



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501050-WX-26

Development	Mixed-use scheme (comprising a multi-purpose events space, a hotel, a bar, a restaurant, a cafe and associated works). Protected structure (RPS Ref. WCC0210).
Location	Main Street, Gorey.
Planning Authority	Wexford County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	20250983
Applicant(s)	Tom and Pat Redmond
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Mark Redmond Patrick and Ellen Asple John Redmond
Observer(s)	Iris Sothern
Date of Site Inspection	30 th July 2025
Inspector	Bébhinn O'Shea

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	6
4.0 Planning History.....	11
5.0 Policy Context.....	12
6.0 EIA Screening.....	14
7.0 The Appeal	15
8.0 Assessment	18
9.0 AA Screening.....	38
10.0 Water Framework Directive	39
11.0 Conclusion and Recommendation.....	40
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	40
Appendix 1: EIA Pre-Screening Form 1	42
Appendix 2: EIA Screening Determination Form 3.....	45

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site measures .78 hectares. It is located at the corner of Main Street and North Parade in Gorey, County Wexford, and wraps around a residential property, Greenville. The site rises to the north and west along the streetscape. The site is largely described in two parts, the 'lower site' being south of Greenville and the 'upper site' being north of Greenville.
- 1.2. No. 45 Main Street is located at the corner of the junction, a Protected Structure with curved frontage returning around the corner, 2 storey in height and extending to the rear, with frontage along North Parade, in use as a pub. There is a yard and outbuildings beyond the main building form. The site then wraps around Greenville, whereafter it includes a former builders yard and electrical recycling facility in its northern area. No. 46 Main Street, adjoining no. 45, is a shop over three building plots, selling garden machinery, motorcycles etc.
- 1.3. There is vehicular access to the rear of the site alongside no. 46 Main Street and also at the rear of the site on North Parade.
- 1.4. Structures in the vicinity are predominantly 2 storey. The nearest properties on Main Street and North Parade are largely commercial uses such as pubs, restaurants and shops. Residential properties immediately adjacent the site are noted adjacent are noted, including two at the rear of no. 50 Main Street and one on North Parade (Greenville, a Protected Structure) along with those in Sean Lois, west of the proposed hotel and units on upper floors on Main St.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for a mixed use scheme including multi-purpose events space, hotel, bar, restaurant, café and associated works

Total floor area	6,279 sqm (Total area of existing (to be retained) and proposed)
------------------	---

Events space	Single storey over lower ground floor c. 11m in height above ground level c. 1795 sqm Including bar, mezzanine floor, kitchen, toilets, stage, backstage and green room and dressing rooms, loading bay, plant, staff areas, toilets etc Maximum capacity 1100 (concert)
Hotel	Three storey c. 13.1 m in height c. 3,279 sqm 79 bedrooms Lobby, reception, bar, breakfast bar, outdoor terrace, landscaped courtyard, kitchen, linen rooms, toilets etc.
Bar	Extension of No. 45 Main St.to provide enlarged bar /public house at ground floor, including refurbishment of outbuildings to provide bar space 735 sqm
Cafe	Refurbishment of ground floor no. 46 Main Street. 90 sqm
Restaurant	Upper floors of no. 45 and 46 Main Street 380 sq m
Access/Parking	Access (vehicular, cyclist and pedestrian) from Main Street and North Parade. Car Parking 37 spaces including 8 EV and 3 accessible. EV charging. Bicycle parking 40 spaces
Outdoor areas	A lower courtyard and upper courtyard also provided to the rear of nos. 45 and 46 Main street. These connect and provide

	access/circulation the bar and events space respectively. Outdoor terraces are also provided.
Alterations	Includes openings in the western elevation and northern elevation of no. 45 Main Street, and in the party wall between nos. 45 and 46 Main Street, as well as other alterations to the elevations of 46. Main Street, providing a through route from Main Street to the central courtyard and interconnectivity between nos. 45 and 46 Main Street at first floor level.
Other	Associated service yard, landscaping, bin storage, SuDS etc
Demolition	A number of structures are proposed to be demolished including a single storey warehouse and associated office and admin building, and rear extensions of nos.46 and 45 Main St. Other fabric, including walls, fencing, gates etc. would be removed.

2.2 The application is accompanied by

Planning report	EIA screening report
Building condition survey	Appropriate Assessment screening statement
Structural assessment report	Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment (AHIA)
Arboricultural report	Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA)
Architectural design statement	Landscape design statement
Schedule of accommodation	Archaeological Impact Assessment
Engineering services report	Traffic and transport assessment

Heating ventilation and air conditioning report	Access and accessibility statement Fire safety statement
Noise and vibration impact assessment	Preliminary construction and environmental management plan
Event management strategy	Resource waste management plan
Hotel management strategy	Letters of support

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. The Planning Authority initially sought **Further Information** on the following matters:

1. Lighting scheme
2. Revised layout plans and documents incorporating the following
 - a) Greater details of secure and covered bin storage and bin collection details;
 - b) Keg storage locations and details of delivery, to be through the service area;
 - c) Secure and covered bicycle storage - only 32 out of 40 spaces are shown;
 - d) Details of the management of the service area which doubles as an outdoor public space;
 - e) Surface water discharge rates for two discharge points. Detailed design details for surface water drainage, retention, disposal;
 - f) Auto turn drawing showing turning movements from North Parade to vehicle access;
 - g) Proposals for the upgrade of the existing vehicle access on Main Street to a pedestrian entrance, to be included in the site boundary. Cross section and details of materials;
 - h) Bus parking has not been provided in the proposal and bus staging locations are not acceptable. Revised proposals required;

- i) The Traffic and Transport Assessment considers significant park and ride facilities for events. No details have been provided about the location of this parking;
- j) Detailed design is required for the proposed layby at the entrance to the hotel. No information is submitted in relation to the proposed relocation of public parking spaces;
- k) Raised crossing table at the main vehicular entrance to the hotel with pedestrian priorities to be provided
- l) All footpaths and existing public parking spaces within the site to be included within the site boundary. Internal footpaths should be two meters in width. Design of footpaths, crossing, roads to be in accordance with relevant current standard
- m) Revised boundary treated treatment at boundary treatment E including a block, plastered and capped wall 1.8 metres in height with no impact on dwelling.

3.1.2. The Planning Authority subsequently **granted permission** subject to 17 conditions set out below.

3.1.3. Conditions

- C1 Plans and particulars
- C2 Requirements for sightlines, roadside drainage, road opening licence, parking, wheel wash, etc
- C3 Development contribution public roads
- C4 Development contribution community facilities
- C5 Surface water have to be disposed of within the site
- C6 Uisce Éireann connection agreement
- C7 Construction Management Plan and construction working hours
- C8 Footpaths, cycleways, roads design in accordance with DMURS. Dropped kerbs required

- C9 Levels of illumination on the site and external light sources shall be designed so as to minimize overall light emission from the site and to prevent glare or dazzle on adjoining access road, public road or on adjoining properties
- C10 Waste management plan
- C11 Services to be underground
- C12 Landscaping scheme to be implemented within 12 months
- C13 Any revisions on foot of a Disability Access Certificate to be agreed
- C14 Archaeological monitoring
- C15 Dust emissions
- C16 Noise emanating from the development shall not cause to be measured at the facing elevation (outside) of any dwelling in the area, during the hours 0700 to 1900 a noise level of 55 DB (A) (Laeq 1 hour) and during the hours 1900 to 0700 and days and bank holidays a noise level of 42 (A) (Laeq 1 hour). The noise is also not to be impulsive in nature or have any tonal element which is 55 DB (A) above the adjacent frequencies.
- C17 Signage

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

3.2.1.1. First Planning Report 02/10/2025

- Considered the development in accordance with the zoning of the site;
- Considered the AHIA submitted and concluded that the works to Protected Structures and adjoining buildings were appropriate;
- Note the AIA considered there was potential for unrecorded archaeological features and recommended an archaeological monitoring condition;

