



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-320530-24

Development	Retention of a new recessed entrance gate and winged fencing.
Location	Starinagh, Collon, Co. Meath
Planning Authority	Meath County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2460027
Applicant(s)	Colm & Lisa Comiskey
Type of Application	Retention Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Colm & Lisa Comiskey
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	9 th October 2024
Inspector	Emma Nevin

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located in the townland of Starinagh some 1.8km to the south of Collon. The subject site is located on the eastern side of the N2 and comprises a gated entrance with metal fencing into an existing field, which contains grassed and a soil berm to the eastern part of the lands.
- 1.2. The site is irregularly shaped and is generally flat. The prevailing character of the immediate area is established one-off dwellings, agricultural lands, and associated buildings.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development consists of the retention of a recessed entrance gate with winged fencing and compacted stone apron for access to agricultural lands.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. The Planning Authority refused permission, following significant further information request, on 15th July 2024, for the following reason:

“The proposed development is located along the N2 which is identified as a strategic corridor in the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027. Policy RD POL 37 of the County Development Plan seeks ‘to ensure that future development affecting national primary or secondary roads, shall be assessed in accordance with the guidance given in the document ‘Spatial Planning and National Roads - Guidelines for Planning Authorities’. The proposed development, if permitted, would not only contravene policies in the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 and National Guidance documents but also represent the intensification of a narrow entrance onto the N2, pose a serious risk to traffic safety and represent a haphazard development and set a dangerous precedent for future developments of a similar nature”.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning Reports dated 6th March 2024 and 12th July 2024 have been provided.

- 3.2.2. This planning application was assessed under the Meath County Development Plan, 2021 – 2027, as amended by Variation no. 1 and 2 to the Meath County Development Plan – adopted on the 13th of May 2024.
- 3.2.3. The original planning report considered it necessary to seek further information on the following items:
- The applicant was requested to amend the development description to accurately detail the subject works, which included retention.
 - The applicants were required to detail vehicular movements of the former pre-existing entrance; and document the expected/anticipated use of the subject entrance in terms of vehicular movements.
 - The applicant was requested to provide a clear evidence base which demonstrated the need for the subject entrance and provide details of how this entrance supports agricultural lands in the form of a comprehensive Business Plan for the farm holding supported by Teagasc. Maps of the full extent of lands associated are also required.
 - Having regard to policies RD POL 37 - RD POL 39, inclusive, of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 which seek inter alia to protect roads from unnecessary or excessive access/egress points which may prejudice the carrying capacity and/or the function of the road and to not endanger public safety by way of a traffic hazard; the applicant was requested to demonstrate the rationale/reasoning for the revised entrance which is to be retained.
 - The applicant was requested to justify why the utilisation of existing entrance serving the same lands from the L-56051-11 is unviable.
- 3.2.4. It was considered that the further information did not compromise significant alterations to the original proposal, and as such, revised newspaper and site notices were not required.
- 3.2.5. The second planning report considered that in response to further information item 2 that *“the provision of an upgraded entrance would lead to an intensification of an entrance onto the N-2, a heavily trafficked, high-speed road, resulting in a traffic hazard. Permission should be refused for the proposed development”*. The planner also considered in response to item 4 that *“the proposed development would be at*

variance with the policies in the CDP in relation to Strategic Corridors and also be at variance with the “Spatial Planning and National Roads – Guidelines for Planning Authorities”. Permission should be refused for the proposed development”.

3.2.6. Accordingly, the planners report concluded that the development be refused for the for the reason outlined in Section 3.1.1 above.

3.2.7. Other Technical Reports:

The planning report indicates that the following were consulted during the assessment of the planning application:

- Transportation: Report received indicating no objection subject to conditions.
- Environment (Water & Flooding): No report received.

3.3. Third Party Observations

3.3.1. No third-party submissions were received.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. 2360477: Permission granted, following further information request, on 15th August 2024 for permission and retention of a new earthen embankment as constructed, (original development was granted permission under Reg. Ref. No. 22/1512, granted 22.06.2023) approximately 2.5 metre high, using imported inert soil (Ref. Certificate of Registration COR-MH-23-0002-01) with tree/hedgerow screening planted on top along with any associated sitework.

