



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501699-WX-26

Development	Retention of part constructed structure and completion of residential dwelling to be used as rental accommodation ancillary to main dwelling, effluence treatment system and associated site works.
Location	Camaross, Kilgarvan
Planning Authority	Wexford County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	20260213W
Applicant(s)	Gus and Orna Connick
Type of Application	Retention
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Retention with Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Denis & Ellen Nolan
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	10 th September 2026
Inspector	Kathy Tuck

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site has a stated site area of 0.43 hectares and is located in the townland of Camaross at the southern end of an existing local road (cul de sac). The N25 is situated approximately 535m to the south and Wexford Town Centre is located c.17km to the east.
- 1.2. The site is irregular in shape and includes an existing 2 storey farmhouse, the subject partially commenced single storey/ detached dwelling structure, 2 no. agricultural sheds, part of a shared access laneway to the remainder of the landholding and part of an open field.
- 1.3. There is a separate existing 2 storey dwelling and associated sheds located to the immediate north of the appeal site on the opposite side (north) of the said farm access lane.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. This is a permission for retention of part constructed single storey dwelling structure which has a stated ground floor area of 65.7 sqm.
- 2.2. Permission is also being sought for the completion of the structure to provide for a 2 storey three-bedroom dwelling to be used as rental accommodation ancillary to the existing main dwelling house.
- 2.3. The proposed dwelling would have a ridge height of 6.75 metres and is provide with 2 no. dormer windows along the front (southern) elevation and 2 no. roof lights along the rear (northern) roof slope.
- 2.4. The development will also provide for the installation of an effluent treatment system replacing the existing on-site system to cater for both on-site and residential structures and all associated site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Following a request for further information the Planning Authority issued a decision to grant planning permission on the 16th June 2026 subject to 14 no. conditions. Conditions of note are as follows:

- Condition no. 3 - The tourist accommodation unit shall not sold or otherwise disposed of save as a single entity with the existing farmhouse. Reason: In the interest of clarity.
- Condition no. 4 to Condition no. 9 – Section 48 Development Contribution: in respect of works, consisting of the provision or improvement of roads/transportation infrastructure/ community/amenity facilities/ climate action/mitigation works. Schedule 2 of the decision sets out a breakdown of this contribution which in total equates to €6,356.00

A response from the Planning Authority was received on the 23rd May 2026 which comprised the following:

1. A revised site layout plan which indicates shared access is to be formed via the existing entrance to the farmhouse, with sensor lighting and a speed ramp to be installed at the entrance to the site to enhance traffic safety for users of the site.
2. Private open space for the proposed tourist accommodation unit has been relocated to be behind parking for that unit, and a reverse parking policy is to be promoted on site to further enhance safety. Low-level hedging will also be required between the parking spaces and private open space for the tourist accommodation unit, and this can be secured by way of condition to enhance privacy and screening for users of same.
3. proposed tourist accommodation unit is to be a year-round enterprise, with occupancy rates specified as 80% from April-August with 30% occupancy anticipated for the rest of the year.

The second report of the Planning authority, dated 11th June 2026, stated that the applicant adequately addressed the concerns raised and the development is therefore

considered to be acceptable. As such the report recommended that permission be granted in line with the decision made.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The first report of the Planning Officer, dated the 13th April 2026, sets out the site location, the proposed development, relevant planning history, details of pre-planning, a summary of reports received, a summary of observations received and details of all relevant national, regional and local planning policy.

The assessment refers to the permission recently refused under ABP-321222-24 on grounds relating to wastewater disposal, internal design, and that insufficient information was provided to warrant a 3rd dwelling on a modest landholding. The planning officer states that there is only 1no. dwelling on the landholding, that being the farmhouse within the existing farmyard – any other dwelling elsewhere is not considered a material element of the proposal, where this dwelling is outside of the registered landholding.

It is further recognised that the appeal site is within a structurally weak area, and the proposal is one of an agri-diversification, whereby the applicants actively provide courses, training, etc. in sheep dog training and also sheep shearing. It is accepted within the report of the Planning Officer that the applicant has submitted and as such it is concluded that the works requiring regularisation is principally acceptable to the Planning Authority and would support the rural economy within the wider location.

However, there were a number of issues outstanding that require further clarification and as such the following further information was sought:

1. Clarify the access arrangements for both the proposed tourist accommodation unit and existing dwelling within the curtilage of the site, noting that the access for the permanently occupied unit appears to traverse through the private open space of the proposed tourism accommodation unit.
2. submit a revised site layout plan outlining the boundary treatments proposed for the curtilage of the proposed tourism accommodation unit, including for bounding the private open space to serve same.

3. Submit details of potential occupancy rates for the proposed tourism accommodation unit, and clarify if occupancy is to be offered year-round or seasonally.

A response from

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Senior Executive Scientist (Environment) – report dated 3rd March 2026 recommends permission be granted subject to condition.

Roads Department – report recommends permission be granted subject to condition.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

The Planning Authority received 1 no. submission which raised concerns relating to:

- Non-compliance with the County Development Plan.
- House on site already rented out.
- Set an undesirable precedent.
- Structure is within 1m of the site boundary and sits below level of adjoining lands.
- Excavation may be dangerous.
- Insufficient detail on surface water.
- Overlooking.
- Access is unsuitable.
- Insufficient detail within plans as regards intended occupancy and traffic movements arising from proposed tourism accommodation .

