



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-303010-18

Development	Construction of house, all associated siteworks including demolition of outbuildings. Significant further information/ revised plans submitted on this application.
Location	Stadalt, Stamullen, Co. Meath
Planning Authority	Meath County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	AA180082
Applicant(s)	Jacqui McConville
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refusal
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Jacqui McConville
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	6 th of February 2019
Inspector	Angela Brereton

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site is located c.1.2kms south west of Stamullen and c.1.8km south-west of the M1, in the rural townland of Stadalt, on the south side of the local road (L-1618-19). This is an area where there are a number of dwellings with frontage to this local road, particularly, on the opposite side of the road. There is one dwelling to the west of the application site, within the landholding shown blue. There are a number of old sheds on site that are no longer in use. There is a fence along the site boundary with this existing single storey house and a pedestrian side gate into the site which forms part of the landholding. There is a narrow set back vehicular entrance to the existing house proximate to that proposed on the subject site.
- 1.2. There is an existing vehicular entrance to the site located at the north-eastern part of the site frontage. Visibility from this entrance is restricted particularly to the east by road side hedgerows. There is a roadside hedgerow along the site frontage. This is a fast busy local road with a number of vehicular entrances.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. This proposal is to consist of the following:
 - A new single storey dwellinghouse (140sq.m) along with new proprietary wastewater treatment system & percolation area,
 - Blocking up of existing entrance and forming of new replacement vehicular and all associated siteworks
 - Demolition of existing outbuildings.
- 2.2. The application form provides that the area of the site is 0.2036ha. The area of the sheds to be demolished is 296sq.m. Drawings including a Site Layout Plan, Floor Plans and Elevations have been submitted.
- 2.3. A letter has been submitted with the application from KT Designs Architectural & Planning Services providing a rationale for the proposed development and including a number of documents to verify the applicant's local need.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On the 23rd of October 2018, Meath County Council refused planning permission for the proposed development for the following reason:

The proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard because the traffic movements generated by the proposed development where the sightlines are restricted would interfere with the safety and free flow of traffic on the public road and would thus be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planner's Report

The Planner had regard to the locational context of the site, planning history and policy and to the inter-departmental reports and the submissions made. Their comments included the following:

- The application site is located in a rural area *under strong urban influence*.
- They have regard to local needs policy and refer to section 10.4 of the Meath CDP 2013-2019. They note the documentation submitted by the applicant relevant to their local need. They considered that the applicant should be requested to submit an Affidavit to reflect the information provided to the PA in support of her local need application.
- They do not object to the proposed design and layout of the dwelling.
- They recommended that F.I be sought relative to demonstration of sightlines at the proposed access.
- They refer to Screening for Appropriate Assessment and concluded that an NIS was not required.

Their request for Further Information included the following:

- The applicant was requested to submit a revised site layout plan which illustrates sightlines at a setback of 2.4m from the road edge of 90m in each direction to the near side of the road.
- A signed affidavit witnessed by a practising Solicitor to verify details outlined in the application relative to the applicant's local need.
- Revised Public Notices where necessary.

Further Information response:

KT Design response on behalf of the Applicant includes the following:

- A drawing showing the required sightlines and a signed agreement between the applicant and the adjoining landowner to maintain the sightlines.
- A signed affidavit witnessed by a Practising Solicitor. This verifies the details outlined in the application.

Planner's response

- They note concerns about sightlines and provide that the drawing submitted does not show the sightlines correctly.
- They note that the agreement signed with the adjoining landowner to the east does not provide for set back of the hedgerow to achieve sightlines.
- They note the concerns of the Transportation Section and their recommendation for refusal relative to traffic hazard.
- They have regard to the sworn affidavit submitted and provide that it appears that the applicant maybe a person local to the area under Section 10.4 of the Meath CDP.

3.3. Other Technical Reports

Transportation Section

They have concerns regarding inadequate sightlines and recommend refusal on the basis that the proposal would constitute a traffic hazard.

4.0 Planning History

- Reg.Ref.AA/170059 – Permission refused by the Council to Jacqui McConville for a new single storey dwellinghouse (140sq.m) along with new proprietary waste water treatment system and percolation area and all associated site works including demolition of existing outbuildings.