4.2. 221512: Permission granted on 26th June 2023 for the construction of a new earthen embankment approximately 1 metre high to Western land boundary and part Southern land boundary using imported inert soil with tree/hedgerow screening planted on top along with any associated site works.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. **Development Plan:**

- 5.1.1. The applicable Development Plan is the Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 (adopted 22nd of September 2021), as amended by Variation no. 1 and 2 to the Meath County Development Plan – adopted on the 13th of May 2024.

I also note that variation no. 3 to the Meath CDP 2021-2027 has been published, with the consultation period ending 18th November 2024.

- 5.1.2. The site is located outside of a designated settlement boundary and is therefore considered to be a 'Rural Area'. The objective for "RA" lands is *'to protect and promote in a balanced way, the development of agriculture, forestry and sustainable rural-related enterprise, community facilities, biodiversity, the rural landscape, and the built and cultural heritage'*.

"The primary objective is to protect and promote the value and future sustainability of rural areas. Agriculture, forestry, tourism and rural related resource enterprises will be employed for the benefit of the local and wider population. A balanced approach involving the protection and promotion of rural biodiversity, promotion of the integrity of the landscape, and enhancement of the built and cultural heritage will be adopted".

- 5.1.3. The application site is located within Landscape Character Area 4 – Rathkenny Hills which is an area characterised as a landscape area of very high landscape value, high landscape sensitivity and of regional landscape importance.

5.2. Relevant Sections/Policy and Objectives:

- 5.2.1. RD POL 37 "To ensure that future development affecting national primary or secondary roads, shall be assessed in accordance with the guidance given in the document 'Spatial Planning and National Roads - Guidelines for Planning Authorities'".
- 5.2.2. RD POL 38 "To ensure that all development accessing off the county's road network is at a location and carried out in a manner which would not endanger public safety by way of a traffic hazard".
- 5.2.3. RD POL 39 "To identify and protect those non-national roads of regional or local importance from unnecessary and excessive individual access/egress points, which would prejudice the carrying capacity and ultimately the function of the road".

5.2.4. Section 9.15.3 “New development proposals onto certain regionally and locally important county road type routes that act as particularly important transport links that traverse Co. Meath shall be assessed having regard to:

- Avoiding unnecessary new accesses, for example where access could be provided off a nearby county road.
- Ensuring that necessary new entrances are located in such a manner as to provide effective visibility for both users of the entrance and users of the public roads so that opportunities for conflicting movements are avoided.
- Avoiding the premature obsolescence of regional roads in particular, through creating excessive levels of individual entrances”.

5.3. **Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines**

5.3.1. Having considered the nature of the proposal and the documentation on file, I am of the opinion that the directly relevant S28 Ministerial Guidelines and other related guidance are:

- Spatial Planning and National Roads - Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012).

“The guidelines set out planning policy considerations relating to development affecting national roads (including motorways, national primary and national secondary roads) outside the 50/60 kmh speed limit zones for cities, towns and villages”.

- Development Management Guidelines (2007).

5.4. **Other relevant Guidance:**

- Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2013).

5.5. **Natural Heritage Designations**

5.5.1. The subject site is not located within nor proximate to a designated European Site.

5.6. **EIA Screening**

5.6.1. I refer the Board to Appendix 1 – Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening of this report.

- 5.6.2. Having regard to the nature and scale of the development comprising the retention of an there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the 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

