



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501435-WX-26

Development	Construction of single storey house with access off existing laneway, bored well, wastewater treatment system with soil polishing filter and all associated site development works.
Location	Tombrick, Castledockrell, Enniscorthy, Co. Wexford
Planning Authority	Wexford County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	20251083
Applicant	Tom Morrissey
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellants	Fiona & Killian Kavanagh
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	15 th July 2026

Inspector

Ian Campbell

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located in the townland of Tombrick, c. 6 south-east of Bunclody and c. 12 km north-west of Enniscorthy, Co. Wexford. The site is located in a rural area outside of a settlement.
- 1.2. The site, which has a stated site area of 0.35 ha, is broadly triangular in shape, is situated on the southern side of a local access road (L-6169), and is accessed from an unpaved laneway which also serves agricultural lands and a second laneway which spurs off this main laneway.
- 1.3. The site is heavily wooded. The particulars submitted with the planning application refer to the external walls of a derelict dwelling on the site however these are not visible from the public road. Power lines traverse the western part of the site, parallel to the L-6169.
- 1.4. Detached dwellings are located to the immediate north and further south.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises;
 - construction of a single storey 4 bedroom house. The house is 'L' shape on plan -
 - stated floor area c. 163 sqm.
 - finished floor level (FFL) indicated as 119.0 metres.
 - maximum ridge height c. 5.1 metres.
 - material finishes to the proposed house are indicated as comprising render and natural stone for the external walls and slate for the roof (grey colour).
 - installation of waste water treatment system (wwts) and soil polishing filter.
 - landscaping and associated site works.
 - vehicular entrance off existing laneway.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Request for Further Information

Prior to the decision of the Planning Authority to grant permission for the proposed development the Planning Authority requested Further Information (FI).

3.1.1. Further Information was requested on the 22nd day of October 2025 as follows:

Item 1: submit details of applicant's current residence, inc. location map.

Item 2: confirm the width of the shared access and details of third party agreement(s) if land is not in applicant's ownership.

Item 3: submit details of surface water drainage.

3.1.2. Further Information submitted on the 21st day of April 2026.

Item 1: applicant confirms that he does not own the dwelling which he currently resides in, and that it is owned by a family member, and that he rents it. Folio details of this property submitted.

Item 2: the access is partially owned by a third party. Letter of consent submitted referring to the use of the laneway and the carrying out of any necessary improvement works, which the applicant is to bear the cost of.

Item 3: updated site plan submitted which includes provision of aco drain across site entrance to prevent water discharging onto public road. Soakaways also provided.

3.2. Decision

The Planning Authority issued a Notification of Decision to GRANT Permission on the 13th day of May 2026 subject to 10 no. conditions. The following conditions are of note;

C3 – occupancy condition.

C7 – requires interceptor grating across full width of entrance.

3.3. Planning Authority Reports

3.3.1. Planning Reports

3.3.2. The first report of the Planning Officer generally reflects the issues raised in the request for FI. The report also notes the following;

- proposal is not ribbon development.
- design of dwelling is acceptable, and would not impact neighbouring amenity.
- applicant was previously granted permission for a house but this was taken over by another party.
- floor area of house meets CDP policy re. minimum site area.
- no impacts on groundwater anticipated noting information submitted in relation to proposed wwtp/site character.

Request for FI recommended.

3.3.3 The second report of the Planning Officer notes that the FI submitted is generally considered acceptable, and recommends a GRANT of permission consistent with the Notification of Decision which issued.

3.3.4. Other Technical Reports

Roads Department – initial report recommends FI (confirm ownership/maintenance of access; details of family home; and details of surface water drainage). Subsequent report recommends specific planning conditions.

3.4. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.5. Third Party Observations

2 no. observations were received by the Planning Authority. The issues raised in the third-party observations may be summarised as follows:

- proposal constitutes ribbon development.

- applicant owns a house.
- impact on character of area.
- adequacy of sightlines.
- policy directs housing to settlements.
- risk to groundwater.
- risk from overhanging trees on the site.

4.0 Planning History

Appeal Site:

None.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Policy

5.1.1. National Planning Framework (NPF)¹ – Project Ireland 2040

National Policy Objective 28 states -

In rural areas under urban influence, facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on the core consideration of demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area and siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements.

In rural areas elsewhere, facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements.