- Considered the landscaping and boundary treatments to be of high quality and to mitigate visual and acoustic impacts. Noted a concern in relation to boundary type E to the north with an existing residential dwelling;
- Noted the arboricultural report;
- Noted the requirements of the roads department in relation to access arrangements;
- Considered that proposed car parking figures are acceptable given the site's central location within walking distance of the rail station, multiple bus routes and a wide range of services;
- Noted that provision for bus parking was required and that although the traffic and transport assessment considered park and ride facilities no details on the location of these were provided;
- Noted the absence of a lighting scheme in relation to potential light pollution;
- Considered that a daylight and sunlight assessment was not required given the orientation of the site and considered that the neighboring dwellings would still receive adequate sunlight and daylight;
- Noted additional details regarding keg and bin storage and supply is required;
- Noted submission of feasibility letter from Uisce Éireann for new connections;
- Noted that the engineering planning report sets out that almost the entire area of the site was roofed or hard surface, and surface water draining is performing adequately with almost all the runoff going to sewers. SuDS are included in the proposed surface water drainage including rainwater harvesting permeable paving and the green roof of the hotel. Surface water discharge rates and design details required;
- Noted the provision of a preliminary CEMP;
- In relation to noise noted a number of concerns in submissions and the submission of a noise impact assessment. Noted extensive noise mitigation measures and modelling of worst-case scenarios and that levels at the nearest sensor receptors are below relevant thresholds with no tonality or impulsivity. Noted that the report states that the predicted noise levels from

events host event activity would be comparable to the existing extent of noise levels;

- Noted the submission on ecological impact assessment concluding no significant effects on biodiversity;
- Note the submission of an event management strategy and hotel management strategy. Maximum capacity of 1100 people in event space, intended for a range of events including concerts, plays, seminars, etc. Crowd safety, circulation, emergency measures included;
- Noted area not at flood risk;
- Concluded that the proposed development would provide significant economic benefits, economic benefits, local employment opportunities in construction and operational phases, heritage-led regeneration, new cultural infrastructure and public realm enhancement.
- Recommended further information as above.

3.2.1.2. **Second planning report**

- This report sets out the response of the applicant. It is not intended to repeat this detail here; the response is set out during consideration of the issues under Assessment below.
- The report of the planner broadly concluded that the applicant had, in a comprehensive further information response, adequately addressed all aspects raised. It stated detailed responses have been provided for each item. The Roads department had reviewed the response and were also satisfied
- A grant of permission was recommended.

3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

Access Officer: 3/9/2025	Disability Access Certificate (DAC) required.
Heritage Officer: 01/09/2025	Recommends a condition be attached for archaeological monitoring

Roads Department: 12/09/2025 Recommends Further Information be requested.

Roads Department: 18/02/2026 Recommends a grant of permission with conditions.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

DoHLGH: Concurs with the findings of the AHIA and recommends archaeological monitoring conditions

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

Six submissions were received. The issues raised are contained within the grounds of appeal below. One letter of representation from Malcome Byrne TD was received in support of the application.

4.0 **Planning History**

20130371 Permission granted for change of use of an existing hardware store/warehouse to an indoor skate park with ancillary retail unit, store areas, spectator areas and cafe, with car parking facilities, ancillary works and to use the existing entrance

029694 Permission granted to erect and complete haybarn to rear of 46 Main Street. May 1987

970787 Permission granted for shop front, internal and external alterations 46 Main Street.

970406 Permission granted on lands fronting north parade to rear of existing premises at no. 46 Main St. Gorey for demolition of 2 storey extension, 2 storey warehouse, 1 barn type building and construction of single storey warehouse of 1,100 sq.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The relevant plan is the Wexford county Development Plan 2022 -2028 including Variation 1 made on 13th July 2026. The following sections are most relevant:

Chapter 3: Core Strategy

- 5.1.2. Designates Gorey as a Level 1 Key town. A development approach for Gorey is set out in Section 3.6.. A set of strategic objectives for the town is set out at the end of the chapter, GT01 to GT07, which includes:

Objective GT01: To strengthen the role of Gorey Town as an economic driver leveraging its strategic location and accessibility to Rosslare Europort and the Eastern Economic Corridor (port, rail and road), build upon its inherent strengths including digital connectivity, skills, innovation and enterprise, tourism, culture and retail services.

Objective GT05: To improve the public realm and attractiveness of the town centre as a place to live, work and visit. This will include key urban regeneration projects/environmental improvement schemes such as the redevelopment of the Market House for cultural uses and the planned public realm improvements to Esmonde Street.

Chapter 5: Design and Place Making Towns and Villages

- 5.1.3. This sets out strategies for towns relating to the following themes Design Quality, Place Based Design; Connected Places; Compact and Rejuvenated; Vibrant, Inclusive, Resilient and Adaptable. Strategic Objectives TV 01 -TV12 refer.
- 5.1.4. The chapter sets out Urban Design principles to guide development Section 5.2 lets key Active Land Management projects. The site is not identified for specific measures.

- 5.1.5. Objective TV55 is To support development which will add to the vitality and vibrancy of our towns and villages including development which will increase population, result in additional services and extend opening hours, subject to normal planning criteria including residential amenity.

Chapter 13: Heritage and Conservation

- 5.1.6. Objective BH05 to BH08 and BH10 and others relate to protection of Protection Structures, original fabric and their setting and the need for Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment (AHIA)
- 5.1.7. Objectives ACA03 to ACA08 relate to the protection of Architectural Conservation Areas. Volume 6 provides a map for Main Street, Gorey which is an ACA.

Volume 2 Development Management Manual.

- 5.1.8. Section 2 Sets out Common Principles for All Developments.
- 5.1.9. Section 6 relates to Traffic and Transport including requirements for TTA, Road Safety Audits, Siting and Design of Access/Egress Points, Sightlines, Car Parking and Cycle Parking

5.2. Local Area Plan

- 5.2.1. The Gorey Town & Environs LAP was made on the 10th day of April 2017, and having regard to Section 251 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, would have expired on the 3rd day of June 2023. The LAP was extended by 3 years and expired on 3rd June 2026.

For information I note the following:

- Figure 9 outlined Key Development sites in the town of which much of the site is within site no. 17. The LAP will “Require the development of key

development sites using robust urban block structures with a presumption in favour of the permitter block typology”

- Opportunity Site Map 6 included much of the site as Site 4. Opportunity sites were to be examined as part of a sequential assessment for any retail development outside the core.
- The site was zoned under map 11 part Retail Core (RC) and Central Business Area (CBA). Culture, recreation & leisure are Permissible in Principle under both zonings. Hotel is Open for consideration under the relevant CBA zoning for that part of the site to rear. Pub is Open for consideration under the relevant RC zoning. Restaurant Permissible in Principle in CBA and Open for Consideration in RC Take away (insofar as it relates to café) is O in both.

5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

3 km to west Slaney River Valley SAC

5.29 km to east Courtown Dunes and Glen pNHA

6.43 km to east Ballymoney Strand pNHA

6.0 **EIA Screening**

See Appendix 2. Having regard to: -

- (i) The criteria set out in Schedule 7, in particular
 - a) the limited nature and scale of the proposed mixed use development, on a brownfield site in an urban area served by public infrastructure.
 - b) the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity,
 - c) the location of the development outside of any sensitive location specified in article 109(4)(a) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)
- (ii) The results of other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment submitted by the applicant including EIA Screening, AA Screening, Pre-

Construction Resource & Waste Management Plan and Ecological Impact Assessment

- (iii) The features and measures proposed by applicant envisaged to avoid or prevent what might otherwise have been significant effects on the environment

The Commission concluded that the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment, and that an environmental impact assessment report is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1. Mark Redmond (MR):

- Insufficient parking. Viability of park and ride of park and ride facilities has not been proven. Gorey is heavily congested
- Traffic and Transport Assessment – surveys should have been conducted during summer period. Basis for the number of projected cars not given.
- Loss of residential amenity to Mr. Redmond's dwelling (rear of 50 Main Street). Loss of light. Proposed events centre and backstage services are just over 20m from dwelling. Mr. Redmond's parent's house is also affected and only 9.8 m from the proposed events centre. Noise. Inadequate separation distance to house. Safety and security arising from volume of people generated by the development. Gate would be required which is undesirable and would block traffic.
- Overbearing. Out of scale and character with surroundings. Visual impact
- Negative impact on No. 50 Main Street (Protected Structure). Contrary to the objectives for ACAs
- No planning condition in relation to hours of operation or number of events is included, or nature of events.

