



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501041-MH-26

Development

Retention of existing prefabricated demountable cabin and all site works.

Location

Mabestown, The Ward Ashbourne, Co. Meath

Planning Authority

Meath County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2660037

Applicant

Vincent McDonnell

Type of Application

Retention

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse Retention

Type of Appeal

First Party Normal Planning Appeal

Appellants

Vincent McDonnell

Observer

Bernie Lawless

Date of Site Inspection

24th June 2026

Inspector

Margaret Commene

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.....	8
5.0	Policy Context.....	8
6.0	The Appeal	13
7.0	Assessment	16
8.0	Appropriate Assessment Screening	24
9.0	Water Framework Directive.....	25
10.0	Recommendation.....	26
11.0	Reasons and Considerations	26
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	29
	Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination	31
	Appendix 3: WFD Examination	33

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located in the townland of Mabestown which is c. 5.5 km south-east of Ashbourne Town Centre and c. 7.5km north-west of the N2/M50 junction (Junction 5). More specifically, the appeal site comprises of a 6.02ha regular shaped site. The majority (northernmost part) of the site comprises of a field, the boundaries of which are generally delineated by hedgerows/vegetated mounds, and an area (southernmost part) of hard standing featuring a cabin (which is the subject of this application), storage structures and areas used for the exercising/training of horses. The site is accessed via an existing laneway which leads to a regional road to the south-east of the property. In terms of gradient, the site relatively flat.
- 1.2. The immediately surrounding area is rural in nature, characterised by farmland and clusters of one-off housing. In terms of residential abutments, there are 3 no. dwellings featuring to the south-east and east of the subject site which are accessible via the aforementioned laneway. The majority of the subject sites boundaries are flanked by agricultural fields.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for retention of an existing single storey prefabricated demountable 51.5sqm cabin, surrounding tarmac surfacing and its associated wastewater treatment system, for the landowners sole use for the purposes of his rest/recuperation while periodically attending horse stables on the lands for a temporary period of five years.
- 2.2. Plans and particulars on file show the cabin to consist of 2 bedrooms, a kitchen, bathroom and living space (an inspection of the site revealed some slight discrepancies in the plans with the cabin featuring 3 bedrooms, a combined kitchen/living space and a bathroom) and is sited in the south-eastern corner of the site as previously described. Waste water from the cabin is drained to and stored within an effluent storage tank (which is emptied as required). There is no waste water percolation area provided. An existing private well provides water to the site.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On 25th February 2026, the Planning Authority refused permission for the following reasons:

- 1. The subject structure to be retained, comprising a demountable dwelling unit, is not acceptable to the Planning Authority in terms of design and does not conform to the policies of Meath County Council namely RD POL 9 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied) which requires all applications for rural houses to comply with the 'Meath Rural House Design Guide'. It is considered that the demountable dwelling unit, if permitted, would create an undesirable precedent for similar development proposals in this rural area. Therefore, the development, as presented, is not considered to be consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*
- 2. The application site is located in a rural area outside any designated settlement and within a rural area designated as "Rural Areas under Strong Urban Influence" where development which is not rurally generated is restricted in accordance with the policies set out in the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied). As per Section 9.3 and Policy RD POL 1, the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied) seeks 'to ensure that individual house developments in rural areas satisfy the housing requirements of persons who are an intrinsic part of the rural community in which they are proposed, subject to compliance with normal planning criteria'. It is the policy of the Planning Authority to direct development into designated settlements and to restrict residential development in rural areas outside settlements to those applicants who can demonstrate an intrinsic link to the rural community or who have an occupation predominantly based in the rural community such as agriculture or in the equine industry. The Planning Authority is not satisfied, based on the information submitted in connection with this application, that the applicant has established a site specific rural generated housing need for a residential unit in this location. The subject development would, therefore, materially conflict with the rural housing policies of the Meath County*

Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied) and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. *Insufficient information has been submitted regarding the suitability of the site to accommodate the proposed development to enable the Planning Authority to make an informed decision on the planning application. In the absence of this information (Site Characterisation Report in Accordance with EPA (2021) Code of Practise for Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems ($PE \leq 10$) in order to properly assess the impact on the local environment, to permit the said development could be prejudicial to public health due to risk of pollution and would not be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*
4. *Based on the lack of information submitted with the application and having regard to the location of the application site within an area identified as being with a flood risk in the OPW PFRA Mapping/Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for County Meath carried out for the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 it is considered that the applicant has not demonstrated that the proposed development would not be at risk of flooding or result in flooding elsewhere. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to 'The Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoECLG & OPW 2009)' and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

- The proposed development of a cabin and wastewater treatment system without its association with a permissible activity is not a permissible use in the 'RA' - Rural Area zone; therefore, the proposal is not acceptable in principle.
- The application site is located in the townland of Mabestown within a rural area where the principle of housing is predicated on local needs subject to normal planning considerations including design, access and services etc. The applicant has not submitted a Local Need Form or any supplementary documentation outlining or supporting the applicant's intrinsic links to the local rural area. It is therefore considered that the applicant has not demonstrated a local need in

compliance with the policy of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied).