4.0 Planning History

ABP-321222-24 Permission REFUSED on appeal to An Bord Pleanála for the Retention of a part constructed single storey structure and permission for completion

to form a two-storey four-bedroom residential building to be used as a rental accommodation ancillary to the existing main dwellinghouse. Permission is also being sought for the installation of an effluent treatment system replacing the existing on-site system to cater for both on-site residential structures and all other associated site works the reason for refusal were as follows:

- 1. Having regard to the soil conditions and high-water table, the Commission is not satisfied, on the basis of the submissions made in connection with the planning application and the appeal, that effluent from the development can be satisfactorily treated or disposed of on site, notwithstanding the proposed use of a proprietary wastewater treatment system. The proposed development would, therefore, be prejudicial to public health.*
- 2. The proposed dwelling design would not be in accordance with the recommendations set out in Section 3.12.2 (Dwelling House Design) of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 in relation to the design and layout of the dwelling or the provision of adequate private amenity. In particular, the proposed aggregate living area is below the minimum standards. In addition, the farmyard between the two structures, which serves as the private amenity space for both existing and proposed dwelling, is not segregated and is proposed to accommodate four car parking spaces, and it is considered that the applicant has failed to demonstrate how it is proposed to achieve minimum private open space standards and adequate private amenity to meet the requirements in the development plan. The development, as proposed, would not serve to achieve a high-quality living environment for residents of the existing dwelling and future residents of the proposed dwelling and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*
- 3. It is considered that the applicant has not provided sufficient justification as to the need to provide an additional dwelling at this location. If permitted, the proposed development would be the third dwelling on a relatively modest landholding. In the absence of an appropriately detailed and robust planning case and supporting planning justifications, it is considered that the proposed development would contravene Rural Diversification Objectives ED105 and ED107 and Rural Based Tourism Objective TM19 and Tourism*

Accommodation Objective TM56 of the development plan, would serve to create an undesirable precedent for similar types of development in the vicinity, and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

PA Ref 20231016 Retention and Permission REFUSED for a part-constructed single storey structure and permission for completion to form a two storey four bedroom residential building to be used as a rental accommodation ancillary to the existing main dwelling house. Permission is also being sought for the installation of an effluent treatment system replacing the existing on-site system to cater for both on-site residential structures and all other associated site works. Reasons for refusal were as follows:

- 1. The applicant has failed to adequately demonstrate rural linkage and housing need in accordance with the rural housing policy as set out in Volume 1 Table 4.6 of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022 – 2028. The proposal is therefore contrary to the proper planning and the sustainable development of the area.*
- 2. It is noted that the red line boundary incorporates the existing dwelling to the south and dwelling for retention with the 0.4 ha. This is considered contrary to Section 3.1.2 Standards for Single Dwellings in Rural Areas and Table 3-3 Site Size, Dwelling Floor Area Ratio and Biodiversity Requirements and contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*
- 3. Insufficient information has been submitted regarding the requirements set out under Table 3-3 (Volume 2) of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022 – 2028. The applicant has submitted no details in relation to a biodiversity tree or shrub planting proposal in order to provide the minimum requirement of 20% of the site area planted for biodiversity use.*

Planning Enforcement – PA Ref 0058-2023

Possible unauthorised demolition and construction of an agricultural shed Enforcement notice served; this application seeks to regularise this ongoing enforcement case.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028

Volume 1 – Written statement

5.1.1. Chapter 6: Economic Development Strategy

- Section 6.7.6: Rural Economy
- Section 6.7.6.2: Rural Diversification including Agri-Food
 - The diversification of the rural economy can both supplement existing rural incomes and add to the richness of the rural area. The Planning Authority recognises that a balance needs to be maintained between facilitating appropriate forms of rural development and protecting the rural environment. Farm based enterprise including agri-tourism proposals, open farms/pet farms and equestrian activities will be facilitated subject to environmental and development management standards. Agri-tourism proposals are dealt with under Chapter 7 Tourism Development. ...
- Objective ED105: To facilitate farm or rural resource related enterprises, including food production and processing on farm holdings, where the key resource is produced on the farm (or other nearby rural resource) or a number of farms in the locality subject to Objectives ED97 and ED98 and normal planning and environment criteria. The scale of the facility should be appropriate to the rural character of the area and will be assessed having regard to a number of factors including source of material, scale of the operation, building size, number of employees and hours of operation, waste generation, traffic movements to and from the site, water and wastewater requirements, environmental impacts including but not limited to noise and odour, and impacts on natural and cultural/built heritage and water. The restoration of vernacular farm buildings to facilitate such enterprises will be encouraged.

- Objective ED106: Where an extension to/intensification of an existing development referred to in Objective ED105 is proposed, it must remain of a scale which is appropriate to the rural area and it should not detract from the environment, rural character, natural or built heritage of the area. Development, from which the majority of the raw material is not from the farm (or other nearby rural resource) or within a reasonable distance thereof, will be required to locate on appropriately zoned lands in a town or village.
- Objective ED107: Development of the type referred to in Objective ED105 and Objective ED106 shall be required to submit adequate information to demonstrate that the proposed development:
 - i. Will make a positive contribution to the local rural economy;
 - ii. Will not adversely affect the character and appearance of the landscape and where possible, involves the reuse of redundant or underused buildings that are of value to the rural landscape; and
 - iii. The design, layout, materials and boundary treatments are of a high quality and appropriate for a rural setting.

5.1.2. Chapter 7: Tourism Development

- Section 7.6.2: Rural Based Tourism
 - The economic benefits of rural tourism and the continued development of this sector have huge potential to revitalise local economies, provide job opportunities for the farming community and enhance the quality of life of rural communities.
 - The Council will continue to support rural based tourism projects where it relates to the use of a rural landholding and the enjoyment of a rural resource and is appropriate in scale for the rural location.
 - The following provides guidance on the types of land holdings and premises that may be considered for rural based tourism development:
 - For agri-tourism/farm diversification projects a farm holding which is a minimum of 10ha.