¹ First Revision 8th April 2025.

5.1.2. **Code of Practice Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (p.e. ≤ 10) 2021**

The Code of Practice (CoP) sets out guidance on the design, operation and maintenance of on-site wastewater treatment systems for single houses.

5.1.3. **Ministerial Guidance**

Sustainable Rural Housing, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2005)

The site is located within an area identified as a 'Structurally Weak Area' (see Volume 1, Map 1 (Rural Area Types) Wexford County Development Plan 2022 - 2028). The Guidelines describe these areas as exhibiting characteristics such as persistent and significant population decline as well as a weaker economic structure based on indices of income, employment and economic growth.

5.2. **Development Plan**

5.2.1. The relevant Development Plan is the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028.

The site is not subject to any specific land-use zoning. As addressed above, the site is located within an area identified as a 'Structurally Weak Area' (see Volume 1, Map 1 (Rural Area Types). The site is also located within an 'Uplands' area (see map entitled 'Landscape Character Units' in Volume 7 Landscape Character Assessment).

The provisions of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 relevant to this assessment are as follows:

Chapter 4: (Sustainable Housing)

- Table 4.6 (Criteria for One-Off Rural Housing)
- Section 4.9.3 (Ribbon Development)
- Objective SH41 (Occupancy Condition)
- Objective SH42 (Permanent Residency Condition)
- Objective SH45 (Design)

Volume 1: (Maps)

- (Map 1: Rural Areas)

Volume 2: (Development Management Manual)

- Section 3.1. Single Dwellings in Rural Areas

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

The appeal site is not located within a European Site. The closest European Site/Designated Sites are;

- Slaney River Valley SAC (Site Code: 000781) – c. 1.8 km east of site.
- Slaney River Valley pNHA (Site Code: 000781) – c. 1.6 km east of site.

5.4. EIA Screening

(See Form 1 and Form 2 attached to this report). Having regard to the limited nature and scale of the development and the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity of the site, as well as the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

This is a third-party appeal by Fiona & Killian Kavanagh against the decision of Wexford County Council to grant permission. The grounds for appeal may be summarised as follows;

- the applicant's claim in respect of his ownership of property is conflicting. The applicant previously stated, in a separate planning application (PA. Ref. 20171030, that he had a legal interest in land/structure. The rental property is not registered with the RTB.
- the applicant does not have a genuine rural housing need and the proposal is speculative in nature. The applicant should have sought permission at the location of his family home.
- the proposal is ribbon development.

- the proposal, using the access laneway, represents a traffic hazard. The owner of the lane does not consent a shared maintenance plan/no consent exists to alter the 'upper layout'.
- the proposed drainage arrangement could result in local flooding.

6.2. Applicant Response

The applicant has submitted a response to the appellant's submission stating the following;

- the applicant does not and has never previously owned a rural dwelling.
- the applicant complies with the requirements of Table 4.6 of the CDP.
- the applicant currently resides in a house in Clonee with his family. This property is owned by the applicant's father-in-law.
- reference in the planning application (PA. Ref. 20171030) to the applicant being the owner of the property was an error on the part of the agent.
- the applicant has no intention of disposing of the property if permission is granted.
- the site is infill in nature and therefore the proposal is not ribbon development. The site previously accommodated a dwelling and utilises an existing entrance. The 5 no. existing dwellings and the proposal relate to an area in excess of 250 metres.
- the owner of the laneway has given the applicant consent to carry out future maintenance works. The applicant has no intention of interfering with the appellant's section of the lane.
- the proposal will not result in a traffic hazard. Sightlines are available.
- no surface water will be discharged to the public road.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

None received.

6.4. **Observations**

None received.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the appeal, the applicant's submission in respect of the appeal, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant national and local policy and guidance, I consider the main issues in relation to this appeal are as follows:

- Rural Housing Policy
- Ribbon Development
- Access/Traffic Safety
- Waste Water
- Impact on Visual and Residential Amenity
- Surface Water Drainage
- Water Framework Directive
- Screening for Appropriate Assessment

7.2. **Rural Housing Policy**

7.2.1. The crux of the appellant's case, as it relates to rural housing policy, is that the applicant has owned/owns a property, and therefore is ineligible under the requirements of the CDP (i.e. Table 4.6 - Criteria for One-Off Rural Housing) for consideration for a dwelling in the rural area. The appellant refers to a previous planning application made by the applicant, PA. Ref. 20171030² the application form (attached to appeal submission) submitted for which stated that the applicant was the legal owner of the property concerned. The appellant also contends that the applicant does not have a genuine rural housing need, that the proposal is speculative in nature, and that permission should instead have been sought at the location of the applicant's family home.

