



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-322670-25

Development	Construction of 94 residential units, creche facility and all associated site works.
Location	Lands at Lagore Road, Dunshaughlin, Co. Meath.
Planning Authority	Meath County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2460621
Applicant(s)	Elci Limited
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refusal
Type of Appeal	First Party V refusal
Appellant(s)	Elci Limited
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	19/8/25
Inspector	Ronan Murphy

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located on the eastern outskirts of Dunshaughlin and is c. 760m from the town centre. The area surrounding the site is an emerging residential area with existing dwellings to the west and north-west and a residential development currently under construction to the south.
- 1.2. The site which has a stated area of 3.6ha is currently a greenfield site which is in agricultural use and is enclosed by hedgerows and drainage ditches to the south and west and hedging to the east.
- 1.3. A portion of the site at the northeast corner is outside of the Dunshaughlin settlement boundary and is zoned as "RA -Rural Area," while a Transport Indicative Road Route traverses the site along its eastern boundary and is to link with Dunshaughlin Outer Relief Road.
- 1.4. The topography rises gently from the north of the site to the south of the site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises of the construction of 77 No. houses and 17 apartments set out in a mixture of detached, semi-detached, terraced houses and a single apartment building.
- 2.2. The houses are laid out in a mixture of two and three storey dwellings ranging in height from 7.8m to 9.5m with pitched roofs with brick and smooth render finishes.
- 2.3. The proposed apartment building would have a height of 11.9m with a pitched roof and would be finished with a mixture of brick and smooth render.
- 2.4. The proposed creche would be a single storey building comprising of a floor area of c. 160m² with a private garden area of 75m². The creche building would have a height of c.7m with a pitched roof.
- 2.5. In addition to the above, it is proposed to provide a 300m long section of the Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road, on the eastern side of the proposed development site. This provision includes a 6.5m wide road carriageway, 2.0m footpaths and 2.0m wide cycle tracks on both sides of the road. In addition to this, The Lagore Road / Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road junction is proposed as a signal-controlled junction.

It is proposed to connect the cycle lanes on the Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road with the proposed cycle lane on Lagore Road via Toucan Crossings. It is noted that the proposed development would not have a direct access to the Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road.

- 2.6 A new cycle lane and footpath is proposed along the site frontage on Lagore Road, and it is also proposed to continue the footpath for approximately 160m along the Lagore Road to link in with the existing footpath to the west at the Maelduin junction.

- 2.1.7 The following key parameters are noted:

Site area	3.66ha (2.65ha developable area)
Residential Units	94
Total floor space	11,989m ²
Building Height	7.8m-9.5m (Houses) 11.9m (Apartment Block)
Density	35.5 units per hectare
Public open space	3,995m ² (15.1%)
Access	Vehicular and pedestrian via Lagore Road
Car and cycle parking	187 car parking spaces 134 bicycle parking spaces

Table 1 Development Parameters

- 2.1.8 The proposal would have the following unit mix:

Unit Type	No of units	%
4-bed houses	49	52%
3-bed houses	28	29%
1-Bed apartment	3	3%
2-Bed apartment	14	15%
Total	94	100%

Table 2 Unit mix

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1 By order dated 6th May 2025 the Planning Authority decided to refuse planning permission for two reasons:

1. *It is the policy of Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 to “ensure that all planning applications for new developments have regard to the surface water management policies provided for in the GDGDS” (INF POL 16). Having regard to the documentation submitted with the application and further information response, it is considered that the Applicant has not provided an acceptable and sufficiently detailed proposed surface water system, with particular reference to the orderly collection, treatment, and disposal of surface water. The proposed surface water system has significantly reduced cover depths for the majority of the proposed network including in trafficable areas which is not acceptable. To rectify the cover depth issues, the applicant would have to significantly raise the proposed ground levels in the affected places which would impact the proposed finished floor levels, proposed roof levels and proposed road levels, thus having a significant impact on the proposed development and site layout. The change in levels would also result in the*

submitted surface water design and modelling having to be redesigned and remodelled. The proposed development is not in accordance with the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study (GDSDS) Regional Drainage Policies Volume 2, for New Developments and the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works Volume 6, therefore the Planning Authority cannot make an informed decision on the orderly collection, treatment, and disposal of surface water. To permit the proposed development would contravene the above referenced policy of the Development Plan, would be prejudicial to public health, would set an undesirable precedent, and would not be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. *It is a policy (INF POL 22) of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027, "To retain a strip of 10 metres on either side of all channels/flood defence embankments where required, to facilitate access thereto". Having regard to the information provided with the application, further information response and due to the lack of a detailed assessment/design of the proposed drainage channel diversion, the Planning Authority is unable to determine whether a channel diversion is feasible in this instance. If not feasible a 10m buffer strip is required along the southern boundary which would have a significant detrimental impact on the proposed site layout and infrastructure. The proposed development would therefore contravene the aforementioned policy and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- 3.2.1.1 There are two planning reports on file. The initial area planners report dated 2/10/24 notes that the proposed development is acceptable in principle, subject to normal planning considerations. The area planners notes that all dwellings meet the minimum space provisions and room sizes as required for both houses and apartments. The overall design, unit mix, density, plot ratio and site coverage of the development were considered to be acceptable.

- 3.2.1.2 Notwithstanding this, concerns were outlined with respect to the following:

- The need to provide information with respect to the sizes of the private open space for the houses and the rear boundary treatments.
- The pocket park to the south-west of the site as it was not sufficiently overlooked.
- The rear boundary treatments do not comply with DM OBJ 29 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027*.
- The need to clarify the materiality of the proposed waste storage compounds for both the apartments and mid-terrace units and revised plans showing the provision of storage for bulky items outside individual apartment units.
- Design issues relating to the Dunshaughlin Outer Relief Road within the site and junction with Lagore Road, the location of car EV and bicycle parking.
- Public lighting.
- The need to provide details of the telecommunications infrastructure for each unit.
- A revised An Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) undertaken by a suitably qualified professional using established best practice survey methods at the appropriate time of year.
- The applicant shall submit documentary evidence of the competency of the author of the Appropriate Assessment Screening Report.
- The applicant shall revised Social Infrastructure Audit in accordance with the guidance outlined in section 7.7.2 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021- 2027.
- Confirmation that the proposed creche meets the minimum floor space per child requirements as outlined in Appendix 1 of the Childcare Facilities Guidelines 2001.
- The need to demonstrate a minimum of 5% universally designed units in accordance with the requirements of the 'Building for Everyone: A Universal Design'.
- The cumulative impacts of the proposed development have been adequately assessed in the application documentation. The applicant is therefore requested to address the requirement for EIA screening and potential need for submission of an EIAR in respect of this development.
- Concerns relating to the surface water drainage and treatment.