- Conclusions in relation to noise impact are based on provision of park and ride facilities.
- Residential development would be preferable on the site and consistent with the objectives of the WCDP.
- Building condition survey does not contain any photographs of the ground floor public house area of 45 Main Street. No reference is made to recent upgrades of 45 Main Street including beer garden.
- Premature pending adoption of LAP.

7.1.2. John Redmond (JR)

- Impact on amenity of his residence (50 Main Street)
- Assessment of noise not adequate. Failure to properly understand impacts and condition imposed is not appropriate or sufficient. Failure to demonstrate noise can be contained within the building.
- Failure to address patron dispersal and routes and proximity of crowds to residential properties
- Failure to address nighttime impacts and operating hours
- Transport, park and ride and associated impacts. Gathering and queuing of passengers
- Dispersal of patrons and disturbance.
- Cumulative impact on the residential environment

7.1.3. Patrick and Ellen Asple (P&EA).

- Scale and intensity of use not suitable for location. Traffic management and safety have not been considered adequately
- Vehicular access on north parade does not meet road safety requirements.

- Number and type of buses to be parked within the site should be specified. Provision should be made for parking for service vehicles for artists and groups.
- The three sites designated or park and ride, owned by the applicants, are inadequate for the current uses on those sites.

7.2. **Applicant Response**

7.2.1. A detailed response is submitted by the applicant according to key issues:

- Traffic and Transport,
- Event Management
- Noise
- Residential Amenity
- Other issues including principle of development, details of ownership, inconsistencies in terms of operating hours.

7.2.2. It is not intended to repeat this in detail here, however these matters are discussed in the assessment below and this response is referenced therein.

7.3. **Planning Authority Response**

No comments

7.4. **Observations**

Iris Southern

Objects on grounds of disturbance to her residence at 31A Sean Lois from lightspill, noise, traffic and manoeuvring, visual intrusion, service noises, proximity to dwelling. Requests permission be refused.

7.5. **Further Responses**

7.5.1. Patrick and Ellen Aspen

- Notes that some matters (vehicular access to North Parade, parking for artists grounds) have been addressed. States an independent Road Safety Audit is required. States that proposed coaches are large vehicles and it is unclear how passenger set down and embarkment will be managed safely.
- Capacity of Park and Ride locations has been given. Parking at both hotels is busy at weekend nights. Notes the use of the community school for parking. States the development should be refused.

7.5.2. John Redmond

- States that the Applicant's response does not resolve the substantive concerns raised; it introduces new detail and complexities not previously assessed, in particular relating to shuttle operation, park and ride, patron management and late-night activity. It reinforced the view that the operation of the development is dependent on extensive operational and behavioral controls which are not sufficiently defined or assessed and, in many cases, unenforceable.

7.5.3. Mark Redmond

- Substantive issues have not been addressed in terms of traffic and parking. The number of parking spaces quoted is ambiguous. The car parking availability is not an accurate representation given times of surveys. There is no basis for the assumptions given in terms of modal split of patrons. Parking referenced is not always available. The loss of public parking spaces is understated. Seasonal traffic and parking is not accounted for. There is an absence of analysis when it comes to parking.
- Concerns in relation to the impact on residential amenities are re-stated. Loitering, volumes of people crossing the entrance point, loss of light, amenity, overbearing nature. Impact on protected Structures and ACA.

8.0 **Assessment**

- 8.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeals, 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
- Traffic and Transport
- Noise
- Built heritage
- Visual impact and design
- Residential amenities
- Other matters

8.2. Principle of Development

- 8.2.1. I do not consider that the proposed development is premature pending the preparation of a new LAP. Given the nature of the development and location of the site, I consider that the proposal may be full assessed having regard to the provisions of the WCDP. The uses proposed are consistent with town centre uses. While I note the Gorey LAP has expired, I have considered its contents and note that there were no specific objectives relating to the site with which the proposed development would conflict. Having regard to the location of the site in the town centre, and the provisions of the WCDP, in which the site is not identified for any strategic purpose, I consider the principle of development acceptable, subject to other planning considerations.

8.3. Traffic and Transport

- 8.3.1. The appeal raises concerns in relation to traffic congestion, failure to adequately address patron dispersal, proximity of crowds to residential properties, gathering and queuing of passengers, insufficient parking, viability of park and ride of park and ride facilities and traffic surveys.

The following sets out the baseline and proposed transport infrastructure:

- 8.3.2. A Traffic and Transport Assessment prepared by Roughan & O'Donovan accompanied the application and was updated in response to the Further Information; this was prepared in accordance with the TII Transport Assessment Guidelines and other relevant legislation and guidelines including planning policy documents and DUMRS.
- 8.3.3. The baseline conditions are noted;
- Gorey is highly accessible from the M11
 - Significant routes run through the centre of Gorey including regional roads linking to Wexford Town, Carlow and Courtown.
 - Substantial sections of the inner relief road have been delivered, providing increased permeability
 - There is a major signalised junction directly at the site with pedestrian crossings
 - The train station is within a 10 minute walk with 6 services daily between Dublin and Wexford and 3 on Saturdays/Sundays.
 - Bus stops are located directly outside the site and there are frequent services between Dublin City, Dublin Airport and Wexford. There are further local services to Curracloe, Riverchapel and Courtown.
 - Cycle facilities are limited
 - There are numerous public car parks within a 5 minute walk.
- 8.3.4. 37 car parking spaces, including 8 EV charging spaces and 3 accessible spaces are provided. 40 secure cycle parking spaces are provided. A dedicated service yard accommodating HGV parking, a loading bay and storage area is stated to be provided.
- 8.3.5. The TTA considers parking demands for three event types (markets, seminars, concerts) and worst case scenarios for each in terms of car parking demand.
- Markets: Complimentary to town centre uses. Linked trips so demand for additional parking is small. Sufficient parking within 500m/7mins of the site which can accommodate small increase in parking demand generated.

Seminars: Range in capacity and duration. The proposed development is intended to cater for up to 500 people at seminars (150 cars). The provision of park and ride is a key feature for the effective management of the seminars, with 75% of attendees utilising this service. It is stated that availability of public car parking in town can absorb the remainder.

Concerts: Full capacity events could generate a car parking demand for 300-400 cars. The TTA states that there are 1124 car park spaces available to the public within 500m of the development. It states that the provision of a park and ride strategy is a key feature of the effective management of concerts and will prevent undue pressure being placed on town centre car parking. The park and ride will operate with a high number of busses and low number of journeys each.

8.3.6. The Park and Ride strategy is set out in Section 3.2 of the TTA. The applicant owns 3 properties in Gorey that they proposed to operate a park and ride facilities from when the Event Space is close to or at capacity. These are:

- Amber Springs Hotel – 0.85 km to the south – which has 210 spaces
- M11 Campus – 0.85 km to the south (beside the above location) which has 210 spaces
- Ashdown Park Hotel (175 spaces) - 1.2km to the northeast of the proposed development.

The TTA states these have a combined capacity available for approx. 180 spaces. These can cater for c. 450 people using an expected ratio of 2.5 people per vehicle.

8.3.7. The Park and Ride will operate with shuttle buses. 8 no. 52 seat buses would operate, for at least two hours before and after hours which also allows for patrons who may wish to avail of the other services/amenities in the town centre. Potential bus staging locations are identified.

- Existing bus stops on Main Street accommodating 1 coach each (2 total) (70m walk).
- Existing bus stops on the Avenue accommodating 1 coach each (2 total) (900m walk).

- Existing school bus zone Main Street accommodating 1 coach (180m walk).