- For equestrian related tourism, an equestrian farm which is a minimum of 10ha.
 - For wood crafting, the timber should be either sourced on the site (an established forested landholding) or sourced close by to the site. Such facilities are envisaged as of craft scale and not commercial wood manufacture.
 - Other examples of suitable landholdings include a county house with outbuildings and walled gardens.
 - Individual premises along a Greenway such as a traditional dwelling, building or farm building from which it is proposed to provide a service to greenway users and other tourists such as a café, bicycle hire or a craft shop.
- The Council will consider each proposal on a case-by-case basis. The rural resource tourism product/attraction must be located on the site, or in close proximity to the site and the scale must be commensurate to the premises. It must be demonstrated that the proposed development does not adversely affect the rural character, environmental quality and amenity of the rural area.
 - Where an extension to an existing authorised project is proposed, the Council will consider whether the proposed increase in scale and intensification of use remains appropriate to its rural location, the impact on the environment and residential amenity or whether by reason of its increased scale and intensification, sourcing of inputs, number of employees and traffic generation it would be more appropriately relocated to zoned lands within a town or village.
 - It is acknowledged certain tourist facilities located in rural areas may be provided as stand-alone developments, and that ancillary uses (e.g. café, restaurant, shop) may be required in order to ensure the long term viability of the tourist facility. Additional uses will only be permitted in cases where the additional use is integrated with and connected to the primary use of the site as a tourist facility, and in cases where the Council is satisfied that the additional use is ancillary to the primary use of the site as a tourist

facility. The additional use shall be located adjacent to the tourist facility, and avail of shared infrastructure and services, insofar as possible.

- Proposals which include the provision of tourist accommodation in a rural area will be considered in the context of Section 7.7.5 Tourism Accommodation, Chapter 4 Sustainable Housing and Chapter 12 Coastal Zone Management and Marine Spatial Planning. The Planning Authority will not favourably consider proposals to convert a residential unit, which was previously granted/ used as a granny flat/self-contained unit for occupation by an immediate family member (whether authorised or not) for use as tourist accommodation.

Rural Based Tourism Objectives:

- Objective TM19: To consider the development of rural based tourism development where it is in accordance with Section 7.6.2 and where it is proposed to develop niche activities, such as those relating to food (particularly value-added products), forestry (such as wood products), crafts, eco-tourism and agri-tourism, (for example farmhouse accommodation will be considered), open farms, farm holidays, health related retreats,4 equestrian activities including bridle paths, bird watching holidays, painting/ photography tuition, angling tourism, field studies and hill-walking where such development will not detract from the visual and rural amenity of the area and subject to normal planning and environmental criteria.
 - Objective TM20: To permit proposals to extend an existing rural resource based tourism project where the scale and intensity of the use and project remains appropriate to its rural setting and where it will not detract from the rural character, amenities, residential amenities or environmental capacity of the area and subject to normal planning and environmental criteria. Proposals which include the provision of tourist accommodation will be considered in the context of Section 7.7.5 Tourism Accommodation and Chapter 4 Sustainable Housing and Chapter 12 Coastal Zone Management and Marine Spatial Planning.
- Section 7.7.5: Tour Accommodation

Farmhouse Accommodation:

With regard to tourist accommodation in rural areas, the Council will favourably consider proposals to develop self-catering tourist accommodation on a farm holding as part of a farm diversification project. This accommodation can be provided by an extension of the existing farmhouse or by the utilisation of other existing dwellings/structures on the farm holding. Only where it has been demonstrated that these are not viable options, will the Council consider new build development. Any new build development shall be in close proximity to the existing farmhouse.

5.1.3. Chapter 8: Transportation Strategy.

5.1.4. Chapter 10: Environmental Management.

5.1.5. Chapter 11: Landscape and Green Infrastructure.

5.1.6. Chapter 12: Coastal Zone Management & Marine Spatial Planning.

5.1.7. Chapter 15: Sustainable Communities & Social Infrastructure Strategy.

Volume 2: Development Management Manual

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The site is not located within or adjacent to a Natura 2000 site. The nearest Natura 2000 sites are as follows:

- Wexford Harbour and Slobs SPA (Site Code: 004076), c. 8.34 km to the West;
- Slaney River Valley SAC (Site Code: 000781), c. 8.34 km to the North;
- Bannow Bay SPA (Site Code: 004033), c. 11.45 km to the Southwest;

6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (see Forms 1 and 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development,

therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The commission received a 3rd part appeal against the decision of Planning Authority to grant planning permission. The grounds of the appeal can be summarised as follows:

Prelude:

- Image included the former low-level agricultural building that occupied the site for the proposed new dwelling house.
- Previous Shed is situated in very close proximity to the property boundary - outlines the appellant's concerns about the proposed development of their family home.

Proximity to Appellant's Family Home:

- proposed dwelling is 15.2 linear meters from the dwelling house
- development will have a very negative impact on the quite enjoyment of their family home.

Planning Permission is not for Short-Term Letting

- application the applicants propose to use the house for tourist related accommodation but that this does not correspond with the statutory development description.
- Short-Term Letting and Tourism Bill 2025 draws a distinction between short and long-term letting and there is ambiguity in the contents of planning application 20260213W and the development description as to which is proposed.
- EU Short Term Rental (STR) Regulation was adopted in 2024 and is required to be applicable in Ireland from the 20th May 2026 - lays down harmonised rules on the collection and exchange of data on short term rental services for member states, hosts providing short-term accommodation rental services, and

online platforms that offer services to hosts providing short-term accommodation rental services within the EU.

- Proposal not compatible with the STR regulation as the description as “rental accommodation” does not accurately reflect the planned use.

Impact on Light & Overshadowing:

- do not agree that there will not be an issue with overlooking/overshadowing – images provide context.
- construction to date is currently at ceiling level of ground floor - some significant additional height will accrue if the house is completed to the maximum right height of 6.75m.
- Fig 13 of appeal set out indicative height of the completed unit.

Plot Ratio & Vehicular Movements

- proposed site is not compatible for the additional vehicular impact from the proposed development.
- circulation space for parking, access for emergency vehicles and so on appears to be overlooked.
- not clear how such a small site can accommodate recreation area and vehicles in a safe and uncompromising manner.