- The need to provide an accessible 10m riparian strip alongside the existing drainage channel/watercourse.
- Responses to submissions from Third Parties and a Prescribed Bodies

3.2.1.3 Further information was requested broadly in relation to the above.

Further information

3.2.1.4 A formal response to the Further Information request was received on 27th March 2025. The response was accompanied by the following:

- A cover letter prepared by SCA Planning.
- DWG No. PL-011 Private Amenity Space Map prepared by Douglas Wallace Architects.
- DWG No. PL-110 Proposed Block Type K prepared by Douglas Wallace Architects
- DWG No. PL-114 Proposed Block Type M prepared by Douglas Wallace Architects.
- DWG No. PL-004 Proposed Site Layout Plan prepared by Douglas Wallace Architects.
- DWG No. PL-009 Revised Phasing drawing prepared by Douglas Wallace Architects.
- DWG No. PL-202 Apartment Refuse Storage Compound Details prepared by Douglas Wallace Architects.
- DWG No. PL-203 Typical Mid-Terrace Refuse Storage Compound Details prepared by Douglas Wallace Architects.
- DWG No. PL-110 Proposed Block Type K prepared by Douglas Wallace Architects.
- DWG No. PL-113 revised layout of the detached creche block prepared by Douglas Wallace Architects.
- DWG No. P2307-GDC-ZZ-XX-DR-C-1006 prepared by GDCL.
- DWG No. NRB-RFI-001 junction layout
- Public Lighting Layout SEHA Technical Services.
- Response to Road and Transportation prepared NRB Consulting Engineers.
- A creche specification drawing has been prepared by Gannon & Associates.
- Revised AA Screening Report prepared by Gannon & Associates.

- Revised Ecological Impact Assessment Report has been prepared by Gannon & Associates.
- An EIA Screening Report prepared by Gannon & Associates.
- Revised Social Infrastructure Assessment prepared by SCA Planning.
- A redesigned surface water system prepared by GDCL Consulting Engineers.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Transport Section: Report dated 26/9/24 requesting further information with respect to the design of the entrance to the development, the design of the Outer Relief Road, bicycle storage, pedestrian connectivity, in curtilage car parking, EV charging for apartments.

Environment Section (Flooding and Water Services): Report dated 1/10/24 requesting further information regarding surface water treatment and the need for a riparian strip.

Public Lighting: Undated e-mail requesting Further Information with respect to public lighting to all public spaces.

Broadband Officer: Report dated 28/8/24 outlining no objection, subject to conditions.

Housing Department: Report dated 22/8/24 no objection.

Post Further Information

Environment (Flooding and Surface Water): Report dated 1/5/25 recommending refusal as the proposed development would not be in accordance with INF POL 16 and INF POL 22 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027*.

Public Lighting: Undated e-mail outlining no objection, subject to condition.

Transportation: Report dated 30/4/25 outlining no objections, subject to conditions.

Broadband Officer: Response noted in planners report, however, the local authority have confirmed that this was an error and no such report was received.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Eireann: Response dated 11/9/24 requesting further information with respect to the need to engage with Uisce Eireann to get an updated Confirmation of Feasibility of connection to public water and wastewater infrastructure.

Department Applications Unit: Response dated 13/9/24 outlining no objection.

HSE: Response dated 10/9/24 requesting further information with respect to the creche facilities.

Post Further Information

HSE: Response dated 15/4/25 outlining no objection, subject to conditions.

Uisce Eireann: Response dated 14/4/25 recommending clarification of Further Information with respect for the need to provide an updated Confirmation of Feasibility.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1 None

4.0 Planning History

Appeal site

4.1 There are a number of applications on the appeal site, the majority of these have been withdrawn, the most recently decided case is set out below:

4.2 **Reg. Ref. DA40241.** Application for the construction of 70 no. 2 storey dwellings and a single storey creche including roads services and ancillary works. Permission refused for the following reason:

1. The proposed development would materially contravene the current Dunshaughlin Development Plan, and, in particular objective DS12, which clearly states that this new residential district shall only be developed after the commissioning of the Dunshaughlin By-pass. The proposed development, would, therefore, be premature pending the commissioning of the By-pass for the village.

Lands to the south

Reg. Ref. 23/60181: Application consisting of modifications to the Strategic Housing Development (SHD) permitted under ABP Ref.:303433-19, as amended by ABP Ref. 307946-20, and Meath County Council Reg. Ref.: 22/1594, which is currently under construction, on lands to the north of the R147 / Dublin Road, Dunshaughlin, County Meath. The proposed development relates to modifications to 232 no. permitted residential units. Permission granted, subject to conditions.

Reg. Ref. 22/1594: Application for modifications to the Strategic Housing Development permitted under ABP Ref.: ABP-303433-19, as amended by ABP Ref.: ABP-307946-20, which is currently under construction. The modifications relate to 27 no. houses (Nos. 210-236. The modifications increased the total no. of residential units within the permitted development by 1 no. unit to 914 no. units. Permission granted, subject to conditions.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1 The *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027* is the operative plan for the area. The appeal site is predominantly located within the A2 'New Residential Zone'. In addition to this, a portion of the site at the northeast corner is outside of the settlement boundary and is zoned as "RA -Rural Area."

5.1.2 Relevant policies and objectives include:

DNS POL 1 which seeks to support residential growth of Dunshaughlin.

DM OBJ 12 which seeks to ensure a high standard of residential design.

DM OBJ 14 which encourages net densities of 35-50 uph on suburban / Urban extension lands.

DM OBJ 15 which relates to Plot Ratio.

DM OBJ 16 which relates to site Coverage.

DM POL 5 which related to Density.

Tables 11.2 (Car Parking Standards) and **Table 11.4** (Cycle Parking Standards)

INF POL 14 which seeks to ensure that all planning applications for new development have regard to the surface water management policies provided for in the GDSDS.

INF POL 15 which requires the use of SuDS in accordance with the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works for new developments.

INF POL 16 which seeks to ensure that all planning applications have regard to the surface water management policies provided for in the GDSDS.

INF POL 18 & 20 (Flood Risk Management), **DM POL 3** (Public Lighting Proposals) **DM OBJ 9 & 10** (Relationship between landscaping and public lighting columns).

5.2 National Planning Framework (2040)-First Revision April 2025

5.2.1 The National Planning Framework - Project Ireland 2040-updated in April 2025 sets out the focus on pursuing a compact growth policy at national, regional, and local level. From an urban perspective the aim is to deliver a greater proportion of residential development within existing built-up areas; to facilitate infill development and enable greater densities to be achieved, whilst achieving high quality and design standards.

5.3 Nature-based Solutions to the Management of Rainwater and Surface Water Runoff in Urban Areas Water Sensitive Urban Design Best Practice Interim Guidance Document

5.3.1 This document shows how to move towards a more systematic and sustainable approach to urban planning and design that seeks to mimic the natural water balance of rural areas through “water sensitive urban design”.

5.4 Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study Volume 2 March 2005

5.4.1 This document is concerned with identification of similar approaches for the Local Authorities to adopt as to how drainage infrastructure for new development is managed.

5.5 Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works Volume 6 April 2006

5.5.1 While the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study Volume 2 policies remain the overriding documents, this Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works sets out the requirements of the Local Authorities in a more concise format for day-to-day use.