- 8.3.8. It is stated that the proposed service yard will double up as a bus parking area and will not be used for servicing purposes when the park and ride is underway. Services buses for crew or performers can be parked off site at one of the park and ride locations.
- 8.3.9. Vehicular access to site will be via a new entrance within 46 Main Street, with the existing entrance to be removed. Vehicular access is otherwise from North Parade. A central service yard serves both the lower (event space) and upper (hotel) parts of the site and is connected via the hotel car park, under passing the upper floors of the hotel.
- 8.3.10. Pedestrian access to the event space will be via the gently sloped route adjacent to number 48, which leads to the upper courtyard. The second entry point is through the underpass arcade passageway beneath number 46, providing access to the lower courtyard. Pedestrian access is also provided at two other points on North Parade. For the hotel there is a pedestrian access beside the main vehicular access.
- 8.3.11. The TTA includes an examination of current modal split having regard to the CSO small area population (SAPS). The TTA includes a survey of existing traffic. Traffic surveys were undertaken on Thursday 8th May and Saturday 10th May 2025 at the adjacent junction and examined in terms of turning movements and queue lengths for existing weekday evening peak, Saturday afternoon peak and Saturday evening traffic.
- 8.3.12. Section 4.1 of the TTA sets out trip generation from the proposed development. The TRICS Database, which is an industry standard method for estimating traffic generated by proposed developments, has been used to calculate the traffic generated for the cafe, pub, restaurant and hotel but as it has no suitable information for calculating trip for the Events Centre, so this has been calculated based modal split of 75% by car and an occupancy level of 2.5 persons per car is assumed based typically on observed ratios for events. Predicted traffic flows were calculated on the basis of these parameters, using a growth factor taken from the TII Publications Project Appraisal Guidelines for National Roads Unit 5.3

Travel Demand Projections and a Central Annual Growth Rate for Wexford. Trip assignments were distributed on the junction in accordance with current traffic.

- 8.3.13. Junction performance assessments are set out in Section 5 of the TTA. The analysis shows that the junction can easily accommodate the traffic generated by the proposed development for the various event types and times. The impact is considered to be adverse but not significant.

Assessment of traffic and transport issues:

- 8.3.14. TTA: I note the detailed Traffic and Transport Assessment (TTA) submitted, which has been prepared with regard to relevant guidance documents, utilises industry standard sources (TRICS, LINSIG) for modelling and has included traffic count results relevant modelling/system outputs. I am satisfied that it is thorough, considered and adequate.
- 8.3.15. Junction impact: I note that the traffic impact analysis included junction performance assessments for worst case scenario weekday PM peak, Saturday afternoon peak and Saturday evening peak, which conclude that the junction can accommodate the traffic generated by the proposed development for the various event types and times. I note that the highest demand at the junction is weekday PM, where the highest peak for the design year 2042 represents approximately 42.4% of available capacity and a maximum queue length of 7.4 vehicles. The current baseline is 37.5% available capacity and maximum queue of 6.2 vehicles. I note the design year 2042 scenario without the development has a 38.6 % of available capacity and a maximum queue length of 6.6 vehicles. In this regard I do not consider that the traffic impact at the junction will be significantly adverse with the proposed development.
- 8.3.16. Car Parking: Section 6.3 of Volume 2 of the WCDP sets out Car Parking policy. It includes car parking standards in Table 6.7 of the WCDP. It states that as a measure to tackle urban decline and promote investment into the town and village centres reduced parking standards shall apply and Maximum Standard in Town Centre or Village Centre are provided including

Hotels: 1 space per 3 bedrooms, 1 space per 50m² of function room or conference room

Public houses/ function rooms/ restaurants: 1 space per 100m²

Cinemas, theatres, stadia. Conference centres (Public Areas): 1 space per 100m²

The proposed development generates a maximum car parking requirement of 50 spaces. Allowing a reduction of 11 spaces for the floor area of the existing public house (which does not have the benefit of designated/private parking) a nett maximum requirement of 39 spaces arises. 37 spaces are proposed. Having regard to the central location of the site, the nature of uses, the good public transport links and walkability of the town centre, I consider this an adequate provision. I acknowledge that larger events are expected to attract a larger number of journeys by car than the above; this is to be catered by offsite public parking and park and ride, which is considered later below.

8.3.17. Cycle parking: It is stated that the scheme will deliver 40 cycle parking spaces (1 space per car in accordance with WCDP requirements set out in Table 6 – 10 of Volume 2 of the WCDP). 16 spaces will be secure and 24 will be publicly accessible. The 16 secure spaces are located in the northwest corner of the hotel car park. 16 further spaces are to the front of the hotel and 8 are in the lower courtyard at the southern end of the site, adjacent the steps the restaurant entrance. I note that section 6.4.2 of the Volume 2 of the WCDP states “However, more generous provision should be considered in town and village centres, education campuses and around public transport hubs.” In this regard I consider the 8 spaces provided within the lower end of the site insufficient. This portion of the site will accommodate a variety of uses; pub, café, restaurant and access to event space intended to accommodate markets and other events aimed at the local population. In the event of a grant of planning permission, I consider an additional 10 covered stands (20 covered spaces) should be provided within the lower portion of the site, in proximity to the sloped access routes.

8.3.18. Park and Ride: At the outset I note that weight that the application puts on park and ride facilities. It notes that the provision of park and ride is a key feature for the effective management events such as seminars, with 75% of attendees utilising this service, i.e. 180 cars. It is stated that availability of public car parking

in town can absorb the remainder. It also states that full capacity events e.g. concerts could generate a car parking demand for 300-400 cars and that the provision of a park and ride strategy is a key feature of the effective management of concerts and will prevent undue pressure being placed on town centre car parking.

8.3.19. I have considered the park and ride locations set out within the TTA. These include

- Amber Springs Hotel – 0.85 km to the south
- M11 Campus – 0.85 km to the south (beside the above location)
- Ashdown Park Hotel- 1.2km to the northeast of the proposed development.

The selection of the above locations in appears to be based solely on ownership – the applicants own the three properties. There is no geographic rationale for their selection. Notwithstanding same, I do not object to the geographic locations in question, their peripherality is appropriate.

8.3.20. I consider the business park lends itself readily for use as a park and ride location for evening and nighttime events; use at this time complements the occupation of the car park by day, and availability could be largely guaranteed for 130 cars during later hours. I find the case for the use of hotel car parks far less convincing. Hotels have a similar offer to that of the proposed development, accommodating seminars, facilitating concerts/performances; I note that the Amber Springs Hotel advertises theatre style facilities for up to 800 people in its main room, with a number of other function rooms also offered. It also advertises seasonal events for Easter, Halloween, Christmas etc and hosts concerts/performances, some of which are detailed in the appellant's submission. Ashdown Park Hotel also advertises a function room for weddings, and I note past music performances held here. Therefore there is potential for larger events in the hotels and the events space to coincide.

- 8.3.21. The response to the appeal submitted by the applicant responds on matters of the park and ride¹. It clarifies the number of parking spaces available within the hotels referred to. Details are contained within section 4.2.6 of the First Party Response to the Third Party Appeal. I am not satisfied that this data is fully representative of availability in accommodating parking for Park and Ride purposes. It is not stated what dates the analysis was carried out, whether it was for one occasion or over a number of days or weeks. It is not stated if availability figures were tested when there were events on. There is no analysis of the parking provision at the hotels for their own purposes compared to standards within the WCDP.
- 8.3.22. I note that Park and Ride will not always be required/available for the events space, but is dependent on a need being identified during a risk assessment process. Where Park and Ride facilities are operational, it is stated that event management professionals will be deployed both at the venue and at each of the Park and Ride hotel locations, ensuring coordinated management across all elements of the transport operation at all times. However, other than this, there is no detail of designation/management of Park and Ride parking e.g. would there be ticketing to ensure spaces, are there designated bus pick up points within the hotel grounds, etc.
- 8.3.23. Overall I consider the Park and Ride proposal has not demonstrated that this is a tested and robust option in terms of available parking. The provision of a park and ride service with shuttle bus transport has been expressly identified as a key management tool for seminars (Response to appeal, p 16). In the event the Park and Ride does not function, e.g. in the event of a maximum capacity seminar with 180 cars and the M11 campus typically unavailable, this will cause uncertainty for patrons, place pressure on public parking, may lead to ad hoc parking in the town centre and surrounding residential areas, and may cause obstruction. This would detract from the amenities of the area and may cause traffic hazard.