- The cabin structure serves as independent living quarters located in the rural countryside. The application lacks the essential information to support its establishment. It is considered that the design approach and siting for the demountable dwelling unit is not in accordance with the Meath Rural Design Guide and should therefore be refused.
- With regards to the large gated entrance providing access, there is no planning history available in the records of Meath County Council concerning the entrance arrangements.
- The application site was referred to the relevant surface water/flooding section, who deem the site to be located within a flood risk zone and require further information for assessment. Further information is also required to facilitate assessment the suitability of the proposed water services.
- The Planning Authority concludes that the proposed development (entire project), by itself or in combination with other plans and developments in the vicinity, would not be likely to have a significant effect on European Site(s). In light of this, it is considered that a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment (Natura Impact Statement) is not required in this instance.
- The proposed development is not a development type listed under Part 1 or 2 of Schedule 5 of the Planning & Development Regulations 2001-2025, nor is it considered a sub-threshold development for the purposes of Schedule 7 Planning & Development Regulations 2001-2025 and will not on its own or cumulatively with other projects result in significant effects on the environment and as such an EIAR is not required.
- Having regard to the submitted documentation from a technical perspective, together with the nature and scale of the development, it is considered that the development would not comply with the provisions of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 and would not be by the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

Environment Wastewater Section (20/02/2026): Recommended that further information be requested in relation to the on-site wastewater system and well.

Environment Flooding – Surface Water Section (23/02/2026): Recommended that further information be requested requiring submission of a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment (SSFRA) and application of the ‘development management Justification Test’ as set out in Chapter 5 of ‘The Planning System and Flood Risk Management, Guidelines for Planning Authorities’.

Transportation Department (25/02/2026): Recommended that further information be requested in relation to sightlines, the entrance layout and consideration of the existing Motorway in the context of the acoustic design requirements.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

None.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

1 no. third party observation was submitted to the Planning Authority. The main issues raised therein are as follows:

- The validity of the planning application having regard to the misleading description of development, inadequacy of levels/dimensions on drawings, absence of information regarding wastewater disposal, non-identification of a right-of-way, failure to disclose details relating to dumping/stockpiling and incorrect description of proposed/previous uses.
- An absence of evidence of compliance with/inconsistency with the policy pertaining to Local Needs included in the Development Plan.
- The use and structure being contrary to the applicable zoning objective.
- The disingenuous nature of the proposal.
- The cumulative progression of development at the application site and the Applicant’s future development intentions thereat.
- Road safety.
- Concerns regarding water services infrastructure.

- Absence of information pertaining to Appropriate Assessment and Ecological Impacts.
- Potential impacts on the adjacent watercourse.
- Precedent created by this application.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Subject Site

4.1.1. There have been recent applications pertaining to the subject site of relevance.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (includes variations No. 1-5)

5.1.1. *Land Use Zoning*

The site is zoned 'RA' - Rural Area in the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied) with a stated objective to 'protect and promote in a balanced way, the development of agriculture, forestry and rural-related enterprise, biodiversity, the rural landscape, and the built and cultural heritage'.

The Development Plan details the following primary objective, in Section 11.14.6, in relation to this zoning objective: - 'the primary objective is to protect and promote the value and future sustainability of rural areas. Agriculture, forestry, tourism and rural related resource enterprises will be employed for the benefit of the local and wider population. A balanced approach involving the protection and promotion of rural biodiversity, promotion of the integrity of the landscape, and enhancement of the built and cultural heritage will be adopted.' 'Residential' is a 'permitted use' subject to compliance with the Rural Settlement Strategy.

5.1.2. *Other Relevant Sections/Policies*

The following policies are considered relevant to the consideration of the subject proposal:

Chapter 6 – Infrastructure Strategy

Section 6.9 states that all planning applications for rural dwellings on unserviced sites are required to demonstrate compliance with the EPA Code of Practice: Wastewater Treatments Systems for Single Houses. In unserviced areas and outside the main settlements, the main method of sewage disposal is by means of individual septic tanks and proprietary wastewater treatment systems. The aforementioned Code of Practice sets out requirements for these systems.

The following objectives and policies are considered to be of relevance:

- INF OBJ 13 - *To ensure that septic tanks, proprietary effluent treatment systems and percolation areas are located and constructed in accordance with the recommendations and guidelines of the EPA and the Council in order to minimise the impact on surface water of discharges.*
- INF OBJ 18 - *To ensure that new developments provide for the separation of foul and surface water drainage networks within application site boundaries.*
- INF POL 20 - *To require that a Flood Risk Assessment is carried out for any development proposal, where flood risk may be an issue in accordance with the “Planning System and Flood Risk Management – Guidelines for Planning Authorities” (DoECLG/OPW, 2009). This assessment shall be appropriate to the scale and nature of risk to and from the potential development and shall consider the impact of climate change.*

Chapter 9 – Rural Development Strategy

Section 9.2 encourages the consolidation of rural development within existing villages and settlements as per national and regional policy guidance. The Development Plan seeks to accommodate rural generated housing needs where they arise, subject to local housing need criteria and development management standards. The site is located within a Rural Area under Strong Urban Influence set out in Section 9.3.

The following policies/strategic policies are considered to be of relevance:

- RUR DEV SP 2 - *To ensure that individual house developments in rural areas satisfy the housing requirements of persons who are an intrinsic part of the rural community in which they are proposed, subject to compliance with normal*

planning criteria. An assessment of individual rural development proposals including one-off houses shall have regard to other policies and objectives in this Development Plan, and in particular Chapter 8 Section 8.6.1 UNESCO World Heritage Site of Brú na Bóinne.