7.2. Applicant Response

A response from the applicant was received on the 6th August 2026 and can be summarised as follows:

- Reference is made to the on-going civil dispute between the applicant and the appellant.
- Applicant considers many of the grounds of the appeal reflect the long-standing personal dispute rather than identifying any material planning error within the assessment of the Planning Authority.
- Following the decision to refuse planning permission by An Bord Pleanála – engaged with Plannign Authority and furnished significant amendments including revised internal layout, updated wastewater proposal, revised parking

and circulation space, clarification of occupancy and further evidence supporting rural diversification.

- Reference made to similar permissions granted in Wexford County Council – PA Ref 20221432/20211929/20082116.

Response to ground 1 – Impact on Residential Amenity

- All concerns relating to impact on residential amenity were fully considered by the Planning Authority.
- Photographs submitted by the Appellant represent a personal viewpoint – do not replace the objective assessment undertaken by the Planning Authority.
- Only first floor window facing appellant's property is a small hallway opening which will be fitted with obscured glazing – serving circulation space as opposed to habitable rooms.

Response to ground 2 – Ambiguity Regarding Tourist Accommodation

- Appears to confuse planning permission with a separate regulatory framework governing short term letting.
- Purpose has consistently been to provide tourist accommodation associated with the established rural diversification enterprise.
- Planning Authority accepted this at pre-application stage and justification demonstrate in application documentation also accepted.
- Planning officer repeatedly refers to the proposal as tourist accommodation associated with established rural diversification enterprise.
- Use of different terms within planning documentation does not alter the nature of the proposed development – does not create ambiguity regarding assessment of the Planning Authority.
- Should any further statutory registration/licensing be required – under a separate legislative process.

Response to ground 3 – Overshadowing loss of Light

- Planning Officer undertook a site visit – deemed ridge height/layout/orientation/relationship with adjoining property to be acceptable.

- Considered it would not give rise to overlooking/overshadowing/any negative impact on adjoining property.
- Image submitted is a illustrative representation only – planning authorities assessment based n submitted architectural drawings.
- Images submitted by the appellant indicate the location of a shed structure in close proximity to their property – demonstrating that there is already existing structure within the vicinity of their property which influences light/outlook and the relationship between the properties.
- Proposal is positioned 50m from appellants dwelling.

Response to ground 4 – Traffic Issues

Further information was provided regarding layout which was deemed to be acceptable.

Appellant has not provided any technical evidence to demonstrate that the revised layout fails to satisfy the Planning Authority's requirements or that emergency access would be compromised.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

None received.

7.4. Observations

None received.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Introduction

Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the appeal, and having inspected the site and having regard to the relevant local policy guidance, I consider the main issues in relation to this appeal are as follows:

- Background
- Nature of the Proposed Development

- Traffic Impact.
- Impact on Amenity.
- Wastewater Treatment Plant

8.2. Background

- 8.2.1. There has been a number of applications lodged to both the Plannign Authority and the Commission seeking permission to regularise the works subject to this appeal. I have set out details of such under section 4.0 of my report above.
- 8.2.2. The subject appeal site forms part of a larger landholding in the Applicants' control/ ownership which extends to a stated total of 29.85 acres (12.08 hectares). The appeal site comprise of a number of agricultural buildings, a two storey dwelling and the partially constructed building which is the building subject to this appeal.
- 8.2.3. There is also another 2 storey dwelling in separate ownership, located c. 17 metres to the northwest of the subject part-constructed dwelling which is in the ownership of the 3rd party appellant.
- 8.2.4. An Coimisiún Pleanála (An Bord Pleanála) at the time refused planning permission for the same development under ABP-321222-24 as it was considered that proposal would be prejudicial to public health, would not provide for an adequate level of residential amenity in terms of internal layout and private open space and would would contravene Rural Diversification Objectives ED105 and ED107 of the County Plan.
- 8.2.5. The applicant has stated that after the Commission issued the decision to refuse permission they engaged with pre-application discussions with the Local Authority to overcome the reasons for refusal. Following the advise provided from the Plannign Authority the applicant lodged the subject application, PA Ref 20260213W, on the 20th February 2026.

8.3. Nature of the Proposed Development

- 8.3.1. From the outset, I note the proposed development description, as set out in the public notices, seeks retention of the existing part-constructed single storey structure and permission for completion '*...to form a two storey three bedroom residential building to be used as a rental accommodation ancillary to the existing main dwelling house.*'

There is no reference in the public notices to the use of the proposed two storey dwelling for any other purpose other than for 'rental accommodation', ancillary to the existing main dwelling house.

- 8.3.2. The statutory notice associated with the subject application has remained unchanged from the 2 no. previous applications. I note that under PA Ref 20231016, which proposed the same development, i.e., rental accommodation ancillary to the main dwelling house, the Local Authority assessed the proposal as a conventional application for rural housing.
- 8.3.3. In this instance the Local Authority has assessed the current proposal as a farm diversification project/ accommodation project and agricultural training/ exhibition/ educational facility as opposed to a proposal for '*rental accommodation ancillary to the existing main dwelling house*' as advertised. Condition no. 3 of the notification of decision to grant permission issued by the Local Authority, as quoted above in Section 3.0, controls the use of the accommodation 'for short term accommodation as farm diversification accommodation only and shall not be sold separately from the main farmhouse and farmyard'.
- 8.3.4. The application was accompanied by a letter from the applicants which seeks to formally address the reasons for refusal outlined by An Bord Pleanála under ABP-321222-24. It is stated that the proposal is '*...not a greenfield development, but the reinstatement of a building on a site that historically accommodated two residential structures and has long formed part of the working farmyard*'.
- 8.3.5. The letter sets out the site history and established use. It states that the site historically contained two dwellings within the farmyard and that one of the buildings a stone structure that stood for over 150 years, was recently demolished due to severe structural deterioration. The applicants states that they were advised by experienced builders that there was no viable option to retain or renovate the building. A photo has been provided of the structure's deterioration. It is further noted that due to longstanding land and surface water issues which required the construction of a retaining wall; the replacement structure was repositioned marginally (approximately one foot) from the original footprint to facilitate appropriate drainage and boundary treatment. This has also been reiterated in an accompanied letter from the said mentioned builder.