¹ I note section 5.2.7 of the First Party Response to the Third Party Appeals states that the TTA “addresses this matter in further details within its response to the appeal”. However, there is no updated TTA accompanying the response to the appeal.

- 8.3.24. Park and Ride bus points: Bus transport is a fundamental operational control of the overall event management strategy (RFI page 13). Section 3.2 of the TTA contains detail on this matter. It is stated that a high number of buses will do a low number of journeys each. It is stated that the service would operate for at least two hours after each event .I note that bus points are described as both bus staging locations and pick up points; there is a lack of clarity around this. For clarity I note that page 33 of the Event Management Strategy indicates that a bus being staged is a parked bus.
- 8.3.25. The proposed development includes 4 bus pick up points within the development; it is stated that the proposed service yard will double up as a bus parking area, services buses for crew or performers can be parked off site at one of the park and ride locations. These pick up points within the development are acceptable; they are proximate, off of the public road/car parking spaces, do not require assembly in public areas and are in control of the applicant.
- 8.3.26. Other pick up points/bus staging areas are indicated as follows:
- Existing bus stops on Main Street accommodating 1 coach each (2 total) (70m walk).
 - Existing bus stops on the Avenue accommodating 1 coach each (2 total) (900m walk).
 - Existing school bus zone Main Street accommodating 1 coach (180m walk).
- 8.3.27. I consider the distance to the stops on Main St. realistic in terms of distance as a pick up point. However, I am less convinced of the existing stops on the Avenue, which are nearly a 1km walk from the venue and almost as far as the Park and Ride locations themselves. I do not consider these are realistic as pick-up points.
- 8.3.28. I do not consider it suitable that existing bus stops on Main Street be used as bus staging locations as this would displace other public transport vehicles and lead to obstruction and traffic congestion on the main street of the town. This matter is somewhat acknowledged on page 33 of the Event Management Strategy which states that there is minimal bus coach traffic through Gorey at the time of night when organised bus transport from the event space would take place (11pm

onwards) but acknowledges that there are some Bus Éireann serves between 00.00 and 0200. As such, bus staging locations in the vicinity are identified further along Main Street, on North Parade, and on Thomas Street (it being intended to typically avoid using North Parade). I consider this is a reasonable proposal for a night time event if, parking bays are not occupied at these locations. A review of the parking survey for Thomas Street however, and the lower part of North Parade for example, show very high occupation of parking spaces during Saturday evening hours. Therefore I am not convinced of the availability and staging potential of this location. These are public spaces. Furthermore it is reasonable to expect that there will be significant demand for these spaces for use by the public where an event is on, further reducing availability compared to that in the survey.

8.3.29. In addition, I do not consider that full capacity day time events are adequately addressed in terms of bus staging/pick up. It is stated that in a full capacity seminar, it is anticipated that 75% of attendees are relying on Park and Ride facilities for transport. As stated the existing bus stops on Main Street are not suitable for bus staging, particularly during the day where public transport is more frequent and traffic is heavier. Again, there is a high level of occupation of street parking spaces in the surrounding area, making their potential for bus staging limited.

8.3.30. It is stated in the application that the Park and Ride system is the principal mitigation measure, reducing pressure on town centre parking and supporting orderly dispersal. However, given the strategy is lacking in robustness in terms of certainty of parking availability in the Park and Ride hotel locations (required by day), and the availability of bus staging locations, I consider the proposed development has not demonstrated orderly dispersal or park and ride arrangements are in place. This is likely to lead to unordered dispersal, and place undue pressure on existing public parking, or lead to ad-hoc parking in residential areas.

8.3.31. Safety of entrance on North Parade: I note the Road Safety Audit submitted in relation to the revised access on North Parade. I am satisfied that the access and traffic safety arrangements at this location area acceptable.

8.4. Noise

- 8.4.1. The appeals raise concerns in relation to noise, that the assessment of noise is not adequate, that it fails to properly understand impacts and that the condition imposed is not appropriate or sufficient. It states that there is a failure to demonstrate noise can be contained within the building. Noise management is stated to be dependent on operational controls which are behavioural and cannot be guaranteed in practice. It also states that conclusions in relation to noise impact are based on provision of park and ride facilities which are not realistic.
- 8.4.2. A Noise and Vibration Impact Statement (NVIS) was submitted as part of the proposed application. I note that the planning authority overall was satisfied in relation to noise impact and noise management relating to the development. I further note that the applicant has responded to issues raised in the appeal in some detail.
- 8.4.3. The NVIS considers operational noise impact, construction noise impact, plant and equipment, noise control measures, structure-borne vibration, patron dispersal. The document contains a statement of competence for those who carried out the assessment including their qualifications and experience. It considers the criteria/guidance within each of the WCDP, British Standards Guidance, EPA Guidance and looks at precedence cases. A baseline noise survey was undertaken, with identified locations. The results are provided within the NVIA. The assessment is carried out with respect to specified Noise Sensitive Locations (NSLs) including the nearest properties to the events space. The inputs for the acoustic model are provided. Design measures to minimize noise are set out along with management/design of internal sound system, plant and equipment, traffic and event management measures. Various operational scenarios are provided and assessed including worst case scenarios. Mitigation is identified. A Noise Control Strategy is set out. I consider the NVIA thorough, considered and comprehensive in its assessment of noise sources and impacts and overall adequate.
- 8.4.4. I consider that noise containment has been addressed in quite some detail in the application and in the appeal response. I note that the event space has been designed using box-in-box construction, which includes a fully isolated internal

structure, structurally separated from the outer building. Construction drawings excerpts, design rationale, predicted performance rates are provided to demonstrate this effect. Glazing is subject to acoustic performance specifications. Lobbied door systems are proposed and a secondary internal wall. The overall layout has had regard to locating noise sources away from nearest sensitive receptors. Other measures include an acoustic boundary wall between the property and those to the west, a covered walkway to direct patron movement away from more sensitive receptors and solid construction for plant enclosures. The Noise Management Policy includes other recommended mechanisms in section 7.4 of the NVIA.

- 8.4.5. The application has considered the nearest properties in terms of sensitive receptors. This includes the properties of appellants. Worst case scenarios modelling noise for daytime/evening and nighttime hours are assessed with the assumptions in terms of noise sources set out. The results refer to a predicted specific sound level (daytime) of 43dB L_{Aeq} (15mins). This compares to residual sound level of 57dB L_{Aeq} (16 hour) and background sound level of 45dB L_{Aeq} (16 hour). (The residual and background noise levels are based on the average unattended survey results which are over a longer period.) The predicted noise levels for the worst-case scenario (NSL 1) is 2dB lower than residual background noise for day and evening scenarios.
- 8.4.6. In terms of the nighttime scenario, the worst-case scenario is based on NSL1 where the modelled result is 39db L_{Aeq} . Again, assumptions in relation to noise sources are set out. This compares to residual sound level of 62dB L_{Aeq} (8 hour) and background sound level of 40dB L_{Aeq} (8 hour). The modelled levels are beneath same.
- 8.4.7. The assessment is carried out with reference to BS standards and EPA standards. Overall it is concluded that the noise emanating from the proposed development will not have any significant adverse impact on NSLs for daytime, evening or nighttime periods and that it is not anticipated that there will be tonal or impulsive characteristics in the noise.
- 8.4.8. While noise management is to a degree dependent on operational controls, this is not uncommon in terms of event management practice generally. I am of the view

that a considered approach to noise mitigation, and monitoring has been proposed, including a detailed noise control strategy. I am satisfied based on the details submitted that the application of conditions relating to noise is appropriate and that the measures are reasonable and implementable, and that the condition of the Planning Authority relating to noise is appropriate.

8.4.9. I do not consider noise, as it relates to patron dispersal to park and ride facilities, is a significant concern. While I have addressed the feasibility of park and ride in my assessment above, and consider there are shortfalls in same, I consider that this noise source will be sufficiently mitigated against by the event management strategy through management of performance and times, dispersal management, crowd control/stewardship etc.