- *RD POL 1 - To ensure that individual house developments in rural areas satisfy the housing requirements of persons who are an intrinsic part of the rural community in which they are proposed, subject to compliance with normal planning criteria.*
- *RD POL 2 - To facilitate the housing requirements of the rural community as identified while directing urban generated housing to areas zoned for new housing development in towns and villages in the area of the development plan.*
- *RD POL 9 - To require all applications for rural houses to comply with the 'Meath Rural House Design Guide'.*
- *RD POL 46 - To ensure that new development is guided towards sites where acceptable wastewater treatment and disposal facilities can be provided, avoiding sites where it is inherently difficult to provide and maintain such facilities. Sites prone to extremely high water tables and flooding or where groundwater is particularly vulnerable to contamination shall be avoided.*
- *RD POL 48 - To ensure all septic tank/proprietary treatment plants and polishing filter/percolation areas satisfy the criteria set out in the Environmental Protection Agency 'Code of Practice Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10)' (2021) (or any other updated code of practice guidelines) in order to safeguard individual and group water schemes.*
- *RD POL 49 - To require a site characterisation report to be furnished by a suitably qualified competent person. Notwithstanding this, the Planning Authority may require additional tests to be carried out under its supervision.*
- *RD POL 50 - To ensure a maintenance agreement or other satisfactory management arrangements are entered into by the applicant to inspect and service the system as required. A copy of this must be submitted to the Planning Authority.*

Section 9.4 sets out criteria that applicants applying for individual dwellings in rural areas must satisfy, as summarized below:

- Demonstrate a genuine need for a dwelling on the basis that the applicant is significantly involved in agriculture.
- Demonstrate their significant employment is in the bloodstock and equine industry, forestry, agri-tourism or horticulture sectors as well as a need to live in a rural area in the immediate vicinity of their employment in order to carry out their employment.
- Have local links to the area where they have spent a substantial period of their lives as members of the established local community.
- Persons who are originally from rural areas with close family ties to the area.
- Persons who are returning emigrants who previously resided in rural areas and are returning to reside near family members, work locally, care for older family members or retire.
- Persons whose employment is rurally based and want to build their first home.

The Planning Authority also recognises that exceptional health circumstances may require a person to live in a particular environment or close to family support. In such cases, the exceptional health circumstances would require supporting documentation from a registered medical practitioner and a disability organisation supporting a planning application.

In the context of design and siting considerations regarding rural residential development, Section 9.6 outlined the following main criteria against which the degree of visual impact will be considered:

- The location of the site within the landscape, the position of the building within the site and its relationship with surrounding buildings. This will help determine whether the development will be a prominent feature in the landscape;
- The attributes of the site and its landscape surroundings and whether these provide sufficient enclosure for the new building. This includes the existence or otherwise of natural boundaries and/or a visual backdrop, and whether there is any intervening vegetation or natural features between the site and critical views; and
- The suitability of the design of the building for the site and its locality, including its form, scale and massing.

Appendix 5 - Landscape Character Assessment

Appendix 13 - Rural Design Guide

Section 2.1.2 states that if a site is not served by a public sewer then waste water will need to be treated and disposed of on site (i.e. be treated in a treatment system before discharge to a percolation area/polishing filter with final discharge through the subsoil to groundwater). A full site assessment will need to be carried out in order to determine the suitability of the site to treat and dispose of wastewater from the dwelling.

5.2. National & Regional Policy Documents/Section 28 - Ministerial Guidelines

The following National Policy and Guidance Documents/Section 28 - Ministerial Guidelines are considered of relevance to the proposed development. Specific policies and objectives therein are referenced within the assessment where appropriate.

- Project Ireland 2040 – National Planning Framework (2025)
- Our Rural Future: Rural Development Policy 2021-2025
- EPA Code of Practice: Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (2021)
- Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes and Sustaining Communities (DoHLGH, 2007)
- Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoHLGH, 2005).
- The Planning System and Flood Risk Management, including the associated Technical Appendices (2009).
- Eastern & Midland Regional Assembly Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy 2019-2031.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

The proposed development is not located within or immediately adjacent to any European site. The nearest European sites are as follows:

- Malahide Estuary SPA (Site Code 004025), located c. 10km to the east;
- Malahide Estuary SAC (Site Code 000205), located c. 10km to the east;
- Rogerstown Estuary SAC (Site Code 000208), located c. 11.5km to north-east;
- Rogerstown Estuary SPA (Site Code 004015), located c. 11.5km to north-east;

- Baldoyle Bay SAC (Site Code 000199), located c. 16.5km to south-east;
- Baldoyle Bay SPA (Site Code 004016), located 16.5km to south-east; and
- Rye Water Valley/Cartron SAC (Site Code 001398), located 14.5km to south-west.

There are no Natural Heritage Areas on site or in the immediate vicinity. The nearest proposed NHAs are as follows:

- Royal Canal pNHA (Site Code 2103), located c. 8.5km to the south;
- Malahide Estuary pNHA (Site Code 00020), located c. 10km to east;
- Rogerstown Estuary pNHA (Site Code 000208), located c. 10km to east;
- Feltrim Hill pNHA (Site Code 001208), located c. 11.5km to south-east;
- Rye Water Valley/Cartron pNHA (Site Code 001398), located c. 14.5km to south-west; and
- Baldoyle Bay pNHA (Site Code 000199), located c. 16.5km to south east.

5.4. EIA Screening

5.4.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices 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.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The appellant owns the site and periodically attends to horses being kept there as a hobby. This hobby is of particular importance given the appellant suffers from Primary Progressive Multiple Sclerosis. The cabin was installed to permit the

appellant, and occasionally family members, to periodically stay overnight when attending to the horses for rest and recuperation/therapeutic benefits.