5.6 Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines

5.6.1 Having considered the nature of the proposal, the receiving environment, the documentation on file, including the submissions from the planning authority, I am of the opinion that the directly relevant Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines are:

- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024. These guidelines seek to support sustainable residential development and the creation of compact settlements for urban and rural areas.
- Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities: Design Guidelines. The purpose of these Guidelines is to assist in delivering homes, in sustainable communities that are socially inclusive.
- Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines- for Planning Authorities issued under Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended) July 2025. The purpose of these guidelines is to provide target standards for new apartments and for redevelopment of existing buildings into apartments. The updated guidelines take effect for planning applications and appeals lodged after 9th July 2025.

5.7 Natural Heritage Designations

5.7.1 The appeal site is not located within or adjoining any designated site.

The nearest European Sites in close proximity to the appeal site are as follows:

- c. 14km from River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (Site Code 004232)
- c. 14km from River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (Site Code 002299)
- c. 15km from Rye Water Valley/Cartron SAC (Site Code 001398)
- c.21.5km from the Malahide Estuary SAC (Site Code 000205)
- c. 21.9km from Malahide Estuary SPA (Site Code 004025)

5.7.2 The nearest Natural Heritage Areas in close proximity to the appeal site are as follows:

- c. 14km from Trim pNHA (Site Code 001357)
- c. 14km from Balrath Woods pNHA (Site Code 001579)
- c.17km from Rathmoylan Esker pNHA (Site Code 000557)

5.7.3 An Appropriate Assessment Screening Assessment prepared by Gannon and Associated was submitted with the initial planning application. The planning authority

outlined concerns with respect to the competency of the author and whether they have the necessary qualifications or experience to carry out the assessment.

- 5.7.4 An updated report was lodged with the further information response which included a statement of competency. I am satisfied that the author of the report has the appropriate competencies to undertake Appropriate Assessment Screening reports. A full assessment is provided in Section 8 and Appendix 2 below relating to Appropriate Assessment.

5.8 EIA Screening

- 5.8.1 The application material includes an EIA Screening report prepared by Gannon and Associates Landscape Architecture Ltd in response to a Further Information request in which concerns were raised that when taken in conjunction with residential developments already permitted in the vicinity, that the cumulative impacts of the proposed development have been adequately assessed in the application documentation.
- 5.8.2 The EIA Screening Report includes a sub-threshold assessment set out in Table 4 of the document. The author concludes that the proposed development does not fall under the list of projects listed in Annex I of the EIA Directive which require mandatory EIA. In addition, a sub-threshold screening exercise was also undertaken, and it was considered that the proposed development is a sub-threshold development. The planning authority was satisfied that based on the information provided and having considered the nature, size and location of the proposed development, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment and as such as sub threshold EIAR is not required. In addition to this, the document includes Schedule 7A documentation.
- 5.8.3 The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 3 in Appendix 1 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.

5.6 Water Framework Directive

- 5.6.1 The purpose of the EU Water Framework Directive is an initiative aimed at improving water quality throughout the European Union. The Directive was adopted in 2000 and requires governments to take a new approach to managing all their waters; rivers, canals, lakes, reservoirs, groundwater, protected areas (including wetlands and other water dependent ecosystems), estuaries (transitional) and coastal waters.
- 5.6.2 An Coimisiún Pleanála and other statutory authorities cannot grant development consent where a proposed development would give rise to a reduction in water quality.
- 5.6.3 There are no surface water bodies present within the proposed development site. However, it is noted that there are existing ditches on the southern and western boundaries of the site. The ditch on the western boundary flows north and passes under Lagore Road before continuing north along field boundary in adjacent field. This joins a network of field boundary drainage ditches which ultimately join the Ratoath Stream.
- 5.6.4 The appeal site is c. 500m to the south of the Ratoath Stream_010 River Waterbody IE_EA_08R010150. This waterbody is classified as a poor ecological status. This is illustrated on the EPA mapping (<https://gis.epa.ie/EPAMaps/agriculture>). In addition to this I note that the site is located above a Locally Important Aquifer-Bedrock which is Generally Moderately Productive. The GSI vulnerability of the site is between moderate (area to the west of the site) and low to the east of the site.
- 5.6.5 I have assessed the proposed development of 94 residential units, creche and associated site works for which permission is sought 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.
- 5.6.6 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The land is connected to public wastewater.

- The surface water discharges through SuDS technology including permeable paving, petrol interceptors, detention basins, tree pits and filter drains prior to outfall into an existing 600m concrete pipe on the verge of Lagore Road.
- Conditions will require appropriate construction phase mitigation measures in a Construction Management Plan to ensure no pollutants enter the drain on the western boundary of the land.

6 The Appeal

6.1 Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1 A first party appeal against the decision of Meath County Council has been submitted by SCA Planning and Development Consultants on behalf of Elci Limited. The appeal includes an Engineering Report prepared by G. Daly Consulting Limited (GDCL), and an independent surface water engineering audit prepared by Punch Consulting Engineers. The appeal can be summarised as follows:

- Unnecessary for Meath County Council to refuse permission, GDCL consulted with and achieved agreement upon drainage engineering within the residential scheme prior to the submission of a Further Information response. Hence there was a clear understanding on GDCL's part that there was an agreement has been reached on all civil engineering items and any other issues could be dealt with by of pre-commencement conditions.

Reason No.1

- Both reasons for refusal are centred on specific technical surface water engineering points which could have been clarified by the Local Authority and / or could have been conditioned.
- It has been confirmed by DW Architects that an architectural redesign is not required, and drainage cover details could have been conditioned by the Local Authority.
- The appended appeal response drawings by GDCL demonstrates compliance with the requirements of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027*.

- To independently demonstrate compliance with the required 'GDSDS' and the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works Volume 6, an independent Stormwater Audit was undertaken, and any issues identified are addressed.

Reason No.2

- The southern boundary field drain is an excavated agricultural field drainage ditch and is not a stream nor a recorded watercourse channel or on any statutory OPW mapping, nor is it in a flood risk area.
- The ditch will be filled in conjunction with the conversion of the use of the land for residential use.
- The Local Authority is in agreement in principle with the diversion of the ditch which is essential due to the alignment of the Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road, but sufficient information was not provided to give the necessary detail on the diversion. The updated design by GDCL is included with this appeal.
- This section of the Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road is not required for the proposed development and could An Coimisiún Pleanála could omit it from the development without any consequence.
- Infrastructure identified as an objective in a statutory development plan is a matter for the planning authority to provide. This could be done by way of Part 8 procedures. There are Government funds available to support the provision of this type of infrastructure to open up zoned and serviced lands for development.
- An Coimisiún Pleanála may consider as a condition that the necessary land corridor for the Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road be ceded to the Local Authority and pre-commencement agreement in writing with the planning authority of surface water drainage infrastructure by way of compliance.

6.2 Planning Authority Response

- 6.2.1 Letter dated 16/6/25 stating that the Planning Authority notes the contents of the first party appeal and are satisfied that all matters were fully considered in the course of

the assessment by the case officer. The Planning Authority requests that its decision be upheld.

