



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Commission Direction
CD-000369
PL-500311-MH-25

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 31 March 2026.

The Commission decided to refuse permission, generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, as indicated in the draft Order hereunder.

Planning Commissioner:

Tom Rabbette

Date:

31st day of March 2026

DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER

Reasons and Considerations

The Sustainable and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities promotes 'sustainable and efficient movement' as a key indicator of good design and placemaking to ensure places are well connected and accessible by sustainable modes.

Having regard to the following:

(i) The development as proposed is dependent upon connections and upgrades, i.e. pedestrian and cycle infrastructure, to the adjacent road network which involves works that are located outside of the red site boundary of the site for which permission is sought. In the absence of written consent from the relevant parties and in the absence of clarity as to how and when this infrastructure can be delivered along Castle Street, the Commission considers that there is an absence of certainty that the connectivity and upgrades to the adjacent road network detailed as part of the proposed development can be delivered within the context of the permission sought. The Commission considers that in the circumstances, the proposed development would result in poor permeability and connectivity for pedestrian, cyclists and vulnerable road users and would fail to meet the mobility needs of future residents.

(ii) The Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 contains objective DM OBJ 96 to require the provision of cycle parking in accordance with the Design Standard for New Apartments 2023, the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines 2024 and Table 11.4 Cycle Parking Standards. The development is provided with substandard cycle facilities, below minimum standards set out in Table 11.4. Therefore, the proposal materially contravenes objective DM OBJ 96 of the development plan. The Commission further considered that the very limited number of accessible car parking spaces (1 no.) and 'age friendly' car parking spaces (1 no.) proposed for this specific type of residential development further compounded the adverse impacts arising from the substandard cycle facilities proposed.

The proposed development fails to provide for the sustainable and efficient transport needs of future residents and would be contrary to Sustainable Compact

Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

NOTE: The Commission concurred with the Inspector's concerns relating to the application of the principles of 'universal design' in the proposed development and the Inspector's concerns relating to the quantum and accessibility of communal open space required to serve the development. However, as these matters may be considered new issues in the context of the appeal, the Commission decided not to pursue these matters in this instance given the substantive reason for refusal.