8.3.6. The applicant further notes that the existing farmhouse, within the red line boundary, is currently occupied by a family, who are embedded in the community and have established strong family and social connections in the area, under a long-term rental arrangement and that the rental income from the farmhouse forms an essential component of the applicant's financial plan to fund the proposed farm diversification enterprise. A separate dwelling, located 291m to the north of the appeal site, serves as the applicants family home.

8.3.7. The need for the development and farm diversification, as stated by the applicant, stems from the need of one of the applicants to change career paths due to health circumstances and advice received from a medical practitioner. I note that no evidence from a medical practitioner has been provided to support this statement. The applicant states that following some consideration a viable opportunity was identified to diversify the farm through sheepdog training, an area in which he has extensive skill, experience, and established connections throughout Ireland and the UK. The letter sets out that the diverse enterprise will include for the following:

- *In-person sheepdog training sessions, allowing handlers to work closely with their dogs;*
- *Access to a trial field with a small flock of sheep for practical training;*
- *Sheep shearing demonstrations and delivery of shearing courses (supported by a letter from the secondary school in Adamstown)*
- *Training opportunities for veterinary students, with appropriate privacy facilitated through on-site accommodation*
- *A tourism element designed to encourage family visits, longer stays, and increased engagement with the local economy*

8.3.8. It is further stated that visitor numbers will be modest and controlled and the business will be family-run, with no staff. Operating hours are indicated as being generally between 9am and 7pm, subject to seasonal variation and as such the on-site accommodation is integral to this diversification. The applicant also submitted 2 no. letters of support from i) a local school (Coláiste Abbain) and ii) a Sheepdog Training Business (Churchmount Sheepdogs) and a copy of the 1st Party Response to the 3rd

Party Appeal lodge to An Coimisiún Pleanála relating to the previous application (ABP-321222-24)

- 8.3.9. The assessment of the Planning Officer states that the applicants have submitted extensive information documenting the existing rural diversification that is taking place (dog training, sheep shearing), and further information as to the expansion opportunities for providing educational courses to local schools, etc. However, I do not consider that the Planning Authority has interrogated Objective ED105 or ED107 of the county plan within their assessment to draw the conclusion that the applicant would comply with such.
- 8.3.10. I further note that the applicant was requested to provide additional operation details were sought to be submitted at RFI stage relating to the potential occupancy rates for the proposed tourism accommodation unit, and clarify if occupancy is to be offered year-round or seasonally. The applicant in response stated that the proposed development will be a year-round enterprise and provide short stay accommodation with expected occupancy rates throughout the year of 80% between the months of April to August and possibly 30-40% for the remaining months.
- 8.3.11. Section 6.7.6.2 of the development plan relates to Rural Diversification including Agri-food and Objectives ED105 and ED107 relate specifically to farm or rural resource related enterprises. In my opinion, the applicant has again failed to suitably adhere to the requirements of Objective ED105 or ED107 in that there are no specific details as to the precise scale of the proposed operation. Policy ED105 requires that information be submitted with regard to the operation, building size, number of employees and hours of operation, waste generation, traffic movements etc.
- 8.3.12. While I accept that some of this has been set out in the letter written by the applicant in terms hours of operation, the application fails to set out or identify that there is sufficient demand for the service that would require the provision of additional accommodation on the site given that operation would be between 9am to 7pm. I do not see the requirement for students or participants to stay on site. If there was such a demand surely the use of the existing dwelling, which appears to be rented to a family who are not engaging in farm activities, would have sufficed to serve the rural diversification proposal. Furthermore, the proposal will not create any employment opportunities as stated by the applicant.

- 8.3.13. As noted under the assessment of ABP-321222-24, the rental income from the existing cottage situated adjacent to the structure subject to this application, which is in the ownership of the applicant, already generates a supplementary income that is separate to the farming practices which may occur on site.
- 8.3.14. Section 7.6.2 of the Wexford County Development Plan relates to Rural Based Tourism and sets out a number of guidance on the types of land holdings and premises that may be considered for rural based tourism development which includes for a farm holding which is a minimum of 10ha; equestrian farms; and landholdings which include a county house with outbuildings and walled gardens. The plan further states that the Council will consider each proposal on a case-by-case basis. Objective TM19 of the county plan allows for the consideration of rural based tourism development where it is in accordance with Section 7.6.2 and the provision of accommodation in support of niche activities which includes for farmhouse accommodation.
- 8.3.15. While the Planning Officer within their report notes that land holding is in excess of that referenced under Section 7.6.2 of the plan and I accept this, the planning case presented ignores the fact that there is an existing dwelling on the site which as I have already mentioned, could provide the accommodation required to serve the sheep dog training proposal, should one arise.
- 8.3.16. Overall, I would share the concern of the previous assessment of the Planning Inspector (ABP-321222-24) and consider that in the absence of a suitably detailed supporting business plan, which would provide a greater degree of certainty and intent of the applicant to develop the business over time and could include, for example, a timeline for implementation, anticipated sources of potential funding/ Government supports, more precise information as to anticipated visitor numbers to sustain the business, the proposal for rural diversification fails to comply with Objectives ED105 or ED107. In addition, I cannot conclude that the applicant has suitably demonstrated the proposed development adheres to the guidance for Rural Based Tourism as set out in Section 7.6.2 of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028.
- 8.3.17. I would emphasise to the Commission that all of these issues were clearly highlighted in the previous assessment of the Planning Inspector (ABP-321222-24) and as such the Applicant had ample opportunity to address such through the lodgement of the application subject to this appeal.