8.4.10. I note the appeal in relation to noise does not raise specific challenges to the technical detail of the NVIA. Based on the information submitted and my assessment above, I am satisfied that subject to conditions (relating to noise levels, performance hours limited to 10.30pm, noise management measures out in the NVIA and Event Management Strategy) the proposed development would not detract unduly from the amenities of surrounding properties.

8.5. **Built and archaeological heritage**

8.5.1. The site is adjacent and slightly within the Zone of Archaeological for Gorey. No RMP sites will be impacted however there is potential for disturbance of archaeological remains, should they exist. Though the site has been extensively developed the amount of ground interference is unclear and monitoring under archaeological licence is recommended. I consider the AIA comprehensive and robust and accept this finding and recommendation, which may be attached by condition in the event of a grant of planning permission.

8.5.2. The site is located within Gorey Architectural Conservation Area and includes a Protected Structure (no. 45) and is adjacent to a Protected Structure (Greenville). An area of historic flagstone paving east of no. 45 on North Parade is also identified, listed on the NIAH.

8.5.3. The appeals raised concerns in terms of the negative impact on No. 50 Main Street a Protected Structure and states that the development is contrary to the

objectives in the WCDP for ACAs. It was stated that the building condition survey did not contain any photographs of the ground floor public house area of 45 Main Street.

- 8.5.4. An Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment AHIA accompanies the application. In terms of the ACA, the AHIA considered the impact on same in accordance with section 3.10 of the Guidelines and considers that it satisfies each of the criteria.
- 8.5.5. I have considered the ACA (noting that there is no specific statement of character for it) and the AHIA. I am satisfied the proposed development will not detract from the character of the ACA; the street line and building plots are respected, the modern buildings to rear are sufficiently set back and of such form that they do not compete with the historic streetscape. While there are some significant alterations to the streetscape at no. 46, 47, 48, the shop fronts across same have had significant interventions, which have not been sympathetic to the design of the original buildings. I consider the alternations now proposed acceptable. Those to nos. 47 and 48 and similar in scale and form to those shown on historic photographs within the AHIA, albeit with contemporary detailing. I consider the alterations to no. 46, while significant, acceptable; the removal of the extended shopfront signage and stone veneered façade will allow better expression of the original character of the building, and an improvement to its current appearance.
- 8.5.6. In relation to Protected Structures, the AHIA considered the impact on no. 45 and concluded that the proposed works involve a minimal loss of historic fabric, and no important feature is destroyed, damaged or obscured. I note that 2 no. openings are proposed to be made in the internal wall of No. 45 Main Street to link it to no. 46 internally. These areas may be seen in image 28 and 36 of the photographic record which forms part of the AHIA (which contains extensive photographs of the ground floor public house area of 45 Main Street). I note the area to be demolished is a more modern extension, of no particular design merit. The first floor demolition plan indicates the removal of more recent internal walls, however the significant elements of the building block work and divisions are retained. I do not consider that these alterations impact to a significant extent on the fabric of the building or will detract significantly from the character of the Protected Structure. The proposed development would, overall, enable the reuse of the building, promoting its refurbishment and survival.

- 8.5.7. I note that the AHIA does not consider the impact of the proposal on other Protected Structures in the vicinity, outside the site. Given the separation distance and form/relationship of new buildings, I do not consider there will be a significant negative impact on the setting of No. 50 Main Street.
- 8.5.8. The nearest Protected Structure outside the site is Greenville on North Parade, which will be surrounded on three sides by the proposed development. I note that there are currently limited views of Greenville from adjacent points, due to the height and proximity of the stables buildings to its north and dense high hedging along its own boundary at North Parade to the south. Therefore the character of this structure is viewed from the front.
- 8.5.9. I note there is a significant difference in levels between the ground levels of the dwelling and the site of the proposed development to rear, rising in both a north south and west east direction. Within the proposed development to the rear of Greenville is plant area above dressing rooms, with a flat roof profile. Having regard to the siting of the building to rear, separation distance, form and roof profile, and the existing massing of buildings around the protected structure, I am satisfied that the proposed development will not unduly detract from the setting of Greenville.
- 8.5.10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development is acceptable in terms of built and archaeological heritage.

8.6. Visual impact and Design

- 8.6.1. While the design is contemporary in nature, I consider its character and aesthetic acceptable. The upper part of the site is more removed from existing structures and capable of accommodating a different form and design aesthetic and I consider a high quality design and finish has been proposed suitable for that location, and of appropriate height, scale and massing.
- 8.6.2. The lower part of the site includes modifications to the streetscape on Main Street which I have addressed in terms of the ACA under Built Heritage, above. The alterations on North Parade are also simple in form and design, and acceptable. The event space itself contemporary and uses materials including aluminium and concrete cladding. While the design is distinctive, I consider it will not compete

with existing buildings, is well considered, of high quality and will not detract from the visual amenity of the area.

8.6.3. No protected views are affected by the proposed development.

8.7. **Impact on residential amenities**

Privacy and overlooking.

8.7.1. I have inspected the site and surrounding properties. The key residential properties potentially affected are Greenville, properties within no. 50 Main Street, and nos. 30, 31A Sean Lois.

8.7.2. I am satisfied that there will not be any overlooking from the proposed development into nearest residential properties from the proposed development within the lower (front) of the site, due to the general absence of windows at first floor level on the relevant elevations.

8.7.3. In the upper site I have considered in particular 30/31A Sean Lois, Greenville and the property to the rearmost of number 50, which are in proximity to the hotel.

8.7.4. The latter property has a significant area of open space to the front (which is in effect only semi private given access arrangements) and a shallow area of private open space to the rear. The windows in the corner rooms in the south eastern elevation of the hotel at first/second floor level are c. 13 m from the rear wall of that dwelling and c. 6m from the rear boundary wall. While I note from hotel elevation 2 that there is some additional treatment of these windows at the southwestern corner of the building to reduce the extent of glazing facing the residential property, I do not consider that is sufficient in terms of safeguarding the residential amenity of that property. In this regard I consider that in the event of a grant of planning permission the last bedrooms on the first and second floor of the hotel should be omitted. I note this will involve minor relocation of the plant. The window serving the second last bedroom on each floor should then be re-located to the end (south western elevation), which, at a distance of c. 18m to Sean Lois and the turning head and arrangements with the sides of those properties, I consider acceptable.

- 8.7.5. In relation to Greenville, there is some ambiguity in terms of elevational detail for the suites on level 1 and 2 which may potentially look into the rear of Greenville, as floor plans suggest corner glazing and elevations show aluminium cladding. In the event of a grant of planning permission, I recommend a condition that there shall be no glazing in the south-east elevation of the suites on level 1 and 2 (2 no. rooms).

Overbearance and overshadowing/loss of light

- 8.7.6. Having regard to the urban context of the site, in terms of the upper part of the site (hotel) I do not consider that the proposed development will be overbearing to properties on North Parade, having regard to the separation distance provided by the roadway and the scale of the buildings proposed.
- 8.7.7. I note that there is a distance of 7m to the side boundary of Greenville, and 27m to the dwelling. I note that the levels increase along North Parade. Given the levels, distance and form/arrangement of the proposed hotel I do not consider it would create a sense of overbearance for that dwelling or the open space relating to same. Again noting the arrangement of existing and proposed buildings, the floor levels of Greenville and nature and proximity of boundaries to the rear, the property already receives limited direct light from the south and west and I am satisfied there will be no worsening of this situation arising from the proposed development.
- 8.7.8. I note there is an existing large warehouse along the western boundary with nos. 30 and 31A Sean Lois. The proposed development will provide an increased setback of structures from the houses at this location, compared to existing, including for that property to the south of 31A Sean Lois. While a structure of increased height is proposed adjacent no. 31A Sean Lois, this is set back at upper stories and I consider there will be no significant effect in terms of overbearance or light.
- 8.7.9. I note a number of residential units within no. 50 Main Street in a backland format relevant to two of the appeals. One at the northwest of the plot (marked no. 50 on the site location map, which I will refer to as 50a) and another mews type development containing 2 - 3 units, more forward and along the southwestern

boundary of that plot. (These are marked 50 and 2 on the site location plan. I will refer to these as 50b).

