed, see Appendix 3 attached. Having regard to the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, and the mitigation measures conditioned, it is concluded that the proposed development will not:

- Result in deterioration of the ecological, chemical, or quantitative status of any relevant surface water or groundwater body;
- Increase pollutant loading or alter the hydrological regime of any receiving watercourse;
- Prevent or impede achievement of environmental objectives under the applicable River Basin Management Plan.

Any residual risks are capable of being addressed through implementation of measures and conditions (Construction Management Plan).

The proposed development is considered to be in compliance with the requirements of Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive.

11.0 Recommendation

Having regard to the foreign assessment, I recommend that permission is refused for the following reasons and considerations.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The proposed development is in an area which is at risk of flooding. The Commission is not satisfied, on the basis of the information lodged with the planning application, that the proposed development would not give rise to a heightened risk of flooding either on the proposed development site itself, or on other lands. The proposed development would be contrary to Objective CAF O20 (Flood Risk Assessments) of the Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028 (as varied), would be prejudicial to public health and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

Clare Carr
Planning Inspector

9th June 2026

Appendix 1 – Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500920-LK-26
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of two stables, access gateway, boundary wall and associated site works
Development Address	Coonagh East, Coonagh, Co Limerick
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a ‘Project’ for the purposes of EIA?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a ‘Project’. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, “Project” means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
<input type="checkbox"/> 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)	
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 <input type="checkbox"/>	
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 2 – Appropriate Assessment Screening

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects	
Case Reference Number: PL-500920-LK-26	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics	
Brief description of project	<p>The construction of 2 no. stables (GFA 123 m²), fodder store, new access gateway and boundary wall on a site with a stated area of 0.792 ha.</p>
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	<p>Infill site 0.792 ha, greenfield, in use as agriculture. Bounded to the north by recreational sports grounds and to the south by existing dwelling(s). The area is rural, broadly characterised by agri. farmlands and one-off housing. The topography of the general area is low-lying. The site and surrounding lands are identified Flood Zone A.</p> <p>Nearest European sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC: 002165 - Lower River Shannon SAC – lies approx. within 1.0 km to the north, west and south of the site.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPA: 004077 - River Shannon and River Fergus Estuaries SPA – lies approx. within 1.0 km to the north, west and south of the site. <p>Potential impacts relate to runoff from storage of farmyard manure.</p>
Screening report	N
Natura Impact Statement	N
Relevant submissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One third party appeal received which raised issues in regard to impacts on European Sites in particular Lower River Shannon SAC and River Shannon and River Fergus Estuaries SPA. The PA identified a potential hydrological connection due to sites position relative to Flood Zone A & B which connect to the Lower River Shannon SAC and River Shannon and River Fergus Estuaries SPA.
Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model	

European Site (code)	Qualifying interests ¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections ²	Consider further in screening ³ Y/N
Lower River Shannon SAC (002165)	Habitats: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estuaries [1130] • Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140] • Coastal lagoons [1150] • Large shallow inlets and bays [1160] • Reefs [1170] • Perennial vegetation of stony banks [1220] • Vegetated sea cliffs of the Atlantic and Baltic coasts [1230] • Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310] • Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritimae) [1330] 	Lies approx. within 1.0 km to the north, west and south of the site.	Direct – No direct link identified Potential Indirect – Hydrological connection via surface water, drain(s) & infiltrate to ground	Y

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mediterranean salt meadows (Juncetalia 33aritime) [1410] • Water courses of plain to montane levels with the Ranunculion fluitantis and Callitricho-Batrachion vegetation [3260] • Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (Molinion caeruleae) [6410] • Alluvial forests with Alnus glutinosa and Fraxinus excelsior (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae) [91E0] <p>Species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Margaritifera margaritifera (Freshwater Pearl Mussel) [1029] • Petromyzon marinus (Sea Lamprey) [1095] • Lampetra planeri (Brook Lamprey) [1096] 			
--	--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lampetra fluviatilis (River Lamprey) [1099] • Salmo salar (Salmon) [1106] • Tursiops truncatus (Common Bottlenose Dolphin) [1349] • Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355] 			
River Shannon and River Fergus Estuaries SPA (004077)	<p>Birds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cormorant (Phalacrocorax carbo) [A017] • Whooper Swan (Cygnus cygnus) [A038] • Light-bellied Brent Goose (Branta bernicla hrota) [A046] • Shelduck (Tadorna tadorna) [A048] • Wigeon (Anas penelope) [A050] • Teal (Anas crecca) [A052] • Pintail (Anas acuta) [A054] • Shoveler (Anas clypeata) [A056] 	Lies approx. within 1.0 km to the north, west and south of the site.	<p>Direct – No direct link identified</p> <p>Potential Indirect – Hydrological connection via surface water, drain(s) & infiltrate to ground</p>	Y