² Concerns application for a domestic extension at Clonee Lower, a rural area within Co. Wexford.

- 7.2.2. I note that the site is located within an area identified as a 'Structurally Weak Area' (see Volume 1, Map 1 (Rural Area Types) Wexford County Development Plan 2022 - 2028) and the PA have based their assessment on the corresponding criteria in Table 4.6, i.e. 'a person building a dwelling house as their permanent place of residence and who has never owned a rural house'.
- 7.2.3. I have reviewed the Landscape Character Map for the County and I note that the site is located within an Uplands Area (see Vol. 7 Landscape Character Assessment). Table 4.6 of the CDP includes an eligibility category relating to landscape and heritage areas within the County, and the CDP notes that there are strict local needs requirements in these areas. I consider that the applicable criteria in this instance is that relating to landscape and heritage areas, and not 'Structurally Weak Areas'. I note that the PA have not identified the site as being located within an uplands area in their assessment, nor has this issue been raised by the appellant.
- 7.2.4. Table 4.6 sets out eligibility criteria for applicants seeking a dwelling within these areas, specifically under sub-heading A³ or B⁴. The applicant has submitted correspondence from a school attesting to his residence at Tombrick for a duration of 5 no. years (i.e. 1991 to 1995). I note that Tombrick is an Upland area and is in close proximity to the where the applicant is now seeking permission for a dwelling. I have assessed the information on the file in respect of the requirements of sub-heading 'A'. Based on the information submitted I consider this to be the most relevant criteria. There is no information on the file to demonstrate that the applicant meets the

³ 'a person who has lived full-time in a principal residence within that particular landscape or heritage area for a minimum period of 10 years (not necessarily concurrently and at any time in their life) and the subject site is within 3km radius of where the applicant has lived or is living and who has never owned a rural house'.

⁴ Such persons shall be defined as persons who by the nature of their work have an overriding economic functional need to reside permanently in the specific Coastal Zone or Landscape and Heritage Area and do not have access to appropriate land outside that area. Such circumstances will normally apply to land or business owners involved in full-time farming, horticulture, marine or tourism (not including B&Bs) related activities and where the business requires them to be located on the premises/holding. The applicant must be able to provide documentary evidence that the employment is full-time. The applicant must be able to demonstrate that the landholding is such to support a viable enterprise.

requirements of 'B', i.e. that by the nature of his work has an overriding economic functional need to reside permanently in the specific landscape area. Based on the information on the file the applicant has not demonstrated compliance with the requirements of Table 4.6 as it applies to Upland areas, specifically the required duration of residency (sub-heading 'A'), or overriding economic functional need to reside permanently in the specific landscape area (sub-heading 'B').

7.2.5. It is also required for applicants seeking permission for a dwelling in upland areas that they do not own a rural house, similar to the criteria for Structurally Weak Areas. In response to the appellant's contention regarding the applicant owning a rural house, the applicant states that his agent erroneously answered this question on the application form, stating that he owned the property when in fact he did not. The applicant has confirmed that he does not and has never previously owned a rural dwelling. The applicant further notes that he and his family reside in a house in Clonee which is owned by the applicant's father-in-law. Documentation in support of this has also been submitted, including the relevant Folio with the owner of this property being stated as the applicant's father-in-law. I am satisfied that the applicant does not/has not owned a rural house, and that he complies with this specific requirement under Table 4.6 of the CDP as it relates to upland areas.

7.2.6. Having regard to the forgoing, I do not consider that the applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated that he complies with the requirements of Table 4.6 of the CDP, as it relates to upland areas and I recommend that permission is refused on this basis. I do not consider that this represents a 'new issue' as the issue of compliance with the Rural Settlement Strategy/Policy and the applicant's need to reside in the rural area was raised in the appeal.

7.3. Ribbon Development

7.3.1. The appellant raises concerns in relation to the creation of ribbon development arising from the proposal at this location. Appendix 4 of the Rural Housing Guidelines, 2005, describes ribbon development as a situation where 5 or more houses exist on any one side of a given 250 metres of road frontage. I note that Objective SH43 (which in turn

refers to Section 4.9.3 of the CDP) provides for a presumption against ribbon development, save for specific exceptions⁵.