- 6.1.1. A first party appeal has been received from EHP Services on behalf of the applicants Colm and Lisa Comiskey. The grounds of the appeal are summarised below:
- The new agricultural entrance replaces an older entrance of historic standing.
 - The development is being used in conjunction with the pre-existing, main use of the western field, i.e. agriculture, and therefore is consistent with the historic use of the appeal site.
 - Strongly disagree with the County Council's opinion regarding the impact of the development upon road safety, it is noted that the Council's assessment of planning ref. no. 2460027 expressed no objection to the principle of development.
 - It was clear from the further information reply that the response related to existing and future/anticipated vehicular levels and frequencies of movement generated by the existing tenant farmer's existing and continued yearly silage cultivation cycle. It is suggested that the County Planner misconstrued this as evidence of an intensification of use.
 - The western field is only farmed by one individual for one purpose, silage. The western field cannot be used for multiple purposes by multiple users. The tenant famer operates a cultivation cycle based on 2no. silage cuts per year, weather depending. Some years this can be reduced to only one cut so associated traffic can be less than indicated.
 - The County Council has in error presumed just because the entrance has been widened and made safer it would automatically attract more use.

- The further information reply made it clear the entrance was constructed to provide an improve and safer vehicular entrance.
- The 2012 Guidelines' and Policy RD POL 37's prohibition on permitting new or intensified existing entrances onto national roads do not apply to the development, as it has not resulted or attracted any additional traffic over and above what was entering and exiting the western field.
- In the absence of any reasoned demonstration of intensification the Council's assessment is flawed and is not supported by either the 2012 Guidelines or Policy RD POL 37 and should be overturned.
- If there was a genuine concern that the development represented an intensification of an existing access onto a national road the Council was empowered/entitled under the Section 3.6 of the 2012 Guidelines and, subsequently, also under Policy RD POL 37 to request a road safety audit.
- This decision seriously undermines the credibility of the Council's assessment of planning ref. no. 2460027 and the reliability of the subsequent decision to refuse.
- The appellants note the Council's Transportation Department; cognisant of the same national guidance and MCDP policies; were favourably disposed towards the development, subject to conditions, and did not share the County Planner's view that the development represented an undesirable intensification of use.
- It is suggested that by improving the original site entrance by providing a 15.7metres setback and wider visibility there is no serious risk to passing traffic.
- Trimming back the hedgerows is an entirely feasible, practice and deliverable requirement and is in keeping with the reasoning behind installing a safer agricultural entrance.
- The appellants are retaining the eastern field for personal use and are retaining the L56051-11 entrance.

- Directing traffic down the L56051-11 could bring traffic into conflict with the parcel delivery fleet and this road is an unmarked secondary road with no passing bays.
- The reason for refusal concludes that a grant of permission would set a dangerous precedent for future development of a similar nature. Referring to precedent is an overused and meaningless turn of phrase and has no relevance to the appeal.
- The appellants are agreeable to a grant of permission to include conditions of permission outlined in the Transportation Department's referral.
- Cognisant that the site is located within Landscape Area 4 – the appellants are amenable to reducing the 2.5-metre-high gates and fencing to 1.6metres and have the winged fences back planted with hawthorn at the next available planting season. The appellant considers that the suggested revisions and changes will ensure the development is appropriate to the rural area.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- 6.2.1. A response was received from the planning authority dated 3rd September 2024.
- 6.2.2. The Planning Authority notes the contents of the first-party appeal and issues raised in same for the proposed development. The Planning Authority is satisfied that the subject proposal was appropriately considered throughout the course of the assessment of the planning application as detailed in the respective Planning Officer Reports dated 07 March 2023 and 15 July 2024.
- 6.2.3. The planning authority conclude that An Bord Pleanála are requested to uphold the decision of the Planning Authority to refuse permission for the development.

6.3. Observations

None received.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having inspected the site and considered the contents of the appeal, I consider the main issues which arise in relation to this appeal are as follows:

- I. Principle of Development & Compliance with Policy
- II. Intensification of use
- III. Impact on traffic safety
- IV. Precedent
- V. Appropriate Assessment, and
- VI. Other Matters.

7.2. Principle of Development & Compliance with Policy

7.2.1. The site is zoned “RA” lands with an objective *‘to protect and promote in a balanced way, the development of agriculture, forestry and sustainable rural-related enterprise, community facilities, biodiversity, the rural landscape, and the built and cultural heritage’*.