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scaup (<i>Aythya marila</i>) [A062] • Ringed Plover (<i>Charadrius hiaticula</i>) [A137] • Golden Plover (<i>Pluvialis apricaria</i>) [A140] • Grey Plover (<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>) [A141] • Lapwing (<i>Vanellus vanellus</i>) [A142] • Knot (<i>Calidris canutus</i>) [A143] • Dunlin (<i>Calidris alpina</i>) [A149] • Black-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa limosa</i>) [A156] • Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157] • Curlew (<i>Numenius arquata</i>) [A160] • Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162] • Greenshank (<i>Tringa nebularia</i>) [A164] • Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) [A179] 			
--	--	--	--	--

	Habitats: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wetland and Waterbirds [A999] 			
--	---	--	--	--

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

AA Screening matrix

Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*							
Site 1	Impacts	Effects						
Lower River Shannon SAC (<u>002165</u>) <table border="1" style="width: 100%; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 25%;">QI/SCI</th> <th style="width: 75%;">CO</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1029 Freshwater Pearl Mussel <i>Margaritifera margaritifera</i></td> <td>To restore the favourable conservation condition of Freshwater Pearl Mussel in the Lower River Shannon SAC.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1095 Sea Lamprey</td> <td>Maintain populations and habitat; ensure free passage</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	QI/SCI	CO	1029 Freshwater Pearl Mussel <i>Margaritifera margaritifera</i>	To restore the favourable conservation condition of Freshwater Pearl Mussel in the Lower River Shannon SAC.	1095 Sea Lamprey	Maintain populations and habitat; ensure free passage	Direct – none identified Indirect – negative impact on water quality, changes in key indicators of conservation status value. <u>Construction Stage</u> Temporary negative impact arising from construction stage due to construction related	Undermine conservation objectives related to water quality.
QI/SCI	CO							
1029 Freshwater Pearl Mussel <i>Margaritifera margaritifera</i>	To restore the favourable conservation condition of Freshwater Pearl Mussel in the Lower River Shannon SAC.							
1095 Sea Lamprey	Maintain populations and habitat; ensure free passage							

<i>Petromyzon marinus</i>		<p>emissions including increased sedimentary and construction related pollution. The impacts arising from construction stage can be managed by Construction Management Plan which would be required to be in place prior to commencement of development.</p> <p><u>Operational Stage</u> Inappropriate storage of organic waste could give rise to negative impacts on water quality or changes in key indicators of conservation status value of the SAC site. Land spreading within open season is required to be carried out in accordance with the <i>Good Agriculture Practice Regulations</i> which came into effect on December 2025 (S.I. No. 588/2025 – European Union (Good Agriculture Practice for Protection of Waters) <i>Regulations 2025</i>. This will ensure that no water pollution will arise from the activity.</p>
1096 Brook Lamprey <i>Lampetra planeri</i>	Maintain populations and habitat; ensure free passage	
1099 River Lamprey <i>Lampetra fluviatilis</i>	Maintain populations and habitat; ensure free passage	
1106 Atlantic Salmon <i>Salmo salar</i> (only in fresh water)	Restore favourable conservation condition; population targets, free spawning access	
1349 Bottlenose Dolphin <i>Tursiops truncatus</i>	Maintain population, habitat quality and usage pattern Stable; ~107 individuals (est.), highly site-faithful	
1355 Otter <i>Lutra lutra</i>	Maintain populations and habitat. Present and widespread in site	
1110 Sandbanks which are slightly covered by sea water all the time	Maintain favourable conservation condition. Stable, area: 1,353 ha	
1130 Estuaries	Maintain favourable conservation condition. Stable/increasing, area: 24,273 ha	

1140 Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide	Maintain favourable conservation condition. Stable/increasing, area: 8,808 ha	Conditions related to surface water management withing site.	
1150 *Coastal lagoons	Maintain favourable conservation condition. Poor conservation status nationally		
1160 Large shallow inlets and bays	Maintain favourable conservation condition. Stable/increasing		
1170 Reefs	Maintain favourable conservation condition. Stable distribution and area		
1220 Perennial vegetation of stony banks	Maintain favourable conservation condition. No decline, stable/increasing area		
1230 Vegetated sea cliffs of the Atlantic and Baltic coasts	Maintain favourable conservation condition. Maintain range and structure		
1310 Salicornia and other annuals colonizing mud and sand	Maintain favourable conservation condition. Stable/increasing, 0.22 ha		
1330 Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-	Restore favourable conservation condition. Target:		