6.3 Observations

6.3.1 There are no observations on file.

6.4 Further Responses

6.4.1 There are no further responses on file.

7 Assessment

7.1 Having examined the appeal details and all other documentation on file, including submissions and responses, the report of the local authority and inspected the site. I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Drainage Design (Reason No. 1 for refusal)
- Southern Boundary / Ditch (Reason No. 2 for refusal)
- Appropriate Assessment Screening

7.2 Principle of Development

7.2.1 The appeal site is zoned A2 'New Residential Zone'. In addition to this, a portion of the site at the northeast corner is outside of the settlement boundary and is zoned as "RA -Rural Area." There is also a Transport-Indicative Road Route traversing the site from north to south. This indicative route is to form part of the Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road.

7.2.2 Residential development and Childcare facilities are both permitted uses within the A2 zone. The proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable having regard to the A2 zoning of the land.

7.2.3 No buildings are proposed within the RA Rural Area Zone, however, the extension to the Eastern Relief Road, road widening with Lagore Road junction and open space associated with the proposed development are all within this zone. Open Space is a permitted use in this zone, while Utility Structures (which include the extension to the

Eastern Relief Road and the road widening with Lagore Road junction) is also a permitted uses in the RA zone.

- 7.2.4 With respect to the characterisation of the road works as utility structures, I make the Coimisiún aware that the approach is consistent with a previous decision of An Bord Pleanála (ABP-313658-22) with respect to the Ratoath Outer-relief Road. The planning authority was satisfied that such an approach is acceptable, and I am satisfied that the proposed Eastern Relief Road and the road widening with Lagore Road junction would fall into such a characterisation.

Density / Layout / Design

- 7.2.5 I make the Coimisiún aware that this assessment is based on the updated plans and particulars submitted at Further Information stage. I note that the number of house units was updated at Further Information from 76 to 77. In addition to this, the number of apartments has been reduced to 17.

Density

- 7.2.6 The density of the proposed development would be 35.5 units per hectare. It is noted that DM OBJ 14 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 provides a density range of 30-50 units per hectare for suburban / Urban Extensions within key towns and Large Towns. This density range is commensurate with Table 3.5 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024.
- 7.2.7 I make the Coimisiún aware that the calculation of the density scheme is based on the developable area of the site (lands zoned A2, 2.65ha) and excludes the area of the site within in the RA Zone as no residential development is proposed in this area. I note that this approach is consistent with Appendix B of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024.
- 7.2.8 While the density proposed is within the lower end of the density range, I am satisfied that it is acceptable in this instance given its location on the eastern boundary of Dunshaughlin.

Plot Ratio / Site Coverage

7.2.9 Policy DM OBJ 15 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027* provides a maximum plot ratio of 1 for development on the edge of town centres. The proposed development has a plot ratio of 0.7. This is acceptable.

7.2.10 Policy DM OBJ 16 requires that site coverage does not exceed 80%. This proposed development has a site coverage of 36%. This is considered to be acceptable.

Layout

7.2.11 The proposed development comprises of 94 No. dwellings set out in a mixture of detached, semi-detached, and terraced configurations. The proposal also includes a separate apartment building which contains 17 apartment (14 x 2 bed and 3 x 1 bed apartments). In broad terms, I am satisfied that the layout of the proposed development is acceptable, and it successfully integrates with the surrounding streetscape which is residential in character to the west and south.

Design

7.2.12 The proposed houses would have maximum heights of c. 9.7m and would be finished with a mixture of brick and smooth render. The overall design of the dwellings would be typical of a residential development at the periphery of a town such as Dunshaughlin and I am satisfied that; the design of the dwellings would not visually detract from the residential amenity of the surrounding area.

7.2.13 The proposed apartment block would have a height of c. 11.9m and would be finished in a mixture of brick, render, Upvc, Aluclad windows, doors, and rainwater goods. The proposed apartment block is located to the east of the site and fronts onto the route of the Dunshaughlin Inner Relief Road. I am satisfied that the design and location of the apartment building is acceptable and would provide for a reasonable urban edge to the Dunshaughlin Inner relief road.

7.2.14 The proposed creche building is one storey and would have a maximum height of c. 7m. The creche is located towards the eastern boundary of the site facing the route of the Dunshaughlin Inner Relief Road. I am satisfied that the design of the creche and its location is acceptable.

Quality of the proposed units

Houses

Unit Mix-houses

7.2.15 The mix of house units is set out in Table 2 above and I am satisfied that the mix of houses is acceptable, given the appeal sites location to the east of Dunshaughlin town centre.

Floor areas -houses

7.2.16 In assessing the proposed development including the Housing Quality Assessment submitted with the Further Information request, I note that all the dwellings exceed the minimum overall floor area requirements as set out in Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities: Design Guidelines 2023. This is considered to be acceptable.

Private open space-houses

7.2.17 Private open space to serve each of the dwellings is proposed by way of back gardens. The relevant private open space areas for the dwellings range between c.45m² to 83m² and therefore I am satisfied that the back gardens would comply with the minimum area standards set out in SPPR2 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024. This is considered to be acceptable.

Unit mix-Apartments

7.2.18 I note that the Apartment Guidelines have been updated and that the updated Guidelines are applicable to any application for planning permission and to any subsequent appeal or direct application to An Coimisiún Pleanála submitted after the issuing of the Guidelines, i.e., from 9th July 2025. In this case, the first party appeal was lodged on 3rd June 2025, therefore the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2023 (Apartment Guidelines) are applicable in this case.

7.2.19 The proposed mix comprises of 14 x 2 bed apartments and 3 x 1 bed apartments. This mix is considered to be acceptable and generally complies with the Apartment Guidelines. However, within the apartments it is noted that 6 of the apartments with Block K are 2 bed 3 person units. This represents c. 35% of the total apartments.

7.2.20 Paragraph 3.6 of the Apartment Guidelines states that planning authorities may consider two-bedroom apartments to accommodate 3 persons in apartment schemes

and that this type of unit may be particularly suited to certain social housing schemes such as sheltered housing. In this regard, I refer the Coimisiún to Drawing No. PL-302 which shows that the apartments in Block K are proposed to fulfil Part V requirements. Given that this element of the scheme is proposed for social housing, the apartment mix is considered to be acceptable and complies with the apartment guidelines.

Floor areas-Apartments

7.2.21 I note that 11 of the 17 proposed apartments exceed the minimum floor areas set out in the Apartment Guidelines by 10%. I am satisfied that the floor areas for the dwellings and apartments are acceptable. In addition to this, I note that all the apartments are dual aspect, and this would comply with the Apartment Guidelines

7.2.22 Finally, I note that a storage area for bulky items has been provided at ground floor level of the apartment building. The provision of a bulky goods store improves the residential amenity of the apartments for future residents and as such is considered to be acceptable.

Private Open Space-Apartments

I note that private open space ranges from 5m² to 7m² and I am satisfied that these areas would comply with the minimum standards set out in the Apartment Guidelines.

Communal Open Space-Apartments

7.2.23 Having regard to Appendix 1 of the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2023, the proposed development is required to provide a total of 116m² of communal open space for the apartments in Block K. An area of 120m² communal open space is proposed to the rear (west) of the apartment building. The area and location of the communal open space (which would be overlooked by the rear elevations of the apartment block) is considered to be acceptable.