7.2.2. The development consists of the retention of a vehicular entrance and gate serving agricultural lands located off the N2. The appellant states that the entrance to be retained replaces an existing entrance at this location. Having regard to the information submitted as part of the planning application and following a review of the site history as viewed from google maps, I can confirm that an existing entrance was in situ at this site prior to the subject entrance and associated gate/fence being erected. I also noted during my site visit, that on the approach to the site, along the N2, I observed several vehicular entrances, which were of similar substandard nature to that of the previous entrance at this site. There are also numerous entrances serving one-off residential dwellings along the N2.

7.2.3. The reason for refusal considers that the development, if permitted would contravene policies in the Development Plan, specifically RD PLO 37 and National Guidance documents, specifically the ‘Spatial Planning and National Roads - Guidelines for Planning Authorities’.

Policy RD PLO 37 states it is an objective of the Council *“To ensure that future development affecting national primary or secondary roads, shall be assessed in accordance with the guidance given in the document ‘Spatial Planning and National Roads - Guidelines for Planning Authorities’.*

7.2.4. Having regard to the policy, I note that the development herein is for the retention of a vehicular entrance to allow for the continuation of agricultural use on these lands, as such it does not relate to ‘future development, as cited in the above policy objective.

7.2.5. Notwithstanding, I reference the Spatial Planning and National Roads - Guidelines for Planning Authorities’, which states in relation to new/existing accesses that;

“The creation of new accesses to and intensification of existing accesses to national roads gives rise to the generation of additional turning movements that introduce additional safety risks to road users. Therefore, from a road safety perspective, planning authorities, the NRA, road authorities and the Road Safety Authority must guard against a proliferation of roadside developments accessing national roads to which speed limits greater than 50-60 kmh apply as part of the overall effort to reduce road fatalities and injuries” (Section 1.5).

“The policy of the planning authority will be to avoid the creation of any additional access point from new development or the generation of increased traffic from existing accesses to national roads to which speed limits greater than 60 kmh apply. This provision applies to all categories of development, including individual houses in rural areas, regardless of the housing circumstances of the applicant” (Section 2.5), and;

“Planning authorities should generally require that planning applications, involving a new access to a national road or significant changes to an existing access, are accompanied by a road safety audit to aid the identification of any appropriate measures required to maintain safety standards. The planning authority may, however, decide to dispense with the requirement for a road safety audit in the case of applications for an individual dwelling proposal in the case of lightly-trafficked sections of national secondary routes – described under the heading “Exceptional Circumstances” above. Guidance for the preparation of road safety audits is included in the NRA Design Manual for Roads and Bridges” (Section 3.6).

7.2.6. Having regard to national guidance I consider that the works have involved significant changes to an existing entrance, however, having regard to the existing substandard entrance at this site, I consider that the works have improved the existing access/egress to the site. In addition, the entrance to be retained is not for the purposes of development and does not serve an individual or multiple residential dwellings, it serves an access to agricultural lands.

7.2.7. Noting the zoning objective, which promotes the development of agriculture, and having regard to the agricultural use associated with this site, and the information presented as part of the first party appeal, specifically that the retention of this entrance replaces an existing entrance at this location and allows for the on-going agricultural use on these lands, I consider that the principle of an entrance at this location would be acceptable under the zoning objective, subject to its use and any potential impact on traffic safety, which will be assessed further below.

7.3. Intensification of use

7.3.1. The reason for refusal states that the retention of the entrance gate would represent an intensification of a narrow entrance onto the N2. I note that the further information request (item 2) required the applicant to detail the vehicular movements of the former pre-existing entrance and to document the expected use of the subject entrance. Following the submission of the further information, permission was refused by the Council as noted above.