Puccinellietalia maritimae)	increasing extent; 495.4 ha		
1410 Mediterranean salt meadows (Juncetalia maritimi)	Restore favourable conservation condition. Target: increasing extent; 48 ha		
3260 Water courses of plain to montane levels with the Ranunculon fluitantis and Callitricho-Batrachion vegetation	Maintain favourable conservation condition. Maintain structure & supporting species		
6410 Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (Molinion caeruleae)	To maintain the favourable conservation condition of Molinia meadows (Molinion caeruleae) in the Lower River Shannon SAC, the habitat must have stable or increasing area and distribution (subject to natural processes), a broadleaf herb:grass ratio of 40–90%, 30–70% of the sward between 10–80 cm high, at least 7 positive indicator species		

	<p>including one "high quality" species, no decline in notable species, negative indicator species collectively under 20% cover (none over 10%, and non-native invasives absent or controlled), specific limits on moss cover (bog moss under 10%, hair moss under 25%), woody species and bracken under 5% cover, and no more than 10% bare ground.</p>		
<p>91E0 *Alluvial forests with <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> and <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> (Alno-Padion, Alnion <i>incanae</i>, <i>Salicion albae</i>)</p>	<p>To restore the favourable conservation condition of alluvial forests with <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> and <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> (91E0) in the Lower River Shannon SAC by ensuring a stable or increasing area and distribution, diverse and native woodland structure with adequate regeneration and dead wood, protection of veteran trees and</p>		

	local distinctiveness, appropriate hydrology, and control of negative indicator (especially invasive) species.		
		<p>Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone):</p> <p>No</p>	
		<p>If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?</p> <p>At operational stage, land spreading within open season is required to be carried out in accordance with the <i>Good Agriculture Practice Regulations</i> which came into effect on December 2025 (S.I. No. 588/2025 – European Union (Good Agriculture Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2025. This will ensure that no water pollution will arise from the activity.</p>	
Site 2	Impacts	Effects	

River Shannon and River Fergus Estuaries SPA (004077)		<p>Direct – none identified</p> <p>Indirect – negative impact on water quality, changes in key indicators of conservation status value.</p> <p><u>Construction Stage</u> Temporary negative impact arising from construction stage due to construction related emissions including increased sedimentary and construction related pollution. The impacts arising from construction stage can be managed by Construction Management Plan which would be required to be in place prior to commencement of development.</p> <p><u>Operational Stage</u> inappropriate storage of organic waste could give rise to negative impacts on water quality or changes in key indicators of conservation status value of the SAC site. Land spreading within open season is required to be</p>	Undermine conservation objectives related to water quality
QI/SCI	CO		
Cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax carbo</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable breeding abundance, productivity, breeding distribution, prey biomass, connectivity, disturbance; stable or increasing long-term trend and non-breeding range/timing/intensity of use (see notes).		
Whooper Swan <i>Cygnus cygnus</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term trend and stable range/timing/intensity of use (non-breeding).		

Light-bellied Brent Goose <i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term trend and stable range/timing/intensity of use (non-breeding).	carried out in accordance with the <i>Good Agriculture Practice Regulations</i> which came into effect on December 2025 (<i>S.I. No. 588/2025 – European Union (Good Agriculture Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2025</i>). This will ensure that no water pollution will arise from the activity. Conditions related to surface water management within site.	
Shelduck <i>Tadorna tadorna</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term trend and stable range/timing/intensity of use (non-breeding).		
Wigeon <i>Anas penelope</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term trend and stable range/timing/intensity of use (non-breeding).		
Teal <i>Anas crecca</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term		

	trend and stable range/timing/intensity of use (non-breeding).		
Pintail <i>Anas acuta</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term trend and stable range/timing/intensity of use (non-breeding).		
Shoveler <i>Anas clypeata</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term trend and stable range/timing/intensity of use (non-breeding).		
Scaup <i>Aythya marila</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term trend and stable range/timing/intensity		

	of use (non-breeding).		
Ringed Plover <i>Charadrius hiaticula</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term trend and stable range/timing/intensity of use (non-breeding).		
Golden Plover <i>Pluvialis apricaria</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term trend and stable range/timing/intensity of use (non-breeding).		
Grey Plover <i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term trend and stable range/timing/intensity of use (non-breeding).		