7.3.2. I note that the PA did not consider that the proposal would result in ribbon development as the distance concerned was in excess of 250 metres (i.e. stated as 260 metres). The applicant's response to the appeal notes that site previously accommodated a dwelling; that the proposal utilises an existing entrance; and that the 5 no. existing dwellings in addition to the proposal correspond to an area which is in excess of 250 metres.

7.3.3. In my estimation, using Google Maps⁶, the proposal would result in 6 no. houses over a c. 260 metre distance, and would therefore not meet the description of ribbon development, i.e. 5 no. houses over a 250 metre distance (single side of road). I am satisfied that the proposal therefore accords with Objective SH43 of the CDP. The exemptions contained under Section 4.9.3 of the CDP are not applicable given that the proposal would not give rise to ribbon development in the first instance.

7.4. Access & Traffic Safety

7.4.1. The appellant raises concerns that the use of the access laneway would create a traffic hazard. The proposal entails a vehicular access onto an existing private laneway, which in turn connects to the L-6169. The area to the front of the site/laneway serves agricultural lands which adjoin the site and a second laneway, which spurs off the laneway. I note that the area concerned is not heavily trafficked and is a low speed environment. Given the nature of the proposal, a single dwelling, and the nature and use of the adjacent laneway, I do not consider that the proposal would result in a traffic hazard. There is no obvious potential for vehicular conflicts, or pedestrian/vehicular conflicts. Additionally, I note that the site layout plan submitted with the planning application/appeal indicates sightlines of 90 metres in either direction, in excess of the 65 metres required (see page 102 of CDP).

⁵ Where there are four or five existing houses in a row and there is an infill site between two of the houses, the Council will consider the development of an infill site for a dwelling house where it is to accommodate a specific housing need such as that of a son or daughter. The infill site must be adjacent to the family home or in very close proximity (250 m of the family home). Only one infill site in that row will be permitted to be developed in order to limit the impact of ribbon development/suburban density in rural areas (regardless of the number of infill sites).

⁶ Measured from the outer extent of the roadside boundary of the northernmost dwelling to westernmost extent of the roadside boundary of the westernmost dwelling.

7.4.2. The appellant notes that the owner of the lane has not consented to engage in a shared maintenance plan, and that no consent exists to alter the 'upper layout'. I note that the laneway is in private ownership and that the owner of the laneway has given consent to the applicant to use the laneway and also to carry out any necessary future upgrade works to the laneway. Based on the information submitted in respect of this laneway I am satisfied that the proposed access arrangement can be implemented and that it can be maintained into the future. The owner of the laneway has stated that the applicant will be responsible for the cost of any damage to the upgraded laneway should the farm machinery, belonging to the laneway owner, result in damage to the upgraded laneway. In my opinion, the laneway owner's position in relation to her potential liability for damage to the upgraded laneway arising from her machinery using the laneway does not hamper the future maintenance of the laneway. I do not consider that a refusal of permission is warranted on the basis of traffic safety or access.

7.5. Waste Water

7.5.1. The Site Characterisation Report submitted with the application identifies that the site is located in an area with a 'Poor Aquifer' where the bedrock vulnerability is 'Extreme'. A ground protection response to R2(1)⁷ is noted in the applicant's Site Characterisation Report. The applicant's Site Characterisation Report identifies that there is no Groundwater Protection Scheme in the area.

7.5.2. The trial hole depth referenced in the Site Characterisation Report is 2.1 metres. Bedrock and the water table were both encountered in the trial hole at a depth of 2.1 metres (bgl). The soil conditions found in the trial hole are described as comprising well drained sandy clay. Percolation test holes were dug and pre-soaked. A sub-surface value of 17.78 was recorded. A surface value test was also carried out and a value of 82.52 recorded. Based on the EPA CoP 2021 (Table 6.4) the site is suitable for a secondary treatment system and soil polishing filter, as proposed. The applicant indicates that a depth of 0.9 metres of unsaturated sub-soil (in accordance with Table 6.3) will be provided beneath the invert of gravel. I was unable to inspect the trial hole during my site inspection. I am satisfied that the proposal complies with the required

⁷ Acceptable subject to normal good practice. Where domestic water supplies are located Nearby, particular attention should be given to the depth of subsoil over bedrock such that the minimum depths required in Chapter 6 are met and the likelihood of microbial pollution is minimised.

separation distances set out in Table 6.2 of the CoP 2021. I am satisfied that the treatment of effluent on the site can be catered for without a risk to groundwater.