This was refused for 2no. reasons in summary – 1) Does not meet the specific requirements set out in RD POL 43 of the MCDP 2013-2019 and the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges – relative to sightlines being inadequate *and* 2) Lack of demonstrated local need being contrary to planning policy and guidelines and to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area and would establish a very undesirable future precedent.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Planning Framework – Project Ireland 2040

Section 5.3 refers to the growth and development of rural areas and the role of the rural town as a catalyst for this. It is recognised that the Irish countryside is, and will continue to be, a living and lived-in landscape focusing on the requirements of rural economies and rural communities, based on agriculture, forestry, tourism and rural enterprise, while at the same time avoiding ribbon and over-spill development from urban areas and protecting environmental qualities.

Objective 18 refers to the policy to support the proportionate growth of and appropriately designed development in rural towns that will contribute to their regeneration and renewal, including interventions in the public realm, the provision of amenities, the acquisition of sites and the provision of services.

Objective 19 outlines that within areas under urban influence, single housing in the countryside will be facilitated based on the core consideration of a demonstrable economic or social need to live in the rural area. It further states that in rural areas elsewhere, it is an objective to 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.

5.2. Meath County Development Plan 2013-2019

Relevant provisions are referenced as follows –

The application site is located on rural lands, outside of any identified settlement in the Co. Dev. Plan 2013. Chapter 10 refers to Rural Development;

Sect.10.2-10.3 sets out the relevant ‘policy’ regarding the assessment of housing within in rural areas. Strategic Policy RUR DEV SP 1 seeks: *To adopt a tailored approach to rural housing within County Meath as a whole, distinguishing between rural generated housing and urban generated housing in rural areas recognising the characteristics of the individual rural area types.*

Section 10.3 provides for three distinct rural area types within Co. Meath, which reflect the different levels of development pressure across the county. These are Area 1 – Rural Areas under Strong Urban Influence,

Area 2 – Strong Rural Area,

Area 3 – Low Development Pressure Areas (see copy of Map10.1 – Rural Area Types Dev. Pressure attached). Applicants are required by the provisions of the Co. Dev. Plan to demonstrate that they are an intrinsic part of the rural community.

Policies RD POL 1-3 seek to cater for rural housing needs and to curtail urban generated housing.

RD POL 2 of the Plan seeks: *To facilitate the housing requirements of the rural community as identified while directing urban generated housing to areas zoned for new housing development in towns and villages in the area of the development plan.*

Sect.10.4 provides the detailed requirements relating to the establishment of ‘local housing need’. This sets out a number of categories of person, who will be considered to be ‘an intrinsic part of the rural community’, (see copy attached).

It is noted that the Planning Authority recognises the interest of persons local to or linked to a rural area, who are not engaged in significant agricultural or rural

resource related occupation, to live in rural areas. For the purposes of this policy section, persons local to an area are considered to include:

- *Persons who have spent substantial periods of their lives, living in rural areas as members of the established rural community for a period in excess of five years and who do not possess a dwelling or who have not possessed a dwelling in the past in which they have resided or who possess a dwelling in which they do not currently reside;*
- *Persons who were originally from rural areas and who are in substandard or unacceptable housing scenarios and who have continuing close family ties with rural communities such as being a mother, father, brother, sister, son, daughter, son-in-law, or daughter-in-law of a long established member of the rural community resident rurally for at least ten years;*
- *Returning emigrants who have lived for substantial parts of their lives in rural areas, then moved abroad and who now wish to return to reside near other family members, to work locally, to care for older members of their family or to retire, and;*
- *Persons, whose employment is rurally based, such as teachers in rural primary schools or whose work predominantly takes place within the rural area in which they are seeking to build their first home, or are suited to rural locations such as farm hands or trades-people and who have a housing need.*

RD POL 9 seeks: *To require all applications for rural houses to comply with the Meath Rural House Design Guide.*

RD POL 41 seeks: *To avoid the removal of existing roadside boundaries where they are more than 3m from the road edge (edge of carriageway), except to the extent that this is needed for a new entrance, and where required for traffic safety reasons. (Please refer to policies contained in Section 9.7.8 Woodlands, Hedgerows and Trees in this regard).*

NH POL 13 seeks: *To encourage the retention of hedgerows and other distinctive boundary treatments in rural areas and prevent loss and fragmentation, where possible. Where removal of a hedgerow, stone wall or other distinctive boundary treatment is unavoidable, mitigation by provision of the same type of boundary will be required.*

Section 10.19 provides the Technical Requirements relative to One Off Houses: Sight Distances and Stopping Distances.