- 8.7.10. In relation to 50a, I note that there are no proposed structures within the development site directly beside this dwelling and due to the orientation of the site and separation distances I consider that there will be no undue loss of light or overshadowing of this dwelling. I consider that this is evident without a full Daylight and Sunlight assessment, with reference to section, elevation and layout drawings on file. In relation to overbearance, I note the site levels and those of adjoining properties, and separation distances, as well of the height of the nearest proposed structure, which is at an oblique angle to the existing property. This is a plant/dockleveller with roof height lower than eaves height of the dwelling, 6 m from the house. The structure steps up further back, to the roof height of the event space, at a distance of c. 20 m from the dwelling, again not exceeding the roof height of the dwelling and not directly opposite the dwelling. I do not consider that these structures will be overbearing to no. 50. I refer the Commission to Section labelled 5 in the Proposed Contiguous Site Sections & Elevations drawing submitted in response to FI in this regard, along with site layout and floor plans. Again, as the structure is at an oblique angle to the existing property and there is no significant loss of aspect.
- 8.7.11. In relation to no. 50b, which appears to contain 3 no. dwellings, the proposed event space is opposite same, but at a distance of c. 9m. I refer the Commission to Section 1 on the drawing Proposed GA Section – Lower Site which shows the relationship to same. I note the mews character of these buildings, and that mews would traditionally have had relatively tight building to building relationships. Given this inner urban location I consider this relationship acceptable. With reference to BRE Site Layout Planning For Daylight And Sunlight – A Guide To Good Practice I have considered a point 1.2 m from floor level of these dwellings (conservative estimate of centre of window) in the front elevation of these dwellings, I note that a visible sky angle of c. 50° remains, which is not a particularly restricted level, particularly for a backland urban location.
- 8.7.12. I therefore do not consider that the proposed development unduly detracts from the amenities of adjacent dwellings through overshadowing/loss of light, or overbearance.

Light spill

- 8.7.13. The appeals raised concerns about light spill. This matter was raised at FI stage by the Planning Authority and the applicant submitted a design report and specification for the proposed development accompanied by a lighting layout, Isolux lines drawing and an electrical scheme
- 8.7.14. The applicant contends that the submission demonstrates that light pollution and light spill to neighbouring residential properties will be minimised through the use of light design mitigation measures. The proposed lighting fixtures tightly control light distribution into the acquired areas minimizing lifestyle to other areas
- 8.7.15. The submission does not raise specific concerns about the lighting proposal. I have reviewed the lighting scheme details submitted in response to FI. I am satisfied that they are comprehensive, and that the proposal is prepared by an individual with expertise in the area. I note the proposal allows for control of individual lights, and dimming of lights up to 10%, that full cut luminaires are proposed at targeted locations. I am satisfied that lighting has been adequately considered and addressed. In addition, I note condition no. 9 of the grant of permission from the Planning Authority, which provides further control of this aspect of the development, if required.

Noise

- 8.7.16. I have addressed noise at Section 8.4 above.

8.8. Other matters

- 8.8.1. Obstruction from pedestrians: I acknowledge there is potential for obstruction of residential entrances or footpaths during crowd dispersal and embarking on buses. However I consider that this is adequately addressed in the Event Management Strategy and should be managed through standard crowd control/stewarding, which is normal practice with event management. It should also be borne in mind that this is a town centre location, and increased activity at certain hours is the norm, and supports the vitality and viability of the town.

8.8.2. Operating hours/number of events: I note no planning condition in relation to hours of operation or number/type of events was included. I do not consider there is any basis to restrict events if the impact in terms of planning considerations is addressed through mitigation measures in relation to noise, residential amenity, traffic etc. I do not consider it necessary to attach operating hours to the public house, which is subject to licencing laws, or café/restaurant. I consider that given the size of the site and proximity to residential properties it would be reasonable if events in the events space concluded at 10.30, with dispersal to follow. In the event of permission being granted I recommend a condition be attached accordingly.

9.0 **AA Screening**

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development at Gorey Corporation Lands, Main Street, Gorey, Co. Wexford in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended.
- 9.2. The closest European Site to the subject site Slaney River Valley SAC (Site Code: 000781) c. 2.8 km west of the subject site.
- 9.3. The proposed development comprises a mixed-use scheme (comprising a multi-purpose events space, a hotel, a bar, a restaurant, a cafe and associated works). 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 based on the following;
- The nature and scale of the proposed development.
 - Location of a site in a serviced urban area and proposed connection to public water wastewater services.
 - The distance from nearest European Site and absence of connectivity between the development site and the European Site.
- 9.4. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded

and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended) is not required.

10.0 **Water Framework Directive**

- 10.1. The surface waterbody BANOGE_010 [IE_SE_11B020100] is approximately 541m northwest of the site. The surface waterbody BANOGE_020 [IE_SE_11B020200] is c. 440m to the north east. The groundwater body is Gorey [IE_SE_G_071] status “Good” and “Review” with no identified pressures.
- 10.2. The subject site is located on zoned land within an inner town centre area in Gorey. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal or by observers.
- 10.3. I have assessed the proposed development 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 water and ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration.
- 10.4. 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 surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- 10.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The nature and location of the works on a brownfield inner urban site with made ground
 - The location of the site removed from any surface waterbodies and lack of any hydrological connectivity.
 - Existing and proposed connections to public water, wastewater and surface water networks.

11.0 Conclusion and Recommendation

- 11.1. I consider the proposed development acceptable in principle having regard to the location of the site, the nature of uses and the provisions of the WCDP. I consider that the proposed development is consistent with many of the provisions of the WCDP in terms of creating vibrant towns and town centres, in particular Objective GT01, Objective GT05, Objective TV55 of the WCDP, and would be a positive development for Gorey in this regard. I consider that the proposed development has a high standard of design, is acceptable in terms of built heritage, and overall provides a considered and responsive layout in terms of adjacent properties, with regard to noise, overbearance, overlooking and daylight/sunlight, and, noting this town centre location, would not detract unduly from those properties in this regard, subject to conditions referred to in my assessment above.
- 11.2. However, in relation to traffic and transport, I do not consider the Park and Ride Strategy proposed by the applicant is robust due to (1) reliance on other hotel sites for parking, with limited analysis of parking standards and availability at those locations, and (2) the selection of public parking areas as bus staging areas, where there is significant demand and use for such spaces. I consider that this undermines the potential of park and ride for patron dispersal, which is a significant element of the transport and event management strategy of the development for larger events. I consider that and would lead to ad-hoc parking in residential areas, put undue pressure on public parking areas and result in disorderly patron dispersal, which would cause obstruction and traffic hazard, and which would detract from the amenities of the area. I therefore recommend that permission be refused as set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Notwithstanding the general acceptability of the proposed development, the Commission considered that there were deficiencies within the Park and Ride Strategy forming part of the application, in particular reliance on hotel sites (with similar functions) for parking, limited analysis of parking standards/availability at those locations, and the proposed use of in-demand public parking spaces as bus staging areas. Given the provision of a park and ride strategy is a key feature of

the effective management of seminars and concerts to be hosted within the proposed event space, it was considered the proposed development would put undue pressure on public parking, would result in ad hoc parking in local residential areas and would lead to disorderly patron dispersal, which may cause obstruction and congestion. The proposed development would therefore seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity and endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard or obstruction of road users. The proposed development 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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

Bébhinn O'Shea
Senior Planning Inspector

10th September 2026

Appendix 1: EIA Pre-Screening Form 1

Case Reference	501050-WX-26
Proposed Development Summary	Mixed-use scheme a multi-purpose events space, a hotel, a bar, a restaurant, a cafe and associated works as detailed below at a site of c. 0.78 hectare. Total GFA proposed and to be retained is 6,279 sq m.
Development Address	Main Street Gorey
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?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☐ 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)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to	State the Class here

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	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
☒ 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), (iv) Urban development. Threshold is 2 Ha. Site is .78 Ha

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes ☒	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☐	