Daylight to Apartments

7.2.24 The application material a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment and Shadow Analysis Report prepared by Douglas Wallace. This includes a study of spatial daylight analysis and a sunlight exposure to each apartment study.

7.2.25 With regard to spatial daylight, the apartment building achieves 100% of relevant habitable rooms (Bedrooms & Living/ Kitchen/ Dining Rooms) in all apartments in

Block K and as such will meet the BRE Guidelines Spatial Daylight Autonomy (SDA). In addition to this, 100% of the Apartments in Block K will meet the BRE Guidelines minimum Sunlight Exposure recommendations.

7.2.26 Having regard to the information provided in this report, I am satisfied that the apartments are acceptable.

Overall Scheme Landscaping – Public Open Space

7.2.27 The plans submitted with the Further Information response shown that an area of c.3,995m² is proposed within three separate areas to the north-west, north-east, and south of the site (adjacent to the apartment building). This would equate to 15.1% of the overall site area and as such would comply Policy and Objective 5.1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024. This area does not include an area which is identified as 'Additional Open space' which is shown in the area of the site which is zoned 'RA' and accommodates part of the western side of the Dunshaughlin Inner Relief Road and for the widening of Lagore Road.

Car /bicycle parking

7.2.28 I refer the Coimisiún to Drawing No. PL-004 which demonstrates that a total of 187 car parking spaces is proposed. This includes two car parking spaces for each of the 77 houses which are provided in curtilage. In addition to this one car parking space per apartment is provided in two areas to the north and south of the apartment block. This provision includes EV charging points at a rate of 1 for every 4 spaces. Finally, there are 10 spaces proposed for the creche and 6 visitor's spaces.

7.2.29 I am satisfied that the car parking provision is acceptable. The car parking for the houses complies with Table 3.8 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024 and the parking for the apartments complies with Section 4.24 of the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments 2023.

7.2.30 A total of 134 bicycle spaces are provided including 72 spaces for residential element of the proposal (the mid terrace dwellings and apartments), 50 visitor spaces and 14 spaces are provided for the creche. I am satisfied that the bicycle parking provision is acceptable.

Social Infrastructure

7.2.31 A Social Infrastructure Assessment is included in the application material (and amended by way of further information). This assessment concludes that there are adequate community, recreational and educational facilities existing or planned in the Dunshaughlin area to serve existing and future population growth. I am satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated that Dunshaughlin has adequate range of facilities to accommodate population growth in the area.

Creche

7.2.32 The proposed creche has an area of c. 160m² which would cater for c.32 children. The Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Childcare Facilities (2001) generally seeks that one childcare facility with places for 20 children shall be provided for each 75 family dwellings. Excluding the 1 bed apartments a total of 91 family residential units are proposed as part of this development. I am satisfied that the provision of a creche for 32 children would comply with the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Childcare Facilities (2001) and as such is satisfactory.

Ecology -Bats

7.2.33 The application material includes a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal prepared by Gannon and Associates which includes a Bat roost inspection. The report notes that the majority of trees within the proposed development site are to be retained as part of the proposed development. However, some mature ash trees associated with two internal field boundaries are to be removed as part of the proposed development. These trees have dense ivy cover, and therefore, adopting a precautionary principle, there is potential for some Bat roosts to be present on these trees. In the absence of mitigation, the direct loss of roosting bats would comprise a Short-term Moderate Negative effect on the local bat assemblage.

7.2.34 I note that there are a series of mitigation measures outlined as part of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, and I recommend that they should be conditioned as part of any decision to grant permission.

Archaeology

7.2.35 There are no protected structures or national monuments within the site boundary, the nearest noted monument is located approx. 545m east of the subject site. It is noted

as ME04199, Ring-ditch. Notwithstanding this, an archaeological Geophysical Survey Report was submitted with the application. The report recommends that the site be subjected to a programme of archaeological test excavation prior to commencement of any groundworks associated with the proposed development. This matter could be dealt with by way of condition.

Residential Amenity of surrounding properties

Overlooking

7.2.36 Having regard to the layout of the proposed development and the set back of proposed units, I do not have any concerns that the proposed development would lead to any undue overlooking either externally or within the proposed development. I have come to this conclusion having noted that the separation distances are generally greater than 16m as set out in SPPR1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024.

7.2.37 There is an exception to this, the setback between Block G and Block M to the east of the site are c. 15.8m. This is a marginal reduction from the standard set out in SPPR1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024 and I am satisfied that this is acceptable given that the vast majority of the scheme complies with SPPR1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024.

Overshadowing

7.2.38 The Daylight and Sunlight Assessment and Shadow Analysis Report demonstrates that the proposed development would not have a negligible effect on the daylight on neighbouring windows as no new structure subtends the 25' to the horizontal line. In addition to this, all public amenity open spaces will meet the BRE Guidelines for Sun on the Ground criteria, with all public open space areas achieving far greater than 50% of the area of open space receiving sunlight for at least 2 hours on 21st March.

7.2.39 The report includes a shadow analysis provided. The results of the Shadow Analysis demonstrates that the new development will meet BRE Criteria and will not have an adverse effect on adjacent private gardens/ amenity areas.

7.2.40 Overall, having regard to the foregoing, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not have an undue impact on the residential amenity of surrounding properties

by way of overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing development. In coming to this conclusion, I have had regard to layout of the proposed development, the separation distances from established residential to the west and the Daylight and Sunlight Assessment and Shadow Analysis Report submitted as part of the application material.

Traffic / Transportation

Traffic volumes

7.2.41 The application material includes a Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by NRB Consulting Engineers. The report notes that Lagore Road carries a weekday AM Peak Hour 2-way flow of approximately 116 vehicles and a weekday PM Peak Hour 2-Way flow of approximately 101 vehicles. This is considered to be lightly trafficked at present. The proposed development would generate 56 vehicle movements (2-way flow) during the morning and afternoon peaks (including the creche). The report concludes that the proposed development will have a negligible impact upon the established local traffic conditions and can easily be accommodated on the existing and approved roads network without any capacity concerns arising. Having considered this information and visited the site, I am satisfied that the proposed development, given its relatively small scale would not unduly increase traffic congestion in the area.

Access

7.2.42 Access to the proposed development is provided by way of a priority junction on Lagore Road. I refer the Coimisiún to Drawing No. NRB-TA-002 (within Appendix A of the Traffic Report) which shows that sightlines of 70m (with 3m setback) can be achieved in a westerly direction which has a speed limit of 50kmph. The drawing also shows a 160m sightline from the proposed access can be achieved in an easterly direction which has a speed limit which changes from 50kmph to 80kmph.

7.2.43 I have considered the proposed sightlines having regard to the TII document DN-GEO-03060 and I am satisfied that the sightlines comply with the visibility distances set out in Table 5.5 and therefore the proposed access is acceptable.

Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road

7.2.44 In broad terms I note that Objective DNS OBJ 9 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027* seeks to facilitate the completion of the Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road from the Dublin Road to the Lagore Road and on to the Red Bog Road to the east and south-east of the town. I am satisfied that the concept of the provision of 300m of the Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road within the appeal site would assist in achieving this objective and therefore would be a planning gain for Dunshaughlin as a whole.

7.2.45 In technical terms, I note that the Transportation Section of Meath County Council outlined concerns with respect to the junction of the Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road and the L-5029 did not comply with TL504 of the Cycle Design Manual. In addition to this, concerns were raised that the design of the Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road including the horizontal and vertical alignments, did not accord with DMURS. As a result of these concerns, further information was requested.

7.2.46 In response the applicants updated the design to comply with TL504 (a protected signal-controlled T-Junction) of the Cycle Design Manual. In this regard, I refer the Coimisiún to Drawing No. NRB-RFI-001 attached to the applicant's further information response. In addition to this, I refer the Coimisiún to Drawing No. NRB-RFI-002, which shows that the Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road is designed with 82m radii at bends. This is in accordance with Table 4.3 of DMURS for a 50km/h design speed with a superelevation of c.2.5%.

7.2.47 Having regard to the foregoing, I am satisfied that the design of the Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road is acceptable. I note that the Transportation section of Meath County Council did not object to the proposed development, post further information, subject to conditions.

7.3 Drainage Design (Reason No.1 for refusal)

7.3.1 The first reason for refusal states (inter alia) that the documentation submitted with the application and further information did not provide sufficient detail with respect to the proposed surface water system and that the proposed surface water system has significantly reduced cover depths for the majority of the proposed network which is not acceptable and that to rectify the cover depth issues, the applicant would have to significantly raise the proposed ground levels which would impact the proposed

finished floor levels, and road levels which would have a significant impact on the proposed development and site layout. It is further stated that proposed development is not in accordance with the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study (GDSDS) Regional Drainage Policies Volume 2, for New Developments and the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works Volume 6 and would therefore contravene INFPOL 16 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027*.

- 7.3.2 The first party states that the first reason for refusal could have been clarified / resolved by the Planning Authority by way of a Clarification of Further Information procedure. The first party further state that the Architects have confirmed that above-ground architectural redesign is not required, and drainage cover details could have been conditioned by the Planning Authority. In addition to this, the appeal response information / drawings prepared by GDSL Consulting Engineers demonstrate compliance with the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study, Regional Drainage Policies Volume 2, for New Developments and the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works Volume 2. An Independent Stormwater Audit has been carried out and the issues identified by the auditors are addressed for acceptance.
- 7.3.3 Having regard to reason No. 1 for refusal, I note the concerns of the local authority with respect to the level of detail relating to the stormwater system provided by the applicant at both application stage and further information stage. In this regard the first party appeal response includes updated surface water drainage drawings and an independent stormwater audit. I am satisfied the sufficient information has been provided to assess the stormwater drainage design.
- 7.3.4 I have considered policy INFPOL 16 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027* which seeks to ensure that all planning applications for new development have regard to the surface water management policies provided for in the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study. this regard, I refer the Coimisiún to Table 6.4 of the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study Volume 2 which shows minimum cover depths for surface water sewers or 1.2m under highways and 0.9m in all other areas.
- 7.3.5 In addition to this, Section 11.8.2 the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works Volume 6 recommends a minimum depth of cover over of a main pipeline is 1.2m and if this cannot be achieved, the pipes shall be fully surrounded in 150mm thick concrete with an absolute minimum depth of cover of 750mm.

- 7.3.6 I note there is a difference between the cover depths between the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study Volume 2 and the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works Volume 6. In my opinion, the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study Volume 2 is a more strategic policy guidance document, while the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works Volume 6 is a more pragmatic document which implements the policies of the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study Volume 2 while allowing for site specific conditions to be considered. In my opinion the figures provided in the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study Volume 2 are the most relevant to the proposed development.
- 7.3.5 I refer the Coimisiún to Drawing No, P2307-GDC-ZZ-XX-DR-C-1004 Rev P07 '*Surface Water Layout 'Civil'*' and Drawing P2307-GDC-ZZ-XX-DR-C-1009 Rev P03 '*Longitudinal Sections Through Surface Water Sewer (Civil)*' submitted with the first party appeal response. In the first instance, I make the Coimisiún aware that there would appear to be minor discrepancies between the drawings relating to a small number of figures outlining the Cover Level and Invert levels. However, I rely on the detailed figures provided on Drawing P2307-GDC-ZZ-XX-DR-C-1009 Rev P03 '*Longitudinal Sections Through Surface Water Sewer (Civil)*'.
- 7.3.6 Having considered the figures provided on Drawing No. P2307-GDC-ZZ-XX-DR-C-1009 Rev P03; I note that a cover level of above 750mm is achieved in all but one of the identified manhole points (s-13) and the majority of pipes are surrounded in 150mm concrete. In this regard, I am satisfied that the stormwater network provided with the first party appeal response would comply with Section 11.8.2 of the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works Volume 6.
- 7.3.7 In addition to this, I refer the Coimisiún to the Independent Stormwater Audit prepared by Punch Consulting Engineers which has been included with the appeal material. Table 2-1 of this report shows that the drainage system generally complies with the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works, Vol 6, apart from some details that should be agreed prior to commencement.
- 7.3.8 Notwithstanding the above, should the Coimisiún be of a mind to grant planning permission then I would recommend a condition which requires the stormwater drainage details to be agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

7.4 Southern Boundary / Ditch (Second reason for refusal)

- 7.4.1 The second reason for refusal states (inter alia) that due to the lack of a detailed assessment/design of the proposed drainage channel diversion, the Planning Authority is unable to determine whether a channel diversion is feasible in this instance and that a 10m buffer which would be required and that the proposal would, therefore, contravene policy INF POL22 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027.
- 7.4.2 The first party states that the southern boundary field drain is an excavated agricultural filed drainage ditch and is not a stream nor a recorded water course channel on any OPW mapping. The ditch is proposed to be filled in conjunction with the conversion of the use of the land from agricultural to residential in conformity with the zoning provisions.
- 7.4.4 In my opinion, there are three issues which need to be addressed namely the status of the southern ditch, whether the ditch preforms any flood defence function and whether the design of the ditch diversion is acceptable.

Status of the ditch along the southern boundary of the site

- 7.4.5 With regard to the status of the ditch along the southern boundary of the land, I note the concerns of the Local Authority that this ditch on the southern boundary of the land is a drainage channel which includes an unknow upstream catchment. However, I make the Coimisiún aware that I have consulted the 25' Tailte Eireann map (on the internal GIS mapping system and the EPA water maps at (gis.epa.ie/EPAMaps/Water and also at gis.epa.ie/EPAMaps/agriculture) and I am of the opinion that there is no evidence to suggest that the drain on the southern boundary of the land has been classified as a river, or a river waterbody of any kind.
- 7.4.6 In addition to this I note that the site is located above a Locally Important Aquifer-Bedrock which is Generally Moderately Productive. The GSI vulnerability of the site is between moderate (area to the west of the site) and low to the east of the site.