Policy RD POL 43 seeks: *To ensure that the required standards for sight distances and stopping sight distances are in compliance with current road geometry standards as outlined in the NRA document Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) specifically Section TD 41-42/09 when assessing individual planning applications for individual houses in the countryside.*

Section 10.19.2 refers to Groundwater Protection and the Planning System and seek to ensure environmental protection. Policies RD POL 44 and RD POL 45 refer.

Policy RD POL 46 seeks: *To ensure that new development is guided towards sites where acceptable wastewater treatment and disposal facilities can be provided, avoiding sites where it is inherently difficult to provide and maintain such facilities. Sites prone to extremely high water tables and flooding or where groundwater is particularly vulnerable to contamination shall be avoided.*

Chapter 11 of the Co. Dev. Plan sets out the 'Development Management Standards & Guidelines'.

Appendix 15 sets out the Co. 'Rural Housing Design Guide'.

5.3. **The Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines 2005**

This seeks to encourage and support appropriate development at the most suitable locations. Section 3.2.3 concerns Rural Generated Housing and gives an example of Persons who are an intrinsic part of the rural community and Persons working full-time or part-time in rural areas.

Section 3.3 is concerned that the consideration of individual sites will be subject to normal siting and design considerations. These include the following:

- Any proposed vehicular access would not endanger public safety by giving rise to a traffic hazard.
- That housing in un-serviced areas and any on site wastewater disposal systems are designed, located and maintained in a way, which protects water quality.

- The siting of the new dwelling integrates appropriately into its physical surroundings.
- The proposed site otherwise accords with the objectives of the development plan in general.

Section 4.4 is concerned with Access and restriction of such on National Primary and Secondary Roads. Regard is also had to Roadside Boundaries. Section 4.5 is concerned with Protecting Water Quality and Site Suitability issues.

5.4. Code of Practice Wastewater Treatment Disposal Systems serving Single Houses

This document (2009) by the EPA relevant to single houses (p.e <10) and replaces SR6:1991 and the EPA Manual 2000 for 'Treatment Systems for Single Houses'. The objective is to protect the environment and water quality from pollution and it is concerned with site suitability assessment. It is concerned with making a recommendation for selecting an appropriate on site domestic wastewater treatment and disposal system if the site is deemed appropriate subject to the site assessment and characterisation report. The implementation of the Code is a key element to ensure that the planning system is positioned to address the issue of protecting water quality in assessing development proposals for new housing in rural areas and meeting its obligations under Council Directive (75/442/EEC).

5.5. EU Water Framework Directive

The purpose of the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) 'is to establish a framework for the protection of inland surface waters, transitional waters, coastal waters and groundwater.

5.6. Natural Heritage Designations

The site is not located within or directly adjoining any European Site. The closest European Site (River Nanny Estuary and Shore SPA) is located 5km north-east of the subject site.

5.7. Environmental Impact Assessment Screening

- 5.7.1. Having regard to the modest nature the proposed development (a single dwelling), the capacity of the soils on site to accommodate wastewater and the distance of the site from nearby sensitive receptors, 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

KT Designs Architectural & Planning Services has submitted an appeal on behalf of the Applicant. The grounds of appeal include the following:

- The information submitted was not assessed accurately by the Transportation Section and the internal report submitted to the PA was misleading and this caused the planning department to refuse the application.
- They refute the Council's opinion that the drawings are inaccurate. An independent surveying company (CSS land surveys) has been requested to carry out a land survey and a copy of this survey is included with this appeal.
- The survey has been carried out on lands 100m either side of the proposed entrance. This survey is in keeping with the site layout drawing as submitted by KT Designs and is proof that the drawings submitted with the application and in response to the F.I are accurate.
- They contend that the opinion formed by MCC is inaccurate and it was this inaccurate opinion that was used as substantiation by the Council as a reason to refuse planning permission.
- They note that a Clarification of Additional Information was never requested by the Council. The applicant was not asked to do a further survey or to provide additional drawings to look in detail at the area of hedgerow that needed be removed or set-back.