7.3.2. As part of the appeal, the applicant again detailed the information submitted by way of the further information. The appeal has clarified that this field is only farmed by one individual (tenant farmer) and is used for one purpose, silage. The appeal states that the tenant farmer operates 2 no. silage cuts per year, weather depending, with vehicular movements at the site totalling 6 no. visits, with 16 no. vehicle movements in total from early March to early September. The machinery utilising this site comprises of 1 – 2 tractors, with associated fertiliser spreader, mover, trailer and silage harvester, depending on the time of year.

7.3.3. As noted in the foregoing, the entrance and associated gates to be retained replaces an existing entrance at this site with the majority of the adjoining land in use as farming land. The appellant also states that the entrance to be retained has not resulted or attracted any additional traffic over and above what was entering and

exiting the site via the old entrance i.e. 16 no. vehicular movements, over a six-month period.

- 7.3.4. Notwithstanding that the vehicles utilising this site will access directly onto the N2, based on the number and infrequency of trips to and from this site, which are spread across six months from March – September, I do not consider that the retention of the entrance as constructed results in the intensification of the existing agricultural use at this location and its retention allows for the continuation of the existing farming use associated with this plot of land.
- 7.3.5. Therefore, I am satisfied that the retention of the entrance and associated gates/fencing does not represent an intensification of a narrow entrance onto the N2, and its retention would be acceptable.

7.4. Impact on Traffic Safety

- 7.4.1. The reason for refusal also states that the retention of the entrance gate would pose a serious risk to traffic safety and represent haphazard development.
- 7.4.2. The appellant refutes this claim and states that by improving the original site entrance and by providing the wider visibility splays there is no risk to passing traffic.
- 7.4.3. Whilst I acknowledge that the site directly accesses the N2, again I reference that the entrance to be retained replaces an existing entrance at this location serving agricultural lands. I also note that the entrance to be retained provides a 15.7 metre set back from the roadside boundary with the N2, which allows agricultural vehicles to stop before continuing onto the N2 and this set back also allows agricultural vehicles to pull in off the N2 while waiting for the entrance gate into the field to open. The entrance is splayed and provides sightlines in both directions, which gives adequate visibility for agricultural vehicles exiting the site. The number of trips generated at this site is also noted in relation to the potential impacts on traffic.
- 7.4.4. I reference the report of Transportation Planning which states “*The applicant has demonstrated sightlines of 215 metres to the nearside edge of the road from a setback of 3 metres to the road edge in accordance with TII Document DN-GEO-03060, from the new agricultural entrance. The applicant has also identified works required to provide unobstructed sightlines*”.

- 7.4.5. The planner's assessment of the further information request in relation to sightlines, considered that a permanent solution aimed at achieving sightlines was not proposed by the applicant. It was considered that the applicants' proposal to trim the hedgerows each year to provide sightlines was '*unfeasible and would likely cease in years to come*'. The appellant states that they are willing to carry out the hedge trimming as required to ensure the benefits of the new entrance to the tenant farmer. I consider in this instance that a condition could be included to request the applicant to ensure and maintain unobstructed sightlines, as per recommendation of the Transportation Department, to ensure that adequate sightlines will be available from the entrance. I am satisfied that this will ensure adequate sightlines at the site are maintained.
- 7.4.6. I also note that the Transportation Department requested that "*the entrance gate shall be recessed at least 12 meters from the edge of the road to allow a vehicle and trailer to pull in fully off the road prior to opening the gate*" and "*the entrance driveway should be no more than +/- 2.5% for the first 7 metres*". While I note that the entrance gate is some 15.7 metres from the roadside, I concur that a condition be included in this instance.
- 7.4.7. As such, I am satisfied that the entrance to be retained, improves the existing access arrangement to this site and given its setback from the N2, and the number of trips generated from this entrance, does not represent haphazard development or pose a serious risk to traffic safety at this location.

7.5. **Precedent**

- 7.5.1. In relation to precedent all appeal cases are assessed and determined on their own merits having regard to the sensitivity of the receiving environment and the specifics of the proposed development. I note that the reason for refusal states that the development would set a dangerous precedent for future developments of a similar nature. The appellant states that referring to precedent is an overused and meaningless and has no relevant to the instant appeal.
- 7.5.2. Based on the foregoing, and again noting the existing entrance at this location, I am satisfied that the development to be retained is acceptable and improves the existing access arrangements at this site.