- 8.3.18. Furthermore, I consider that the statutory notice does not appear to reflect the nature of the proposed development as detailed in the supporting documentation and the assessment of the Planning Authority. The notice is linking the use of the proposed structure as rental accommodation to the existing main dwelling house situated within the red line boundary of the appeal site. As I have set out above, the existing house in the appeal site is currently being rented to a family who do not appear to be involved in the rural activities of the adjoining farm area. As such, I consider that this would also need to be reconsidered in the event that any more applications are forthcoming to regularise or complete the works undertaken to date.
- 8.3.19. On a final note, concern was raised by the 3rd party appellant to this appeal that the use proposed does not accord with the statutory notice associated with the subject application and that the proposed development fails to comply with the EU Short Term Rental (STR) Regulation.
- 8.3.20. I have already noted my concern relating to the statutory notice above and consider that the EU Short Term Rental (STR) Regulation referenced to be a separate code to that of Planning and as such does not come within the remit of my assessment.

8.4. Traffic Impact

- 8.4.1. The appellant contends that the appeal site is not compatible for the additional vehicular impact that would be generated from the proposed development and that there is no circulation space for parking, access for emergency vehicles or any other relevant vehicles needing access.
- 8.4.2. The site layout plan submitted, at both planning stage and in response to the additional information requested, clearly shows 2 no. car parking spaces each for both the existing and proposed dwellings (4 no. car parking spaces in total) including for 1 no accessible space.
- 8.4.3. The question of use of the proposed development arises at this point. I note the Car Parking standards set out in table 6-7 of Section 6.3.1 of Volume 2 of the Development Plan (Development Management Standards) and requires 2 no. spaces for residential dwellings. However, in the instance of the proposal being considered as a rental property for tourism use, as what the applicant has described in plans and particulars submitted, the proposal would be considered under Guest

House/B&B/hostel and then be required to provide 2 no. spaces for the existing dwelling on site and 3 no. space for the proposed unit (1 space per bedroom or 1 space per 10 bed dormitory). As such there is a shortfall of 1 no. space.

- 8.4.4. Notwithstanding the ambiguity as to the precise type and format of rental accommodation being proposed, it is my opinion, should the development be permitted, and should an appropriate condition be attached which controls the use of the building as short term farm diversification accommodation only, the subject proposal can be considered a house and, as such, the quantum of car parking being proposed would therefore be sufficient
- 8.4.5. I accept that Increased traffic movements to and from the site area likely to arise, however, in my opinion, would not be of such a scale and intensity to give rise to any significant traffic safety concerns. The existing local road serving the site, although narrow in places, has sufficient carrying capacity to cater for the proposed development.
- 8.4.6. With regard to circulation space and accessibility for emergency vehicles, I note the Roads Department raise no objection to the proposed development subject to the attachment of in relation to maintenance of sightlines, at all times, and the treatment and disposal of surface water within the curtilage site.
- 8.4.7. I am satisfied that the proposed development, as presented, will not present a significant traffic impact on the local road network.

8.5. Impact on Amenity

Overlooking

- 8.5.1. An estimated maximum separation distance of 14.5 metres is proposed between the opposing first floor windows of the existing farmhouse and the proposed dwelling. The minimum development plan guidance recommendation of 22 metres between opposing first floor windows relates to the rear of dwellings so is therefore not applicable to the front of the proposed dwelling facing south onto the farmyard.
- 8.5.2. I would note that SPPR 1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Guidelines, 2025 states that that statutory development plans shall not include an objective in respect of minimum separation distances that exceed 16 metres between

opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses, duplex units or apartment units above ground floor level.

8.5.3. I note, in particular, that the only upper floor window on the northern elevation of the proposed structure are indicated to serve circulation space. As this window serves non habitable rooms, there is no opposing window opes which serve habitable rooms. There are no window opes locate o the rear elevation of the appellants property at first floor level. Furthermore, I witnessed from undertaking a site visit that there appears to be a garage structure situated to the rear of the appellants property which widows along the ground floor level of their dwelling address. I am therefore satisfied that no undue overlooking of the existing opposing dwelling will occur.

8.5.4. From undertaking a site visit it appears that the private amenity space serving the appellants dwelling appears to be situated to the front (north) of the existing dwelling with access to farm buildings situated to the rear of the dwelling. I therefore do not accept that the proposal will give rise to issues of overlooking the private amenity space utilised by the appellants.

Overshadowing

8.5.5. Concern is also raised with regard to loss of light and overshadowing. Again, having regard to the separation distance indicated and the orientation of the appeal site and proposed structure, relative to the path of the sun, undue issues of overshadowing of the opposing property is not anticipated.

Internal Amenity

8.5.6. The Commission (previously An Bord Pleanála) previously raised concern over the internal layout of the proposed development which is as stated failed to comply with the internal sequential standards as per the Quality Housing Standards, 2007.

8.5.7. The unit has been amended to provide for 2 storey 3bed/6person dwelling and provide for an aggregate living area of 38.37 sq.m as per drawing no. 5A submitted to the Planning Authority on the 20th February 2026. In addition, it provides for an aggregate bedroom area of 41.41 sq.m; and a gross floor area of 127.06 sq.m

8.5.8. Overall, having regard to the requirements of Section 5.3.1 and Table 5.1 of the Quality Housing Standards, 2007 with regard to 2 storey 3bed/6person dwellings, I note that

the proposed development is considered to be accepted and in accordance with all sequential standards.

Private Amenity Space

- 8.5.9. The Planning Officer notes within their first assessment that clarification would be required in terms of the provision of private open space for the proposed unit and existing farmhouse. The applicant submitted a revised layout which indicated a clear area of private amenity space to the front of the proposed structure, behind the proposed parking area, which will be segregated from the amenity space serving the eight dwelling via the use of 1.8m high hit and miss round timber fencing.
- 8.5.10. The open space provided is considered to be adequate and will provide for a high level of amenity for future potential residents.
- 8.5.11. Overall, I consider that the applicant has overcome the 1st reason for refusal indicated by An Bord Pleanála, under ABP-321222-24.