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

Form 3 - EIA Screening Determination Sample Form

A. CASE DETAILS		
An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	501050-WX-26	
Development Summary	Mixed-use scheme a multi-purpose events space, a hotel, a bar, a restaurant, a cafe and associated works as detailed below at a site of c. 0.78 hectare. . Total GFA proposed and to be retained is 6,279 sq m.	
	Yes / No / N/A	Comment (if relevant)
1. Was a Screening Determination carried out by the PA?	No	Comment in LA Planning Report p 16
2. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?	Yes	EIS Screening Report prepared by Purser
3. Has an AA screening report or NIS been submitted?	Yes	AA Screening Report prepared by Altamar
4. Is a IED/ IPC or Waste Licence (or review of licence) required from the EPA? If YES has the EPA commented on the need for an EIAR?	No	
5. Have any other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment which have a significant bearing on the project been carried out pursuant to other relevant Directives – for example SEA	Yes	Wexford County Development Plan 2022 - 2028 SEA Wexford County Development Plan 2022 - 2028 NIS

		Pre-Construction Resource & Waste Management Plan	
		Ecological Impact Assessment	
B. EXAMINATION	Yes/ No/ Uncertain	Briefly describe the nature and extent and Mitigation Measures (where relevant) (having regard to the probability, magnitude (including population size affected), complexity, duration, frequency, intensity, and reversibility of impact) Mitigation measures –Where relevant specify features or measures proposed by the applicant to avoid or prevent a significant effect.	Is this likely to result in significant effects on the environment? Yes/ No/ Uncertain
This screening examination should be read with, and in light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith			
1. Characteristics of proposed development (including demolition, construction, operation, or decommissioning)			
1.1 Is the project significantly different in character or scale to the existing surrounding or environment?	No	The proposed development is within the built up urban area, surrounded by development mainly 2 storey in height. The height of the development ranges from 1-3 stories. It is similar in scale and character to existing development with some contemporary alterations/elements, but not significantly different.	No
1.2 Will construction, operation, decommissioning or demolition works cause physical changes to the locality (topography, land use, waterbodies)?	No	Some demolition is proposed as part of the development but this will not change the physical appearance or topography of the locality	No

1.3 Will construction or operation of the project use natural resources such as land, soil, water, materials/minerals or energy, especially resources which are non-renewable or in short supply?	Yes	Raw materials to be used as per typical construction scheme but not of such scale and quantity that there would be significant effects on the environment	No
1.4 Will the project involve the use, storage, transport, handling or production of substance which would be harmful to human health or the environment?	Uncertain	Demolition element and construction activities will require the use of potentially harmful materials such as asbestos, contaminated soil, fuels and give rise to waste for disposal. The Preliminary Construction and Environmental Management Plan, and Construction Waste Management Strategy within, address potential impacts and will mitigate same	No
1.5 Will the project produce solid waste, release pollutants or any hazardous / toxic / noxious substances?	Uncertain	Construction activities will require the use of potentially harmful materials such as fuels and give rise to waste for disposal. Pollutants such as dust emissions are likely. There is potential for asbestos. Waste during construction works. The Preliminary Construction and Environmental Management Plan, and Construction Waste Management Strategy within, address potential impacts and will mitigate same	No
1.6 Will the project lead to risks of contamination of land or water from releases of pollutants onto the ground or into surface waters, groundwater, coastal waters or the sea?	No	Typical construction management practices as set out in the Preliminary Construction and Environmental Management Plan. Application contains robust surface water and nature based SuDS strategy.	No
1.7 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes	During construction the project will cause noise and vibration, but will be subject to mitigation through CEMP and planning conditions, and monitoring. Operational noise may arise from the nature of use but is also proposed to be controlled by condition.	No

1.8 Will there be any risks to human health, for example due to water contamination or air pollution?	No	Typical construction management practices as set out in the Preliminary Construction and Environmental Management Plan will mitigate against contamination of air from dust. Water supply is piped. There are measures to prevent pollution to receiving waters.	No
1.9 Will there be any risk of major accidents that could affect human health or the environment?	No	Site not in the vicinity of any site with a risk. Flood Zone C – not at risk of flooding.	No
1.10 Will the project affect the social environment (population, employment)	Yes	It will provide for increased uses within town centre, supporting population, creating increased economic activity and creating employment.	No
1.11 Is the project part of a wider large scale change that could result in cumulative effects on the environment?	Yes	Yes. The town is targeted for growth in line with NPF. However, this has been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment during the preparation of the WCDP	No
2. Location of proposed development			
2.1 Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining or have the potential to impact on any of the following: - European site (SAC/ SPA/ pSAC/ pSPA) - NHA/ pNHA - Designated Nature Reserve - Designated refuge for flora or fauna - Place, site or feature of ecological interest, the preservation/conservation/ protection of which is an objective of a	No	None in immediate vicinity. Brownfield site in urban area, connecting to public wastewater systems and incorporating SuDS. Sufficient distance from sites with lack of direct hydrological connection and intervening urban environment. Significant effects on biodiversity unlikely.	No

development plan/ LAP/ draft plan or variation of a plan			
2.2 Could any protected, important or sensitive species of flora or fauna which use areas on or around the site, for example: for breeding, nesting, foraging, resting, over-wintering, or migration, be affected by the project?	No	Brownfield site, mainly built land. Ecological Impact Assessment carried out. No rare or protected habitats noted. Invasive species noted, no terrestrial mammals. No evidence of bats. Minor potential impact on birds - site clearance to be outside nesting season as mitigation	No
2.3 Are there any other features of landscape, historic, archaeological, or cultural importance that could be affected?	Yes	Archaeological Impact Assessment submitted. Significant ground disturbance has already occurred. No significant features evident. Monitoring recommended in AIA. Monitoring conditions recommended by DoE. Part of the site within ACA. 3 No. Protected Structures affected. Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment submitted. Effect on built heritage would not be so significant in itself to warrant EIA.	No
2.4 Are there any areas on/around the location which contain important, high quality or scarce resources which could be affected by the project, for example: forestry, agriculture, water/coastal, fisheries, minerals?	No	-	No
2.5 Are there any water resources including surface waters, for example: rivers, lakes/ponds, coastal or groundwaters which could be affected by the project, particularly in terms of their volume and flood risk?	No	No water features in immediate vicinity. Surface water protection strategy within the Preliminary Construction and Environmental Management Plan. Made ground.	No
2.6 Is the location susceptible to subsidence, landslides or erosion?	No	-	No

2.7 Are there any key transport routes(eg National primary Roads) on or around the location which are susceptible to congestion or which cause environmental problems, which could be affected by the project?	No	Town centre	No
2.8 Are there existing sensitive land uses or community facilities (such as hospitals, schools etc) which could be affected by the project?	No	Mixed use town centre area. No sensitive uses given nature of development	No
3. Any other factors that should be considered which could lead to environmental impacts			
3.1 Cumulative Effects: Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulative effects during the construction/ operation phase?	Uncertain	A recent permission for construction of a 2 storey school has been identified 20250456. There could be cumulative effects if construction periods coincide however this is uncertain and would not in itself warrant EIA	No
3.2 Transboundary Effects: Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects?	No	Limited local temporary effects.	No
3.3 Are there any other relevant considerations?	No	-	No
C. CONCLUSION			
No real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	X	EIAR Not Required	
Real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.		EIAR Required	
D. MAIN REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS			

EG - EIAR not Required

Having regard to: -

1. the criteria set out in Schedule 7, in particular
 - (a) the limited nature and scale of the proposed mixed use development, on a brownfield site in an urban area served by public infrastructure.
 - (b) the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity,
 - (c) the location of the development outside of any sensitive location specified in article 109(4)(a) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)
2. the results of other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment submitted by the applicant including EIA Screening, AA Screening, Pre-Construction Resource & Waste Management Plan and Ecological Impact Assessment
3. the features and measures proposed by applicant envisaged to avoid or prevent what might otherwise have been significant effects on the environment

The Commission concluded that the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment, and that an environmental impact assessment report is not required.

Inspector _____

Date _____

Approved (DP/ADP) _____

Date _____