7.6. **Appropriate Assessment**

- 7.6.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of S177U the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.
- 7.6.2. The subject site is not located within or adjacent to any European Site.
- 7.6.3. The development to be retained is located within a rural area and comprises the retention of a new recessed entrance gate and winged fencing with compacted stone entrance apron which provides access to agricultural land off the N2 roadway, which replaces the pre-existing entrance gate.
- 7.6.4. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the development to be retained, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment for the reason that it could not have any appreciable effect on a European Site.
- 7.6.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Small scale and nature of the development to be retained.
 - The location of the development in a serviced rural area, distance from European Sites and absence of ecological pathways to any European Site.
- 7.6.6. I consider that the development to be retained would not be likely to have a significant effect individually, or in-combination with other plans and projects, on a European Site and appropriate assessment is, therefore, not required.

7.7. Other Matters

7.7.1. Further Information

- 7.7.2. As part of Further Information request item no. 4 of Ref. 2460027, the applicant was requested to justify why the utilisation of the existing entrance serving the same lands from the L-56051-11 is unviable.

As part of the further information response and appeal the applicant has stated that the eastern field is to be retained for personal use, as the existing entrance on the L-56051-11 provides access to the rear of the applicants' property. Additionally, the appellant suggests that directing agricultural vehicles down the L-56051-11 could result in traffic conflict noting the location of the DPD parcel distribution depot at the top of this rural road.

Following site inspection and noting the existing depot and adjoining residential sites located along the L-56051-11, I consider that redirecting agricultural traffic down the

L-56051-11 to access the appeal site would result in an intensification of this rural road and could potentially result in traffic conflicts along the road. The L-56051-11 terminates at the N2 so traffic would ultimately have to access the N2. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the retention of the access as constructed is a more acceptable access to the appeal site.

7.7.3. Landscape Character Area 4 – Rathkenny Hills

The site is located within a landscape character area and the appellant states that they are amenable to modifying the existing entrance and reducing the overall height from 2.5 metres to 1.6 metres and planting the boundary.

Following my site inspection, I do not consider that the entrance to be retained detracts from the character of the area and has been finished to a high-quality standard. As such, I do not consider that modifications to the existing fence or additional planting, as suggested in the appeal are required in this instance.

8.0 **Recommendation**

- 8.1. I recommend that permission for retention be granted, subject to conditions as set out below, for the following reasons and considerations.


9.0 **Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to the 'RA' rural area zoning which applies to the site under the Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 (as varied), under which the development of agricultural is stated to be generally acceptable in principle, subject to the conditions set out below the development to be retained improves the existing access arrangements at this site, does not result in an intensification of vehicular movements at this site and is acceptable in terms of traffic movements and pedestrian safety. The development to be retained complies with the Development Plan, the Spatial Planning and National Roads - Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012) and accords with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be retained in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by additional information submitted on 20th June 2024, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The applicant shall provide and maintain unobstructed sightlines of 215 metres to the nearside edge of the road from a setback of 3.0 metres, in accordance with TII Document DN-GEO-03060, from the agricultural entrance. The nearside road edge shall be visible over the entire sight distance.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of traffic safety.</p>
3.	<p>The entrance gate shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) Be recessed a minimum of 12 meters from the edge of the road to allow a vehicle and trailer to pull in fully off the road prior to opening the gate.(b) The entrance driveway should be no more than +/- 2.5% for the first 7 metres. <p>Reason: In the interest of traffic safety.</p>

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.



Emma Nevin
Planning Inspector

22nd October 2024

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	320530-24		
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of a new recessed entrance gate and winged fencing.		
Development Address	Starinagh, Collon, Co. Meath		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	X
		No	
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) or does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	X	Retention of a new recessed entrance gate and winged fencing	
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)
No	X		No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes			

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?

No	X	Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required