7.6. Impact on Visual and Residential Amenity

- 7.6.1. Whilst impacts on visual and residential amenity have not been specifically raised in the appeal, I am satisfied, having regard to the scale and design of the proposed development, that the character of this area will not be adversely affected by the proposed development, and that the proposed dwelling would not have any significant adverse impacts on the amenity of property in the vicinity.

7.7. Surface Water Drainage

- 7.7.1. The appellant raises concerns that the proposal could result in surface water flooding. The applicant is proposing soakaways within the site and has indicated a aco drain across the front entrance of the site to address the potential for surface water to drain onto the roadway. The measures proposed, which are typical for developments of this nature, will in my view adequately cater for surface water, and I am satisfied that significant issues in respect of flooding will not arise as a result of the proposed development.

7.8. Water Framework Directive

- 7.8.1. Water Framework Directive - 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 and ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. 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. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature and extent of the proposed development, entailing shallow excavations.

- The absence of any surface water features in the vicinity of the site.
- The location of the site outside of an area indicated as being susceptible to flooding.

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have resulted in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

7.9. Screening for Appropriate Assessment

7.9.1. I have considered the proposed development at Tombrick, Castledockrell, Enniscorthy, Co. Wexford in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended. The subject site is located c. 1.8 km from Slaney River Valley SAC (Site Code: 000781). The proposed development comprises permission for the construction of 1 no. dwelling and a wastewater treatment system.

7.9.2. 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 distance from nearest European Site(s).
- The weakness of connectivity between the development site and European Sites.
- The nature and scale of the proposed development.

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act, 2000) is not required.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. Having regard to the above it is recommended that permission is refused based on the following reasons and considerations.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the documentation submitted with the application and appeal, the Commission is not satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated that he comes within the scope of the housing need criteria as set out in Table 4.6 of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028, specifically in relation to areas of the County identified as 'Upland', which are identified on the map entitled 'Landscape Character Units' in Volume 7 Landscape Character Assessment. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028. 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, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Ian Campbell
Senior Planning Inspector

2nd September 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

An Coimisiún Pleanála	PL-501435-WX-26		
Case Reference			
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of single storey house with access off existing laneway, bored well, wastewater treatment system with soil polishing filter and all associated site development works.		
Development Address	Tombrick, Castledockrell, Enniscorthy, Co. Wexford		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	X
		No	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?			
Yes	X	Part 2, Sch. 5, Class 10, (b), (i) Part 2, Sch. 5, Class 10, (b), (iv)	Proceed to Q3.
No			
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			
No	X		Proceed to Q4

4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes	X	Class 10, (b), (i) (threshold is 500 dwelling units) – proposal is for 1 no. dwelling. Class 10, (b), (iv) (threshold is 20 Ha.) – site area is 0.35 ha.	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)

5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	X	Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Coimisiún Pleanála Case Reference	PL-501435-WX-26
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of single storey house with access off existing laneway, bored well, wastewater treatment system with soil polishing filter and all associated site development works.
Development Address	Tombrick, Castledockrell, Enniscorthy, Co. Wexford
The Commission carried out a preliminary examination [ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development regulations 2001, as amended] of at least the nature, size or location of the proposed development, having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations. 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 proposed development comprises the construction 1 no. house served by a wastewater treatment system in a rural area. The proposed development will not give rise to the production of significant waste, emissions or pollutants.
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	The development is located in a rural area. The site is c. 1.8 km from a European Site. Following

of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	screening for Appropriate Assessment, it has been ascertained 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. Given the scale and nature of development there will be no significant environmental effects arising.
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).	During the construction phase noise, dust and vibration emissions are likely. However, any impacts would be local and temporary in nature and the implementation of standard construction practice measures would satisfactorily mitigate potential impacts. The proposed wastewater treatment system is designed to comply with the relevant EPA CoP.
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.
	Yes or No Yes

There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.	No
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIAR required.	No

Inspector:

Date:

DP/ADP: _____

Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)