- They consider that it was wrong to refuse permission when taking into consideration that the adjoining landholder had given consent to do what was previously requested and that there was no reason to assume that the landowner would not have given consent to remove or set-back the hedgerow should it have been requested.
- They ask that proper procedures be followed in the assessment of this application.
- They have regard to the sightline to the east and to the vision 'triangle' i.e the area that needs to be kept clear and provide a discussion of this. They include a drawing from CSS Land Survey to show the sightlines to the east of the entrance in yellow. Also, an Extract from this to show distances at a point of land ownership change/vision area in yellow.
- They provide that this is clear proof that it is not necessary to remove or set back 25m of the boundary.
- The proposal will make the area safer as it involves blocking up the existing entrance, so that the new entrance will have the required sightlines.
- They refer to the recent decision by the Council to grant permission for another dwelling in Stadalt Stamullen Reg.Ref. AA-180460 refers. Condition no 11 allows for hedgerows to be cut back to achieve sightlines.
- They provide that it is inconsistent to refuse one application on the basis of the necessity to remove a roadside boundary and then grant permission for the above similar application.
- They conclude that their application was not assessed accurately by the Council's Transportation Section and the decision to refuse was in error. The Applicant has substantive grounds of appeal and a personal letter is included in this regard. They ask the Board to grant permission.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

Meath County Council's response has regard to the First Party grounds of appeal and their comments include the following:

- The applicant was afforded the opportunity to address the concerns regarding sightlines and road safety through the F.I process.
- The information submitted as part of the Appeal and in particular, the new survey was not submitted as part of the response to the F.I request and it is the PA's opinion that the site should have been fully surveyed when making the original application.
- Notwithstanding this the PA has referred the appeal submission to the Transportation Section and they have recommended refusal.
- The PA requests the Board to uphold the decision to refuse permission for the development.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Rural Settlement Strategy - Local Needs

- 7.1.1. The site is located in a Rural Area under Strong Urban Influence as identified in the Meath CDP, Map10.1 relates. It is noted that the site is in an area under pressure for one-off housing and the road frontage appears semi-urban and is close to the southern development boundary of Stamullen. Rural Development Policies RD POL 1 -3 seek to restrict urban generated development in such locations. Section 10.4 has regard to the criteria relative to *Persons who are an Intrinsic Part of the Rural Community* and has been noted in the Policy Section above.
- 7.1.2. Regard is also had to the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines 2005 where the strategy indicates that there should be a presumption against urban-generated one-off housing in rural areas adjacent to towns. It is put forward that the applicant has a proven local need and there should not be a blanket ban on genuine applicants in the area. Details of the Applicant's local need have been submitted with the planning application.
- 7.1.3. Supporting documentation has been submitted with the application to provide verifiable evidence of the applicant's local links to both Kilmoon and Stadalt and Stamullen. A letter of consent to apply for permission has been included by the landowner Kevin McConville. The site is on the family landholding adjacent to the

family home. Land Registry details have been submitted. The applicant is in the process of separating from her husband and has submitted a letter relative to her marital status. As part of the Council's F.I request the applicant was invited to submit a signed affidavit witnessed by a Practising Solicitor. This legal document to contain and verify the details outlined in this application and in particular to address the proposed legal separation process that the applicant will enter into including any supporting legal correspondence in this regard.

- 7.1.4. The documentation submitted provides that the applicant lived in Kilmoon (1995-2013 where they sold a house) and Staldt, Stamullen Co. Meath from 2013 - present. She provides that building the house on this site ensures she remains part of the Meath community where she has been active for over 20 years, allows her son to remain in the community where he has gone to school, allows the separation to be finalised under a formal separation agreement, reduces costs for the new build, ensures that she can look after elderly relatives. A letter of support on medical grounds has been included relative to the latter. The Local Needs form submitted provides that the applicant does not own her own property and works as a Special Needs Assistant in Ashbourne, Co. Meath.
- 7.1.5. The First Party provides that her local need complies with section 10.4 of the MCDP quoting Council's local needs criteria relative to residing in the rural community for over 20 years and being in an unacceptable housing scenario. Also, that her local housing need is compounded by it being the only economically viable option to address the issues stated. On the basis of the documentation submitted and having regard to Section 10.4 of the MCDP I would concur with the Council that the applicant is in an unacceptable housing scenario, is caring for an elderly relative in the adjoining family home and is a person with links to this rural area. However, it must also be noted that the applicant has only lived in the area since 2013, prior to which she and her former spouse owned their own property in the rural area in Irishtown, Kilmoon, Ashbourne.
- 7.1.6. Regard is also had to National Policy Objective 19 of Project Ireland 2040. This provides: *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 the 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 this case I would consider that it has been demonstrated that the applicant complies with the criteria relative to National Policy Objective 19.