Channels/flood defence embankments

- 7.4.7 Policy INF POL 22 of *the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027* states that a 10 metres strip is required to be retained on either side of all channels/flood defence embankments where required. In addition to this, the report of the Environment

(Flooding) section of Meath County Council states that they cannot recommend that planning permission be granted from a flood risk perspective.

- 7.4.8 I have consulted the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for Dunshaughlin as set out in Volume 4 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027*. In this assessment the appeal site is not identified as being within Flood Zone A or Flood Zone B. In addition to this, the southern boundary ditch is not identified as being a channel or flood defence embankment. I also note that no streams or waterbodies are shown within the subject land.
- 7.4.9 With regard to Dunshaughlin the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment concludes that there is limited predicted fluvial flood risk in Dunshaughlin, and land use zoning is generally appropriate. Fluvial flooding from the Broadmeadow River mainly affects agricultural lands to the northeast of the settlement, it is also noted that the principal conflict with the Flood Zones is the E2 zoning to the west of the settlement. The appeal site is not affected by these conclusions.
- 7.4.10 In addition to the above, I refer the Coimisiún to the Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment prepared by GDCL Consulting Engineers submitted with the application. This assessment notes that the site is within Flood Zone C. However, the assessment notes that there is a moderate risk of pluvial flooding of the site and moderate risk of flooding of the site due to the potential surcharging and blockage of the new drainage network. The assessment sets out a number of mitigation measures to address residual flood risks.
- 7.4.11 I note that the 'The Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities' outlines that riparian strips should be preserved along river channels (Section 4.25 refers) and for river maintenance (Section 5.7 refers). I am satisfied that the ditches are not rivers or channels as previously discussed.
- 7.4.12 Having considered all the foregoing, I am satisfied that a 10m strip is not required in this case, as the appeal site is not within Flood Zone A or B and the southern boundary is not identified as a channel/flood defence embankments in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for Dunshaughlin.

Ditch Diversion Design

7.4.13 I note that the diversion of the southern boundary ditch is required to serve both the residential development and for the drainage associated with the delivery of the 300m long section of the Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road to the east of the site. From an inspection of the reports on file, It would appear that the planning authority does not oppose the diversion of the southern boundary *per se*, however there are concerns that the applicant has not clearly demonstrated that it is possible to divert the existing drainage channel in a northly direction alongside the new link road and then in a westerly direction along the Lagore road in accordance with the relevant guidelines and installed with acceptable separation distances.

7.4.14 The first party appeal includes a detailed assessment and design which provides an engineering justification for the proposed interception / diversion of the ditch at the southern boundary of the land. I refer the Board to Appendix B of the first party appeal submission and drawing No. P2307-GDC-ZZ-XX-DR-C-1004 Rev P07 '*Surface Water Layout 'Civil'*'.

7.4.15 It is noted that the southern ditch will be filled with a 375mm filter drain (perforated pipe wrapped in permeable geotextile inside). The purpose of this is to mimic the ditched land drainage function of the rear adjacent fields.

7.4.16 With regard to the drainage for the Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road to the east of the site, the plans show a 225mm interceptor pipe to the east of the road. This pipe outfalls into the drain along Lagore Road to the north of the site. In addition to this there is a separate 350mm filter drain along the east of the road which outfalls into the detention basin to the north-east of the site.

7.4.17 I note that the first party appeal suggests that as the 300m section of the Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road is not required to service the proposed development that it could be omitted from the scheme or ceded to the local authority by way of condition. This section of road could then be designed by the local authority under Part 8 procedures. In my opinion, this arrangement would not be in the interests of orderly planning, as a road design has been prepared, proceeded through the planning process and the Local Authority (including the Transportation Section) have no objection to such. In my opinion commencing this process from the start to facilitate a Part 8 procedure does not represent an efficient use of the planning process. Therefore, I recommend that

the Coimisiún decide on the application as set out in the application and first party appeal.

7.4.18 Having considered the plans and report submitted in the first party appeal, I am satisfied that adequate provision for the diversion of the southern ditch has been demonstrated. Notwithstanding this, should the Coimisiún be of a mind to grant planning permission then I would recommend a condition which requires the details with respect to the southern ditch and drainage for the Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road to be agreed with the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

8 AA Screening

8.1 I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The proposed development is located to the east of Dunshaughlin Town. The proposal comprises of the construction of 94 residential units, creche facility and all associated site works. Following an Appropriate Assessment Screening exercise, it has been determined that the proposed development, individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not adversely affect the integrity of the Malahide Estuary SAC (Site Code 000205), Malahide Estuary SPA (Site Code 004025), River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (site code: 002299), the River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (site code: 004232) or the Rye Water Valley/Cartron SAC (001398).

8.2 This determination is based on:

- There is no source-pathway-receptor connectivity in the case of River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (site code: 002299), the River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (site code: 004232) or the Rye Water Valley/Cartron SAC (001398).
- The considerable downstream distance and associated dilution factor between the proposed development and the SPA, the nature of the qualifying interests of the SPA, the nature of the proposed works and the presence of existing barriers to the movement of pollutants to any watercourse in the case of the Malahide Estuary SPA (Site Code 004025) and the Malahide Estuary SAC (Site Code 000205).

See Appendix 2 for further details.

9 Recommendation

9.1 I recommend that planning permission be granted.

10 Reasons and Considerations

10.1 Having regard to the provisions of the residential zoning objective of the subject site, its location in proximity to Dunshaughlin Town Centre and to the nature and scale of the proposed development, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area or property in the vicinity and would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety, surface water design and flooding. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application on 12th of August 2024, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 27th of March 2025, 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.

Reason: In the interest of clarity

2. The permitted creche shall be included within Phase 1 of the development.

Reason: To ensure the timely provision of services, for the benefit of the occupants of the proposed dwellings.

3. Prior to the commencement of development:
4. a) Mitigation and monitoring measures outlined in the plans and particulars, including the Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment and the Revised Ecological Impact Assessment submitted with this application shall be carried out in full, except where otherwise required by conditions attached to this permission.

b) the developer shall submit a comprehensive list of mitigation and monitoring measures from the named reports and a corresponding timeline/ schedule for implementation of same to the planning authority for its written agreement.

c) the developer shall obtain an updated Confirmation of Feasibility for the development.

Reason: In the interest of protecting the environment, public health, and clarity.

5. No development shall commence on the site until such time as the following have been agreed and complied with:
 - (a) A storm water drainage plan and storm water management plan are agreed to in writing with the planning authority.
 - (b) Detailed designs and calculations (including pipe sizes, manhole sizes and pipe gradients) of the diversion of the southern ditch and drainage for the

Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road are agreed in writing by the planning authority.

(c) Detailed designs for all road widening and footpath works to Lagore Road are agreed in writing by the planning authority.

(d) Detailed designs for the section of the Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road within the site and including the junction and traffic light signalling with Lagore Road are agreed in writing with the planning authority.

(e) Requirements of Meath County Council's Roads Design Section, Environment Section, Public Lighting Section and Broadband Officer are agreed in writing.