- The cabin is not and never will be used as a house or private residence. It is a very basic structure akin to a dacha or chalet. This and its isolated location means that it has no appeal as a rental property or holiday accommodation. Its current and future use is limited to the appellant and his immediate family. The appellant resides elsewhere and is not seeking to live permanently at the appeal site. He seeks to use the cabin for rest and recuperation. Accordingly, the retention of the single storey prefabricated demountable cabin does not contravene the policies set out in the Development Plan.
- In the context of refusal reason No. 2, a Site Characterisation Report is not required. Waste water from the cabin is drained to and stored within an effluent storage tank (which is emptied as required) and there is no waste water percolation. Use of the cabin is intermittent and so the volume of waste water is minimal. In light of this, the proposal cannot be prejudicial to public health due to risk of pollution. There is sufficient information regarding the suitability of the site in this regard to enable the Planning Authority to make an informed decision.
- In the context of the refusal reason pertaining to flooding, the data informing the Flood Risk Assessment comes from theoretical modelling rather than actual flood event information. The probability of flooding on the appeal site is estimated to be a Low Probability and Medium Probability. There is not evidence that the site has flooded in the past and the proposal is limited to a 5-year timeframe.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority has responded to the grounds of appeal. The response is summarised as follows:

- The Planning Authority notes the contents of the first party appeal and the issues raised. The Planning Authority is satisfied that the subject proposal was appropriately considered throughout the course of the assessment of the planning application as detailed in the Planning Officers report of 23rd February 2026. The Planning Authority request the Commission to uphold the decision to refuse permission.

6.3. Observations

One observation was lodged on the first-party appeal. The main points raised therein can be summarised as follows:

- It is asked that the appeal be refused due to the invalidity of the planning application having regard to the misleading description of development, inadequacy of levels/dimensions on drawings, absence of information regarding wastewater disposal, non-identification of a right-of-way, failure to disclose details relating to dumping and stockpiling and incorrect description of proposed/previous uses. Having regard to Sections 37(1)(b) and 34(1) of the Act, it is requested that the Commission refuses to handle the appeal on the basis that the original application was never actually valid.
- The Planning Authority's refusal is welcomed.
- The following observations are made in the context of the contents of the appeal:
 - No proof has been furnished that the appellant owns the horses on site which calls into question the genuineness of the appellant's need for the 'cabin'.
 - The appellants reference to 'therapeutic benefits' contradicts the other reference made to 'rest and recuperation'. Given the appellant lives 30-45 minutes away from the appeal site, there is no need for the 'cabin'.
 - The cabin will not be for the sole use of the appellant, with several references made throughout the appeal submission to its use by family members.
 - The description of the cabin as a dacha or chalet is inaccurate. It is more akin to a mobile home or portacabin and is not in keeping with the character of the area.
 - Use of the lands is not authorised. Reference is made to Section 5 Declarations made by the Planning Authority but these do not confer permission the same way that planning or retention permission does.

- No information is provided about the storage tank utilised for waste water storage or how said tank is emptied/the waters disposed of. Further to this, the appellant has misled the Planning Authority by noting the existence of a conventional septic tank system on the application form.
- With regards to the appellants claims regarding the absence of evidence of previous flooding on site, photographs accompany the observation that clearly illustrate previous flooding on site. Thus, flooding is a real issue on site and refusal is warranted even if it is only intended to be in place for 5 years.
- The application seeks '*retention permission....for a temporary period of five years*'. However, the structure is on-site and in use for more than five years. Therefore, seeking retention permission for the development and its use for a temporary period of five years means that its permissibility has already expired, as they commenced more than 5 years ago. This means that should the commission proceed to grant retention permission, regardless of the decision, the permission will immediately and automatically expire. Both planning permission and retention permission should have been sought if future use was intended.

7.0 Assessment

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

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Site Servicing
- Flooding
- Impacts on Residential Amenities
- Other Matters

7.1. Principle of Development

- 7.1.1. Before turning my attention to the Planning Authority's reasons for refusal, I must firstly consider the nature of the proposal for which permission is sought. The subject application seeks retention permission for an existing prefabricated demountable 51.5sqm cabin, surrounding tarmac surfacing and its associated wastewater treatment system on the appeal site. It is stated that this cabin is for the landowners sole use for the purposes of his rest/recuperation while periodically attending horse stables on the lands. In response to the Planning Authority's deeming the cabin to constitute a '*demountable dwelling unit*', the appeal submission provides the following further information regarding the nature of the existing structure (in summary): - the cabin is not and never will be used as a house or private residence. It is a very basic structure akin to a dacha or chalet. This and its isolated location means that it has no appeal as a rental property or holiday accommodation. Its current and future use is limited to the appellant and his immediate family. The appellant resides elsewhere and is not seeking to live permanently at the appeal site.
- 7.1.2. Having inspected the appeal site, including the internals of the subject structure, I would concur with the Planning Authority in deeming it to be a '*demountable dwelling unit*'. The structure features 3 bedrooms, a fully functioning bathroom and a shared living/kitchen space with food preparation/storage facilities (fridge, cooker and microwave) as well as laundry facilities in the hallway. All of which lend it capable of accommodating residents on a permanent basis. Further to this, I do not consider the subject site to be isolated, as suggested, given its proximity to other residential properties, the settlement of Ashbourne and the N2/M50.
- 7.1.3. As previously discussed, the appeal site is zoned 'RA' - Rural Area in the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied) which has a stated objective to '*protect and promote in a balanced way, the development of agriculture, forestry and rural-related enterprise, biodiversity, the rural landscape, and the built and cultural heritage*'. Under this land use zoning objective, residential development is generally acceptable in principle subject to the proposed development being compliant with the Rural Settlement Strategy (which is outlined in Chapter 9 of the current Development Plan). Chapter 9 of the Development Plan also places the subject site within a Rural Areas under Strong Urban Influence.