Lapwing <i>Vanellus vanellus</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term trend and stable range/timing/intensity of use (non-breeding).		
Knot <i>Calidris canutus</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term trend and stable range/timing/intensity of use (non-breeding).		
Dunlin <i>Calidris alpina</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term trend and stable range/timing/intensity of use (non-breeding).		
Black-tailed Godwit <i>Limosa limosa</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term trend and stable range/timing/intensity		

	of use (non-breeding).		
Bar-tailed Godwit <i>Limosa lapponica</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term trend and stable range/timing/intensity of use (non-breeding).		
Curlew <i>Numenius arquata</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term trend and stable range/timing/intensity of use (non-breeding).		
Redshank <i>Tringa totanus</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term trend and stable range/timing/intensity of use (non-breeding).		
Greenshank <i>Tringa nebularia</i>	Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term trend and stable range/timing/intensity of use (non-breeding).		

<p>Black-headed Gull <i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i></p>	<p>Maintain favourable conservation condition: stable or increasing long-term trend and stable range/timing/intensity of use (non-breeding).</p>		
<p>Wetlands</p>	<p>Maintain favourable conservation condition of wetland habitat, with permanent area stable and not significantly less than 32,261 ha (other than due to natural variation).</p>		
		<p>Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone):</p> <p>No</p>	
		<p>If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?</p> <p>No</p> <p>At operational stage, land spreading within open season is required to be carried out in accordance with the <i>Good</i></p>	

	<p><i>Agriculture Practice Regulations</i> which came into effect on December 2025 (S.I. No. 588/2025 – <i>European Union (Good Agriculture Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2025</i>). This will ensure that no water pollution will arise from the activity.</p>
<p>Step 4: Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site</p>	
<p>I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on Lower River Shannon SAC (Site Code 002165) and on the River Shannon and River Fergus Estuaries (SPA 004077). The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European site(s). No further assessment is required for the project.</p> <p>No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.</p>	
<p>Screening Determination</p> <p>Finding of no likely significant effects</p>	

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 the Lower River Shannon SAC (Site Code 002165) and on the River Shannon and River Fergus Estuaries (SPA 004077) in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- The relatively minor scale of the proposed development and lack of impact mechanisms that could significantly affect a European Site.
- The distance from European sites and lack of direct connections weak indirect connections to the European sites.
- Taking into account the screening determination of the 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 (stage 2) under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, is not required.

Appendix 3 – WFD Impact Assessment Stage 1

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Coimisiún Pleanála ref. no.	PL-500920-LK-26	Townland, address	Coonagh East, Coonagh, Co. Limerick
Description of project	Construction of two stables, access gateway, boundary wall and associated site works		
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,	<p>Site is located in the rural area.</p> <p>Site contains existing shipping container and is in agricultural use.</p> <p>Site is located in an area designated as Flood Zone A.</p> <p>Site ground levels are generally consistent with the adjoining public road.</p>		
Proposed surface water details	Surface water to be managed within site, as per PA conditions		
Proposed water supply source & available capacity	Existing connection to public mains.		

Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues	Management of organic waste generated on site will be stored under canopy attached to the building. Spreading would occur during open season and weather permitting. The PA included standard conditions to manage same.
Others?	No

Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection

Identified water body	Distance to (m)	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface runoff, drainage, groundwater)
River Waterbody	Potential connection via drain at rear of site	BARNAKYLE_020 IE_SH_24B050600	Moderate	At risk	Ag, UR	Potential surface water runoff
Ground Waterbody	Underlying site	Limerick City Northwest IE_SH_G_140	Good	At risk	Ag, For, DWTS	Surface water drainage to ground

							Runoff from farmyard manure discharge to ground
Step 4: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage.							
CONSTRUCTION PHASE							
No.	Component	Water body receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.
1.	Surface	BARNAKYLE_020 IE_SH_24B050600	Surface runoff	Pollution	Construction Management Plan	No	Screened out

2.	Ground	Limerick City Northwest IE_SH_G_140	Underground	Pollution	Construction Management Plan	No	Screened out
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
1	Surface	BARNAKYLE_020 IE_SH_24B050600	Surface runoff	Pollution	Standard agriculture conditions that are applicable to all farming activities conditions that relate to manage runoff from storage of organic waste. Adherence to the "Good Agriculture Practice Regulations which came into effect on December 2025 (S.I. No. 588/2025 – European	No	Screened out

					Union (Good Agriculture Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2025 (GAP Regulations, 2005)” will ensure no risk of water pollution arising.		
42	Ground	Limerick City Northwest IE_SH_G_140	Underground	Pollution, ground filtration	Standard agriculture conditions that are applicable to all farming activities conditions that relate to manage runoff from storage of organic waste. Adherence to the “Good	No	Screened out

					Agriculture Practice Regulations which came into effect on December 2025 (S.I. No. 588/2025 – European Union (Good Agriculture Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2025 (GAP Regulations, 2005)” will ensure no risk of water pollution arising.		
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
1.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--