8.6. Wastewater Treatment and Disposal

- 8.6.1. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing on-site waste water treatment plant and provide for a new system which will serve both the existing dwelling and proposed dwelling on site. While I note that the appellant to this appeal has not raised concern over this part of the proposal given that it formed part of the reason for refusal of the previous application, I consider it necessary to assess this part of the proposed development.
- 8.6.2. The Planning Inspector, under ABP-321222-24, noted concern over the soil conditions and high-water table and considered that the Applicant has not suitably demonstrated that the proposed Waste Water Treatment System would not present a significant pollution risk and by default a resultant negative impact to public health.
- 8.6.3. The subject application is seeking to install a new on site wastewater treatment system (WWTS). The new system is proposed to be located in the field to the immediate southeast of the existing farmyard, c. 80 metres from the proposed dwelling. It is proposed that the system will serve both the proposed new 2 storey dwelling and the existing 2 storey dwelling and, in this regard, has been designed for a population equivalent (PE) of 9 persons.

- 8.6.4. I note the Site Suitability Assessment Report submitted as part of the planning application documentation. The report notes that the site is located within a poor aquifer with high vulnerability which generates a R1 groundwater protection response. In addition, the report notes that the site is location in the Fethard groundwater area which has a poor status.
- 8.6.5. A trial hole was excavated to a depth of 2.35 metres. Water ingress was encountered at 500 mm below ground level indicative of a perched watertable. The soil profile shows topsoil between ground level and 300 mm, sandy silt clay from 300 mm to 500 mm and sandy silt clay with frequent gravels and occasional cobbles and boulders between 600 mm to 1900 mm.
- 8.6.6. The soil at between 500 mm and 1.9 metres was found to have a very firm density and was of an orange/ yellow/ brown/ grey colour, likely indicating mottling due to impeded drainage, although this was not recorded in the trial hole log. No iron pans or mottling was recorded above the water table and no solid bedrock was encountered at the base of the trial hole. The subsurface T test failed as it was greater than 120 minutes/ 25 mm. A surface T Value of 22.14 minutes/ 25 mm was recorded.
- 8.6.7. I note the comments presented in Section 5.0 of the Site Characterisation Report as well as the proposed Method Statement. The proposal has not changed from that of the previous application n that it is proposed to excavate the unsuitable material to a depth of 1.65 metres and replace with suitably material that would have a percolation value of 3-20 maintaining a minimum depth of 900mm . The only difference in this instance of that the scale of the soil polishing filter has been decreased to 67.5sq.m.
- 8.6.8. I consider that the proposal to excavate and refill the site will not rectify the issue of impeded drainage for the polishing filter. Essentially, this lower percolating material will fill with effluent as it will be unable to escape laterally and will back up leading to a malfunction of the treatment system. This was also reiterated in the previous assessment undertaken by the Commission under ABP-321222-24.
- 8.6.9. Therefore, having regard to the recorded water ingress at 500 mm, the proposal to discharge to groundwater, the poor status of the ground water body, the applicants' proposals to excavate the existing unsuitable soils to a depth of 1,650 mm from ground level and to replace same with imported soils with favourable percolation values, the proposal to provide a 67.5sq.m filter bed which is undersized having regard to

recommendations set out in Table 10.1 of the EPA Code of Practice owing to the comments provided in Section 5.0 of the Site Characterisation Report, where there is an acknowledgement on behalf of the Applicant that ‘there is no guarantee to the longevity of the proposed system but it is one of the best available options ..’, I am satisfied that the Applicant has not suitably demonstrated that the proposed Waste Water Treatment System would not present a significant pollution risk and by default a resultant negative impact to public health.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed retention and completion application for the proposed dwelling structure and in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located the rural townland of Camaross (Kilgarvan E.D.). The nearest European Sites are Slaney River Valley SAC (Site Code: 000781) located c. 8.3 km to the north and Wexford Harbour and Slobbs SPA (Site Code: 004076) located c. 8.3 km to the east. The proposed development comprises retention of single-storey structure and permission for completion of house for rental use and associated site works.
- 9.2. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.
- 9.3. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The small scale and nature of the development.
 - The location-distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.
 - Taking into account the screening report/determination by Local Planning Authority.
- 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) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The subject appeal site is located in the rural townland of Camaross (Kilgarvan E.D.). The proposed development comprises retention of single storey structure and permission for completion of house for rental use and associated site works. The Carrowreagh River (River Waterbody Code: IE_SE_13M010700) is located c.114 metres to the west of the subject appeal site. The appeal site is also located within Fethard Groundwater Aquifer (EU_CD Code: IE_SE_G_065) which is a poorly productive bedrock. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.2. I have assessed the proposed residential 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 & 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.
- 10.3. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The small-scale nature of the proposed development.
 - The location of the subject appeal site, distance to the nearest water body and lack of direct hydrological connections.
- 10.4. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result 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.

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend that the decision of the Planning Authority be overturned and permission be refused for the following reasons and considerations.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The Applicant has not provided sufficient justification as to the need to provide an additional dwelling at this location. If permitted, the proposed development would be the second dwelling on a relatively modest landholding. In the absence of an appropriately detailed and succent planning case and supporting planning justifications, it is considered that the proposed contravenes Rural Diversification Objectives ED105 and ED107 and Rural Based Tourism Objective TM19 and Tourism Accommodation Objective TM56 of the Wexford County Development Plan, 2022 to 2028, would serve to create an undesirable precedent for similar cases elsewhere and is therefore not in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. Having regard to the soil conditions and high water table, the Board is not satisfied, on the basis of the submissions made in connection with the planning application and the appeal, that effluent from the development can be satisfactorily treated or disposed of on site, notwithstanding the proposed use of a proprietary wastewater treatment system. The proposed development would, therefore, be prejudicial to public health.