- 7.1.4. The Planning Authority's second refusal reason pertains to the subject proposals consistency with said Rural Settlement Strategy. Based on the information submitted in connection with this application, they do not consider that the applicant has established a site specific rural generated housing need for a residential unit in this location. Therefore, the Planning Authority deems the proposal to be contrary to Section 9.3 and Policy RD POL 1, thus materially conflicting with the rural housing policies of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied).
- 7.1.5. Compliance with rural housing policy is a core consideration for any planning application for a one-off house in a rural area. The local needs criteria for persons to live in this area is detailed in Section 9.4 of the development plan and Policy RD POL1 requires that individual house developments in rural areas satisfy the housing requirements of persons who are an intrinsic part of the rural community in which they are proposed, subject to compliance with normal planning criteria. Clear policy is also set out at both a national and regional level regarding rural housing need. Within the National Planning Framework First Revision, NPO 24 seeks to manage the growth of areas that are under strong urban influence to avoid over development and NPO 28 requires applicants within rural areas under urban influence to have a demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area, having regard to the viability of the smaller towns and rural settlements. I also note that RPO 4.80 of the Regional Spatial Economic Strategy – Eastern & Midland Region, 2019-2031, sets out that Local Authorities shall manage growth in rural areas under strong urban influence by ensuring that in these areas the provision of single houses in the open countryside is based on the core consideration of demonstratable economic or social need to live in a rural area, and compliance with statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements.
- 7.1.6. The planning application is not accompanied by a Local Need Form or any supplementary documentation outlining or supporting the applicant's intrinsic links to the local rural area. Further to this, the documentation accompanying the application as well as the appeal submission specifically reference that the appellants principal private residence is elsewhere and it is not his intention to permanently reside at the subject site. Reference is made, in both the application material and appeal submission, to the Appellant suffering from Primary Progressive Multiple Sclerosis and his attendance/overnight stays at the cabin allowing for rest and recuperation/providing

therapeutic benefits. However, it is not argued by the first party that the dwelling unit is necessitated on exceptional health grounds nor is any medical evidence substantiating such a need provided.

7.1.7. The Applicant has not demonstrated compliance with the Local Needs Qualifying Criteria as outlined in Section 9.4 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied) and would be contrary to Policy RD POL 1. The proposed development would also result in a haphazard and unsustainable form of development in an unserviced area, it would contribute to the encroachment of random rural development in the area and would militate against the preservation of the rural environment that is sensitive to change. Further, it would also undermine the settlement strategy set out in the current Meath County Development Plan that seeks to direct this type of development to appropriately zoned land within settlements. For these reasons the proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. Therefore, it should be refused permission for the reasons outlined above.

7.2. Design

7.2.1. Permission is sought to retain a demountable dwelling unit with a stated gross floor area of c. 51.5sqm which extends to a maximum height of 2.72 metres. In terms of materials/finishes, the unit features a flat roof and is clad in painted aluminium sheeting.

7.2.2. The Planning Authority's second refusal reason also pertains to the subject proposals non-compliance with Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied)'s rural development policy. More specifically, it considers the proposal to be contrary to RD POL 9 which requires all applications for rural houses to comply with the 'Meath Rural House Design Guide'. The Meath Rural House Design Guide is included at Appendix 13 of the current Meath County Development Plan and sets out guidelines on rural housing in Co. Meath, including in relation to orientation, site layout and building design. The Guide recommends positioning a dwelling on a site having regard to existing shelter, topography and vegetation and design which draws from traditional forms of development and good design practice.

7.2.3. I do not find the subject unit to be visually obtrusive in the context of the surrounding landscape. The unit is modest in terms of scale/size, is not excessive in height (i.e. it

is single storey with a flat roof style) and adopts a minimum setback of c. 20 metres from the sites southern boundary. Mature hedgerows/trees feature along the sites southern/eastern boundaries in particular which assist in limiting visibility of the site from south-eastern approach. Further to this, as set out in the Landscape Character Assessment, included at Appendix 5 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027, the subject site falls with The Ward Lowlands Landscape Character Area which is deemed to be of low value and slow sensitivity. The site also falls outside the path of any protected views or prospects as identified within Map 8.6 of the current Meath County Development Plan. However, I find the proposed development to be contrary to the Meath Rural Design Guide in the context of waste water treatment. Section 2.1.2 of the same requires suitable treatment/disposal of waste water on site. Preparation of a full site assessment is required in order to determine the suitability of the site to treat and dispose of wastewater from the dwelling. Very limited information accompanies the planning application/appeal submission regarding the waste water treatment system featuring on site and a full site assessment is not provided.

7.2.4. The matter of site servicing is discussed in greater detail in the subsequent section.

7.3. Site Servicing

7.3.1. As outlined previously, the subject structure will be served by an existing private well and wastewater from the same is drained to and stored within an underground effluent storage tank (which is emptied as required). This storage tank is located c. 8 metres to the north-east of building. No wastewater percolation area features on site.

7.3.2. The Planning Authority's third refusal reason states (in summary) that insufficient information (Site Characterisation Report in Accordance with EPA (2021) Code of Practice for Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (PE≤10)) has been submitted regarding the suitability of the site to accommodate the proposed development and in the absence of this the impact on the local environment cannot be assessed. Therefore, to permit said development could be prejudicial to public health due to risk of pollution and would not be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. As outlined previously in Section 3.2.2, the Meath County Council's Environment Wastewater Section recommended that further information be requested in relation to the on-site wastewater system and well. More specifically, they

noted that in the absence of information regarding these items '*a comprehensive assessment cannot be conducted, and determination of suitability cannot be reached*'. Further to this, the observation received on the appeal also makes reference to the absence of information regarding the storage tank utilised for wastewater storage or how said tank is emptied/the waters disposed of.