7.2. Consistency with Rural Design Guide

- 7.2.1. The Rural Design Guide sets out guidelines on rural housing in County Meath, for example, from orientation and site layout to building design. The Guide recommends positioning a dwelling on a site having regard to existing shelter, topography and vegetation and design which draws from traditional forms of development and good design practice.
- 7.2.2. The Site Layout Plan shows the proposed dwelling on a similar building line, to the north east of the applicant's existing family home. It is shown set back 18.7m from the road and with a 25m rear garden area. There is no objection to the removal of the existing derelict sheds on site. It is proposed to construct a 3no. bed bungalow with a g.f.a of 140sq.m and shown 6m to ridge height. External finishes proposed include dark grey roof tiles and napp plaster finish. There are no windows proposed in the side elevations. It is considered that the proposed dwelling will correspond to the existing bungalow and will not be obtrusive or detract from the character of the mixture of house types in this rural area.

7.3. Access issues

- 7.3.1. Regard is had to the Council's reason for refusal and to the Planning History. It is noted that the first reason for refusal in the previous application Reg.Ref. AA170059, was relative to inadequate sightlines. Then the site layout plan showed the entrance proposed in the same location as the existing entrance to the site i.e to the north east of the site. This has been altered in the current application which shows the existing entrance is to be closed off and a new entrance to be formed further south west along the frontage of the site i.e closer to the boundary with the site of the adjacent dwelling (the applicant's family home) to the west.
- 7.3.2. In response to the Council's F.I requested the applicant submitted a drawing which they provide shows sightlines from a point set back 2.4m from the edge of the road to 90m in each direction to the near side of the road. They also include a signed

agreement between the applicant and the adjoining landowner to maintain sightlines as requested. However, it is noted that while this agreement allows for hedge cutting and maintenance it does not refer to agreement by the landowner for set back of the hedge outside of the site boundary relative to sightlines.

- 7.3.3. There is concern that the site layout drawing submitted does not appear to accurately reflect the works required to achieve sightlines of 90m and in particular to the east where they appear to be shown outside of the revised site boundary i.e the red line. The Council's Transportation Section, subsequently commented that sightlines to the east are obstructed by the boundary hedge of the adjacent property and will require removal and setting back of approx. 25m of the boundary. These works are not included in the red line boundary. They also noted that no consent has been submitted to carry out works on the adjacent eastern property. They recommended refusal as they considered that the proposal would constitute a traffic hazard.
- 7.3.4. The First Party grounds of appeal query the Council's reason for refusal relative to the recommendation of the Council's Transportation Section Report. They refute that their drawings are inaccurate and provide that they have had an independent land survey carried out (a copy is included with their appeal) and that this survey is in keeping with the site layout drawing as submitted by KT Designs and is proof that the drawings submitted to the Council are accurate. They provide a discussion relative to the sightline to the east and note the importance of keeping the vision 'triangle' clear. They include a drawing showing the area to acquire the 90m sightline in yellow (Extract from CSS Land Survey – distances at point of land ownership change/vision area in yellow) and provide that the hedgerow can easily be cut back to the vision line at the times of the year when it is necessary to do so. They provide that this is proof that it is not necessary to remove or set back 25m of boundary hedge, also that the agreement entered into with the adjoining landowner is sufficient to allow necessary cutting back/trimming of the hedgerow in order to maintain sightlines.
- 7.3.5. Having regard to the issue of traffic hazard they provide that that proposal will by blocking up the existing entrance make access safer as the sightlines will be improved from the new entrance, to the required sightlines. They also refer to the issue of precedent and note that the Council recently granted permission for another

dwelling in Stadalt Stamullen - Reg. Ref. AA-180460 refers. In this case a condition was included relative to the boundary hedge and sightlines. They provide that in their case the hedgerow does not have to be set back to achieve the relevant sightlines.