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.

Kathy Tuck
Planning Inspector

XX October 2026

Appendix 1

Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501699-WX-26
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of part constructed structure and completion of residential dwelling to be used as rental accommodation ancillary to main dwelling, effluence treatment system and associated site works.
Development Address	Camaross (Kilgarvan E.D.), Co. Wexford
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☐ No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	

☐ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
☒ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.	<p>Class 1 (a) of Part 2: Projects for the restructuring of rural land holdings.</p> <p>Class 10 b) (i) of Part 2: Construction of more than 500 dwelling units.</p>
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) [Delete if not relevant]
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3) [Delete if not relevant]

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 2

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-501699-WX-26
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of part constructed structure and completion of residential dwelling to be used as rental accommodation ancillary to main dwelling, effluence treatment system and associated site works.
Development Address	Camaross (Kilgarvan E.D.), Co. Wexford.
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	<p>The subject appeal site has a stated site area of 0.4 hectares and comprises the retention of a partially constructed single storey dwelling structure permission for completion of house for rental use and associated site works.</p> <p>The site is located in a rural area, is part brownfield, part greenfield and forms part of an established farm holding. It is proposed to service the development with water from a new private bored well.</p> <p>It is proposed to discharge of effluent to a new effluent treatment system and associated percolation area.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the proposed development will not result in any significant use of natural resources, will not result in any significant production of waste, will not give</p>

	rise to significant pollution or nuisance impacts, will not give rise to any significant risk of accident/ disaster or impacts upon human health.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	The subject site is not located within or adjoins any environmentally sensitive sites or protected sites of ecological importance, or any sites known for cultural or historical significance. The nearest designated European Site to the appeal site are Slaney River Valley SAC located c. 8.3 km to the north of the appeal site and Wexford Harbour and Slobbs SPA located c. 8.3 km to the east. Given that there are no hydrological connections I have concluded in my AA Screening that that the proposed development would not likely have a significant effect on any European site. I consider that there is no real likelihood of significant cumulative impacts having regard to other existing and/or permitted projects in the adjoining area.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts	Having regard to the relatively small scale nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, the likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and the absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA

<p>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p>	<p>EIA is not required.</p> <p>Include the following paragraph under EIA Screening (a separate heading) in the Inspectors report.</p>
--	---

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

DP/ADP: _____ **Date:** _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix 3

AA Screening Determination

Screening the need for Appropriate Assessment: Screening Determination (Stage 1, Article 6(3) of Habitats Directive)

I have considered the [title of project] in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located the rural townland of Camaross (Kilgarvan E.D.). The nearest European Sites are

- Bannow Bay SAC (Site Code 000697) located 6.88 km to the south,
- Slaney River Valley SAC (Site Code: 000781) located c. 8.3 km to the north and
- Wexford Harbour and Slobbs SPA (Site Code: 004076) located c. 8.3 km to the east.

The proposed development comprises retention of single-storey structure and permission for completion of house for rental use and associated site works. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale and nature of the development
- The location-distance from nearest European site and lack of connections
- Taking into account screening report/determination by Local Planning Authority

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) is not required.

Appendix 4

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Bord Pleanála ref. no.	321222-24	Townland, address	Camaross (Kilgarvan E.D.), Co. Wexford
Description of project		Retention of part constructed structure and completion of residential dwelling to be used as rental accommodation ancillary to main dwelling, effluence treatment system and associated site works	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		<p>The subject appeal site is located in a rural area and forms part of a working farm holding. The subject appeal and surrounding lands fall gently in a general east to south east direction. There is an existing open drain along part of the northern site boundary. There is an existing stream located c. 114 metres to the east of the edge of the proposed development site which flows in southerly direction. The appeal site is located within Fethard Groundwater Aquifer (EU_CD Code: IE_SE_G_065) which is a poorly productive bedrock. The appeal site, in particular, the proposed WWTS, is located in an area of High Groundwater Vulnerability where groundwater here has natural characteristics that make it highly vulnerable to contamination by human activities.</p>	

Proposed surface water details	Proposed Surface Water Disposal is to Soakpit (See q. 20 of Application form). Condition no. 8 requires a nature based surface water attenuation to be agreed.					
Proposed water supply source & available capacity	Existing bored well on the subject site. It is proposed to provide a new connection to same. No water supply capacity issues raised in the appeal.					
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues	Existing septic tank/ soakpit serving the existing dwelling is to be decommissioned. It is proposed to install a new wastewater/ effluent treatment system including a soil polishing filter and a diffuse willow bed area. The new wastewater treatment system is proposed to serve the existing dwelling and proposed new dwelling and is designed to a population equivalent (PE) of 10 persons.					
Others?	Not applicable.					
Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection						
Identified water body	Distance to (m)	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk,	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off,

				review, not at risk		drainage, groundwater)
River Waterbody	114m (east)	MULMONTRY_030 (EU Code IE_SE_13M010700)	Good (2016-2021)	Not at risk	No pressures stated	Not hydrologically connected to surface watercourse.
Groundwater waterbody	Underlying site	Fethard Groundwater Aquifer (EU_CD Code: IE_SE_G_065)	Good	Not at risk	No pressures stated	Groundwater
Step 4: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage.						
CONSTRUCTION PHASE						

No.	Component	Water body receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.
1.	Surface	MULMONTTRY_030 (EU Code IE_SE_13M010700)	None	None	None	No	Screened out
2.	Ground	Fethard Groundwater Aquifer (EU_CD Code: IE_SE_G_065)	Drainage	Hydrocarbon Spillages	Standard Construction Measures / Conditions	No	Screened out
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
3.	Surface	MULMONTTRY_030 (EU Code IE_SE_13M010700)	None	None	None	No	Screened out
4.	Ground	Fethard Groundwater Aquifer (EU_CD	Drainage	None	None	No	Screened out

		Code: IE_SE_G_065)					
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
5.	N/A						