7.3.3. In response to this refusal reason, the appellant argues that a Site Characterisation Report is not required. Regarding wastewater treatment on site, it is noted that use of the cabin is intermittent and so the volume of wastewater is minimal. In light of this, the proposal cannot be prejudicial to public health due to risk of pollution. It is contended that sufficient information regarding the suitability of the site in this regard is provided to enable assessment.

7.3.4. I find the application to be deficient in terms of the specific design/layout/maintenance of the waste water treatment system proposed to serve the subject structure. I concur with the Planning Authority that there is a lack of information on the file to demonstrate the adequacy of the private wastewater treatment arrangements. In my opinion this constitutes a failure to comply with Section 2.2 of the EPA Code of Practice as it applies to new houses in unsewered rural areas. I therefore consider that the applicant has failed to comply with Policy RD POL 49 of the current Meath County Development Plan, the proposal is contrary to Section 6.9 and Appendix 13 (more specifically Section 2.1.2) of the same and that permission should accordingly be refused in relation to this matter.

7.4. Flooding

7.4.1. The Planning Authority's fourth refusal reason pertains to the issue of flooding. More specifically, it is considered that given the lack of information submitted the applicant has not demonstrated that the proposed development would not be at risk of flooding or result in flooding elsewhere having regard to the location of the application site within an area identified as being with a flood risk in the OPW PFRA Mapping/Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for Co. Meath carried out for the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied). The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to 'The Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoECLG & OPW 2009)' and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. This reason for refusal is informed by the referral comments received by the

Environment Flooding – Surface Water Section of Meath County Council (discussed previously in Section 3.2.2). I note the application is not accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment.

7.4.2. The appellant refutes this refusal reason, contending that data informing the Flood Risk Assessment comes from theoretical modelling (showing a Low Probability and Medium Probability of the same) rather than actual flood event information and that there is not evidence that the site has flooded in the past/the proposal is limited to a 5-year timeframe. In direct response to this, the observation on the appeal received includes photographs illustrating previous flooding on the wider site and argues that in light of this, refusal is warranted.

7.4.3. Upon review of the OPW website (www.floodinfo.ie) and the Meath County Council's MapInfo flood mapping (which is informed by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment prepared as part of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied)), Flood Zones A and B affect the majority of the subject site. The onus is on the Applicant, to demonstrate, by way of an appropriate Flood Risk Assessment that the proposed development, as presented, is acceptable from a flood risk perspective. As set out previously in Section 5.1.2, Policy INF POL 20 of the current Meath County Development specifically requires preparation of the same. In the absence of a Flood Risk Assessment, it is my opinion, that the Applicant has not demonstrated that the proposed development would not give rise to an increased risk of flooding on the site or other properties in the vicinity and permission should be refused accordingly.

7.5. Impacts on Residential Amenities

7.5.1. The suitability of the development in terms of the residential amenity of neighbouring properties is assessed in this section of the report. As previously outlined, there are 3 no. dwellings featuring to the south-east/east of the subject site. More specifically, 1 no. dwelling (a bungalow) features in the site immediately abutting the subject site's eastern boundary and 2 no. dwellings (a dormer bungalow and a 2-storey dwelling) feature to the south of the appeal site, on the opposite side of the laneway providing access to the appeal site. Given the minimum setback from the nearest dwelling is c. 55 metres and the size/single story height of the subject structure, it is not anticipated that these properties will be impacted upon by way of overlooking, overbearing,

overshadowing or potential negative impacts on daylight/sunlight they currently receive.

7.6. Other Matters

7.6.1. *Procedural Issues* - The observation on the appeal raises two procedural matters, the first pertaining to the invalidity of the planning application and the second pertaining to the seeking of retention permission in this instance. Turning my attention to the matter of the applications validity firstly. Given the various flaws deemed to feature in the application material (as set out previously in Section 6.3), the observer requests that the Commission refuse to handle the appeal, pursuant to Sections 37(1)(b) and 34(1) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended), on the basis that the original application was never actually valid. In this regard, I note that the Planning Authority is the appropriate validation authority and that the development description/application material were considered acceptable by the Planning Authority and the application was deemed valid. I do not consider that the development description/application material submitted are inadequate so as to warrant invalidation of the application or for the purposes of determining the proposal before the Board. In the context of the arguments put forward regarding the matter of retention permission being sought, I note that retention permission is permission for an unauthorised structure or works/use that is already built or carried out/has commenced without planning permission. The granting of retention permission regularises the applicable unauthorised structure/works/use and affords planning permission moving forward. The temporary 5-year period referenced in the development description pertains to the continued use of the subject building for a 5-year period moving forward rather than a period of time preceding the application lodgement date as suggested by the observer.