7.3.6. The Planning Authority response to the grounds of appeal notes concerns about sightlines. The Transportation Section's response states the following: *The applicant was requested to submit FI showing the required sightlines and stating that "the existing hedgerow on adjoining boundary will need to be set back to provide for safe access onto the local road from the proposed development. The consent submitted as FI did not give consent to set back the hedgerow, and it stated that the applicant could not interfere with the integrity of the hedgerow.*

7.3.7. On site I noted that there is a hedgerow along the roadside boundary frontage and the existing entrance gate to the site/sheds is set back and sited further to the east. The proposed entrance is in a better location relative to sightlines than the existing. It is noted that the boundary hedge along the site frontage will have to be removed to facilitate sightlines. There is also a boundary hedge along the roadside boundary to the east of the site. This is a fast and busy road with a number of vehicular entrances to houses particularly on the opposite side of the road and is outside the town speed limits. Having viewed the site location I would be concerned that there is a need for the removal of a significant area of the boundary hedgerows to facilitate the recommended sightlines and that this would include outside the subject landholding and site shown red in the landholding to the east. This would be contrary to RD POL 41 and NH POL13 which (as quoted in the Policy Section above) are relative to the retention of boundary hedgerows in the rural area. Also to RD POL 9 as the Meath Rural House Design Guide seeks to avoid the removal of large sections of hedgerow.

7.4. Drainage issues

7.4.1. The Site Layout Plan shows the proposed location of the new wwts and percolation area and soakaway to the rear of the site. Details on foul and surface water treatment has been submitted by ARC Design Services. This includes that it is proposed to position the soakaway greater than 5m from any building and the road boundary and greater than 3m from the neighbouring boundary. It is noted that the location of the wwts/septic tank for the existing house has not been shown. A

proposed treatment system manufacturers report – O'Reilly Oakstown Environmental has also been submitted. It is proposed to connect to the public water mains.

- 7.4.2. Regard is had to the Code of Practice Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems Serving Single Houses (p.e.< 10). Table 6.2 of this EPA Code of Practice provides the minimum depth requirements for on-site systems discharging to ground i.e.1.2m and at the base of polishing filter 0.9m.i.e minimum depth of unsaturated subsoil to bedrock and the water table. Table 6.3 provides an interpretation of percolation test results and “in cases where $3 < P < 75$ the site may be suitable for a secondary treatment system and polishing filter at ground surface or overground if the soil is classified as Clay...” The ‘T’ and ‘P’ test values given are within this range.
- 7.4.3. A Site Characterisation Report has been submitted. This notes the soil and rock type. The Aquifer Category vulnerability is low and the groundwater protection response is R1. The depth to base of the trial hole was 2.10m and the average ‘T’ result =28.72. Percolation tests were subsequently carried out and the average for ‘P’ tests =35.14. Therefore, both fall within the acceptable range. The recommendation is due to the tight nature of the site, to install a packaged waste water treatment system and polishing filter and discharge to ground water. They provide that all separation distances are to be achieved and all works to be carried out in accordance with the EPA Guidelines.
- 7.4.4. Therefore, it is considered that based on the documentation submitted and having regard to the Code of Practice that the site is suitable for the disposal of effluent.

7.5. Screening for Appropriate Assessment

- 7.5.1. Taking into consideration the nature and scope of the proposed development, the wastewater treatment system proposed to serve the dwelling, the details provided on the site characterisation form and the existing residential and farm development in the intervening distance, I am of the opinion that no appropriate assessment issues arise and that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, on any Natura 2000 site.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1. I recommend that permission be refused for the reasons and considerations below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The proposed development would add to a proliferation of vehicular entrances onto this public road and would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard because of the additional traffic turning movements the development would generate at a point where sightlines are restricted in an easterly direction. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed removal of a significant part of a roadside boundary hedgerow to gain access to the site and to achieve the sightlines would have a detrimental effect on the rural character of the area and would be contrary to Policies RD POL 9 and NH POL 13 of the current Meath County Development Plan 2013-2019.

Angela Brereton
Planning Inspector

22nd of February 2019