7.6.2. *Transportation Department Referral Comments* – I note that the Transportation Department of Meath County Council recommended further information be requested in the context of the subject application regarding sightlines, the entrance layout and consideration of the existing Motorway in the context of the acoustic design requirements. Should the Board be inclined to grant planning permission, I am satisfied that these requests can be suitably fulfilled and addressed by way of conditions given the size/nature of the subject site and immediately surrounding area.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

- 8.1. I have considered the proposal for permission for the retention of a demountable cabin and the associated tarmac area/waste water treatment system, at Mabestown, The Ward Ashbourne, Co. Meath, in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).
- 8.2. The subject structure is located on a c. 6H a site in a rural area of Co. Meath. The immediately surrounding area comprises of agricultural fields and a small no. of one-off houses. The subject land is not directly adjacent to a European site. It is located c. 10km west of the Malahide Estuary SPA (Site Code 004025) and the Malahide Estuary SAC (Site Code 000205) and c. 11.5km to south-west of the Rogerstown Estuary SAC (Site Code 000208) and Rogerstown Estuary SPA (Site Code 004015).
- 8.3. The Planning Authority did not raised any conservation concerns in the context of Natura 2000 sites. It concluded that the proposed development, by itself or in combination with other plans and developments in the vicinity, would not be likely to have a significant effect on European sites, and considered that a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment (Natura Impact Statement) is not required in this instance.
- 8.4. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The nature and relatively modest scale of the subject development.
 - The location-distance from the nearest European Site and the lack of direct hydrological connection.
 - Taking into account the findings of the AA screening assessment by the Planning Authority.
- 8.5. I conclude that, on the basis of objective information, the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (Stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

9.0 Water Framework Directive

- 9.1. The subject development comprises the retention of an existing single storey prefabricated demountable cabin (dwelling unit), surrounding tarmac surfacing and its associated wastewater treatment system in Mabestown, The Ward Ashbourne, Co. Meath. Wastewater from the subject development is drained to and stored within an effluent storage tank (which is emptied as required). There is no wastewater percolation area serving the same. An existing private well provides water to the site.
- 9.2. The appeal site comprises of a c. 6.02ha land parcel situated within a rural area. The subject structure and associated tarmac surfacing/wastewater treatment system features in the south-eastern corner of the site. The sites eastern (and part of the southern) site boundary is formed by a watercourse, a tributary of the Ward River. This watercourse is located a minimum of c. 26 metres from the subject structure and c. 23 metres from the effluent storage tank serving the same. The Ward River (IE_EA_08w010300) has a current 'at risk' WFD status.
- 9.3. I have assessed the subject development by way of a screening assessment (see Appendix 3) and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration.
- 9.4. As discussed in the preceding sections of this report, I am of the view that the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed wastewater treatment system complies with the EPA's Code of Practice for Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (PE < 10 (EPA 2021)) as no details of the same/associated testing have been provided with the application. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, in the absence of such information, I consider that it cannot be ruled out that the subject development will not pose a risk to surface and ground water bodies. Accordingly, I recommend that permission be refused in relation to this issue.
- 9.5. This is a new issue not addressed by the Planning Authority in their reasons to refuse and the Commission may wish to seek the views of the parties. However, having regard to the other substantive reasons for refusal set out below, it may not be considered necessary to pursue the matter.

10.0 Recommendation

Having regard to the foregoing, it is recommended that permission be refused for the proposed development for the reasons and considerations set out below.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 1. The subject site is located in a rural area which is identified by the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied) as being under strong urban influence. In such areas, National Policy Objective 28 of the National Planning Framework (First Revision, 2025) outlines that in such areas, single housing proposals shall be facilitated based on the core consideration of demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements, and Policy RD POL 1 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied) also requires that individual house developments shall satisfy the housing requirements of persons who are an intrinsic part of the rural community in which they are proposed. The applicant has not demonstrated an economic or social need to live in a rural area and has not demonstrated that they are an intrinsic part of the rural community in which the development is located. The proposed development, therefore, does not accord with National Policy Objective 28 of the National Planning Framework (First Revision, 2025), materially contravenes the rural housing policies of the Meath County Development 2021-2027 (as varied) and is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*
- 2. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate the suitability of the site to accommodate the proposed development and how the existing on-site wastewater treatment system would comply with the EPA's Code of Practice for Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems Single Houses ($PE \leq 10$) (2021). In the absence of this information, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy RD POL 49, Section 6.9 and Appendix 13 (more specifically Section 2.1.2 therein) of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied). Therefore, to permit the said development could be prejudicial to public health due to risk of pollution and would not be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

3. *The Applicant has not provided a Flood Risk Assessment in accordance with the requirements of Policy INF POL 20 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied). In the absence of same and having regard to the location of the application site within an area identified as being at risk of flooding, in the OPW PFRA Mapping/Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for Co. Meath carried out for the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied), it is considered that the applicant has not demonstrated that the proposed development would not be at risk of flooding or result in flooding elsewhere. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to 'The Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoECLG & OPW 2009)' and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*
4. *Having regard to the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, in particular its location proximate to the Ward River (IE_EA_08w010300) which is deemed to be 'at risk' of not achieving WFD Objectives, in the absence of information pertaining to the wastewater treatment system on site regarding compliance with the provisions of the EPA's Code of Practice for Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (PE < 10)(EPA 2021), the Commission is not satisfied that the proposed development would not give rise to a risk of deterioration in the ecological and/or chemical status of ground or surface waters. Therefore, the proposed development would therefore be contrary to the requirements of Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive. The proposed development, therefore, as presented, is not considered to be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

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

Margaret Commane
Senior Planning Inspector

1st July 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501041-MH-26
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of an existing single storey prefabricated demountable cabin (dwelling unit), surrounding tarmac surfacing and its associated wastewater treatment system.
Development Address	Mabestown, The Ward Ashbourne, Co. Meath
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☒ 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)	Class 10(b)(i)(iv) - Infrastructure Projects. Thresholds: > 500 homes > 10 hectares
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 ☐	
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-501041-MH-26
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of an existing single storey prefabricated demountable cabin (dwelling unit), surrounding tarmac surfacing and its associated wastewater treatment system.
Development Address	Mabestown, The Ward Ashbourne, Co. Meath
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	The application pertains to a demountable dwelling unit erected on a c. 6Ha site. The subject dwelling unit has a modest footprint, comes forward as a standalone project, does not require demolition works, does not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas,	The development is situated in a rural area on agricultural land. 3 no. dwellings and other agricultural buildings feature in the vicinity. The development is removed from sensitive natural habitats, centres of population and designated sites and landscapes of identified significance in the County Development Plan. The nearest European sites and proposed Natural Heritage Areas are located c. 10kms and c. 8.5kms from the subject site, respectively (see Section 5.3 for further details).

landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	
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).	Having regard to the modest nature of the subject 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 3: WFD Examination

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Bord Pleanála Ref. No.	PL-501041- MH-26	Townland, address	Mabestown, The Ward Ashbourne, Co. Meath
Description of project		Retention of an existing single storey prefabricated demountable cabin (dwelling unit), surrounding tarmac surfacing and its associated wastewater treatment system.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening		The site is located within the rural townland of Mabestown, proximate to Ashbourne. The site and surrounding land is generally flat and comprises of limestone till. There is a watercourse forming the eastern site boundary and part of the southern site boundary.	
Proposed surface water details		Section 20 of the submitted Application Form indicates that surface water drainage is proposed by discharge via soakpit. However, no details of the same have been provided.	
Proposed water supply source & available capacity		Existing well onsite c. 25 metres south of the cabin	
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues		Waste water is drained to/stored within an effluent storage tank located c. 8 metres. This is emptied as required. There is no waste water percolation area provided.	
Others?		Not applicable.	

Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection						
Identified water body	Distance to (m)	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)
River Waterbody	Adjacent to site	Ward River_030 (IE_EA_08W010300)	Moderate	At risk	Urban Waste Water, Hydromorphology and Other Anthropogenic Pressures	Potential run off from the wastewater treatment system.
Groundwater Waterbody	Underlying site	Swords (IE_EA_G_011)	Good	Not at risk	None	Drainage to groundwater

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

CONSTRUCTION PHASE

No	Component	Water body receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	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	Ward River_030	Watercourse forms eastern site boundary.	Site works to construct WWTS and Hydrocarbon Spillages	Standard Construction Measures / Conditions	No	Screened out
2.	Ground	Swords	Drainage	Hydrocarbon Spillages	Standard Construction Measures / Conditions	No	Screened out

OPERATIONAL PHASE							
3.	Surface	Ward River_030	Watercourse forms the eastern site boundary and is proximate to the waste water treatment system.	Transmission from inadequately treated waste water. Compliance with EPA CoP has not been demonstrated in the context of the on-site wastewater treatment system.	Unknown. Minimal details provided regarding waste water treatment system.	Yes	Screened in
4.	Ground	Swords	Untreated wastewater to ground.	Transmission from inadequately treated waste water. Compliance with EPA CoP has not been	Unknown. Minimal details provided regarding waste water treatment system.	Yes	Screened in

				demonstrated in the context of the on-site wastewater treatment system.			
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
5.	NA						

STAGE 2: ASSESSMENT					
Details of Mitigation Required to Comply with WFD Objectives – Template					
Surface Water					
Development/Activity e.g. culvert, bridge, other crossing, diversion, outfall, etc	<u>Objective 1:Surface Water</u> Prevent deterioration of the status of all bodies of surface water	<u>Objective 2:Surface Water</u> Protect, enhance and restore all bodies of surface water with aim of achieving good status	<u>Objective 3:Surface Water</u> Protect and enhance all artificial and heavily modified bodies of water with aim of achieving good ecological potential and good surface water chemical status	<u>Objective 4: Surface Water</u> Progressively reduce pollution from priority substances and cease or phase out emission, discharges and losses of priority substances	Does this component comply with WFD Objectives 1, 2, 3 & 4? (if answer is no, a development cannot proceed without a derogation under art. 4.7)
	Describe mitigation required to	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 2:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 3:	Describe mitigation required to	

	meet objective 1:			meet objective 4:	
Development Activity 1: Operation phase, surface water	The applicant is required to demonstrate that the wastewater treatment system complies with the EPA CoP as there is potential run off to the adjacent watercourse on the eastern site boundary.	The applicant is required to demonstrate that the wastewater treatment system complies with the EPA CoP.	The proposed wastewater treatment system and polishing filter must comply with the EPA CoP.	The proposed wastewater treatment system and polishing filter must comply with the EPA CoP.	No – the applicant has failed to demonstrate compliance with the EPA CoP.
Details of Mitigation Required to Comply with WFD Objectives – Template					
Groundwater					
Development/Activity e.g. abstraction, outfall, etc.	<u>Objective 1:</u> <u>Groundwater</u> Prevent or limit the input of pollutants into	<u>Objective 2 :</u> <u>Groundwater</u> Protect, enhance and restore all bodies of groundwater, ensure a	<u>Objective 3:Groundwater</u> Reverse any significant and sustained upward trend in the concentration of any pollutant	Does this component comply with WFD Objectives? (if	

	groundwater and to prevent the deterioration of the status of all bodies of groundwater	balance between abstraction and recharge, with the aim of achieving good status*	resulting from the impact of human activity	answer is no, a development cannot proceed without a derogation under art. 4.7)
	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 1:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 2:	Describe mitigation required to meet objective 3:	
Development Activity 2: Operation phase, groundwater	The applicant is required to demonstrate that the wastewater treatment system complies with the EPA CoP.	The applicant is required to demonstrate that the wastewater treatment system complies with the EPA CoP.	The proposed wastewater treatment system and polishing filter must comply with the EPA CoP.	No – the applicant has failed to demonstrate compliance with the EPA CoP.