(f) All amenity/open spaces, roads, footpaths, public lighting, water, and wastewater services shall be completed in accordance with the standards and conditions set out in the Departmental publication Recommendations for Site Development Works for Housing Areas, except where superseded .

(e) Drainage arrangements, including the disposal and attenuation of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Full details shall be agreed with the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development and all works shall be completed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority prior to the occupation of any house within the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of roads and traffic safety, protection of the natural environment, public health and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

6. Prior to commencement of development and/ or occupation of the residential units, as applicable, a final Road Safety Audit(s) and/ or Quality Audit(s) of the

development, including the main entrance, internal road, and path layouts, shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of sustainable transportation, and traffic and pedestrian safety.

7. The site shall be landscaped in accordance with a comprehensive scheme of landscaping, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of 5 [five] years from the completion of the development [or until the development is taken in charge by the local authority, whichever is the sooner], shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.

8. The area shown as public open space on the lodged plans shall be reserved for such use. The public open space shall be completed and fully landscaped before any of the dwellings are made available for occupation and shall be maintained as public open space by the developer.

Reason: In the interest of the amenities of the occupants of the proposed housing

9. Proposals for a naming / numbering scheme and associated signage shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, all signs, and apartment numbers, shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme. The proposed names shall be based on local historical or topographical features, or other alternatives acceptable to the planning authority. No advertisements/marketing signage relating to the name(s) of the development shall be erected until the developer

has obtained the planning authority's written agreement to the proposed name(s).

Reason: In the interest of urban legibility and to ensure the use of locally appropriate place names for new residential areas.

10. a) Prior to the commencement of the development as permitted, the applicant or any person with an interest in the land shall enter into an agreement with the planning authority (such agreement must specify the number and location of each house), pursuant to Section 47 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, that restricts all relevant residential units permitted, to first occupation by individual purchasers i.e. those not being a corporate entity, and/or by those eligible for the occupation of social and/or affordable housing, including cost rental housing.

(b) An agreement pursuant to Section 47 shall be applicable for the period of duration of the planning permission, except where after not less than two years from the date of completion of each specified housing unit, it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the planning authority that it has not been possible to transact each of the residential units for use by individual purchasers and/or to those eligible for the occupation of social and/or affordable housing, including cost rental housing.

(c) The determination of the planning authority as required in (b) shall be subject to receipt by the planning and housing authority of satisfactory documentary evidence from the applicant or any person with an interest in the land regarding the sales and marketing of the specified housing units, in which case the planning authority shall confirm in writing to the applicant or any person with an interest in the land that the Section 47 agreement has been terminated and that

the requirement of this planning condition has been discharged in respect of each specified housing unit.

Reason: To restrict new housing development to use by persons of a particular class or description in order to ensure an adequate choice and supply of housing, including affordable housing, in the common good.

11. The developer shall enter into water and wastewater connection agreements with Uisce Eireann, prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of public health

12. All service cables associated with the proposed development, such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television, shall be located underground. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity

13. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity

14. Prior to the commencement of any works associated with the development hereby permitted, the developer shall submit a detailed Construction

Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for the written agreement of the planning authority. The CEMP shall incorporate details for the following:

- (i) Measures to ensure that there no pollutants including dust and hydrocarbons enter any of the drains on the land.
- (ii) collection and disposal of construction waste,
- (ii) surface water run-off from the site,
- (iii) on-site road construction, and
- (iv) environmental management measures during construction including working hours, noise control, dust and vibration control and monitoring of such measures.

A record of daily checks that the construction works are being undertaken in accordance with the CEMP shall be kept at the construction site office for inspection by the planning authority. The agreed CEMP shall be implemented in full in the carrying out of the development.

Reason: In the interest of environmental protection, residential amenities, public health & safety, and environmental protection.

15. Construction and demolition waste shall be managed in accordance with a construction waste and demolition management plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall be prepared in accordance with the 'Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects,' published by the Environmental Protection Agency in 2021.

Reason: In the interest of sustainable waste management.

16. A detailed construction traffic management plan shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of

development. The plan shall include details of arrangements for routes for construction traffic, parking during the construction phase, the location of the compound for storage of plant and machinery and the location for storage of deliveries to the site.

Reason: In the interest of sustainable transport and safety.

15. a) All ground works associated with the proposed development shall be monitored under licence by a suitably qualified archaeologist. Prior to construction all previously identified archaeological features and deposits should be conserved by record (full excavation) prior to any ground works under the terms of an agreed Method Statement agreed by the Department. All topsoil stripping associated with the archaeological monitoring should be carried out using a toothless flat grading bucket only.

b) Should further archaeological material be found during the course of works, the work on the site shall be stopped pending a decision as to how best to deal with the archaeology. The developer shall be prepared to be advised by the Department with regard to any necessary mitigating action (e.g., preservation in situ, or excavation) and should facilitate the archaeologist in recording any material found.

Reason: To ensure the continued preservation (either in situ or by record) of places, caves, sites, features, or other objects of archaeological interest

16. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer, or, in default of such agreement, the

matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

17. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or other security to secure the provision and satisfactory completion of roads, footpaths, watermains, drains, open space and other services required in connection with the development, coupled with an agreement empowering the local authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory completion of any part of the development. The form and amount of the security shall be as agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion of the development.

18. Prior to commencement of development, the applicant or other person with an interest in the land to which the application relates shall enter into an agreement in writing with the planning authority in relation to the provision of housing in accordance with the requirements of section 94(4) and section 96(2) and (3) (Part V) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, unless an exemption certificate shall have been applied for and been granted under section 97 of the Act, as amended. Where such an agreement is not reached within eight weeks from the date of this order, the matter in dispute (other than a matter to which section 96(7) applies) may be referred by the planning authority or any other prospective party to the agreement to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Part V of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and of the housing strategy in the development plan of the area.

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

Ronan Murphy
Planning Inspector

11th September 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-322670-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of 94 residential units, creche facility and all associated site works.
Development Address	Lands at Lagore Road, Dunshaughlin, Co. Meath
	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? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project.' Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> 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)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input type="checkbox"/> 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?	
<input type="checkbox"/> 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.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	<p>Part 2 Class 10 (b) (i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units. The proposed development is for 94 dwellings.</p> <p>Part 2 Class 10 (b) (iv). The site is 3.66ha which is substantially lower than the threshold.</p> <p>Part 2 Class 10 (dd). All private roads which would exceed 2000 metres in length. The proposed development does not include for a private road.</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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 2 – AA Screening Determination

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

I have considered the proposal for the construction of 94 residential units, creche facility and all associated site works in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The application material includes an Appropriate Assessment-Natura Impact Assessment Screening report prepared by Gannon and Associates.

Screening summary

The Appropriate Assessment Screening report identifies 5 Natura 2000 designated sites within 22km of the application site.

The proposed development is identified as being within the Zone of Influence of Malahide Estuary SAC (Site Code 000205), Malahide Estuary SPA (Site Code 004025), River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (Site Code 002299), River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (Site Code 004232), Rye Water Valley/Cartron SAC (Site Code 0013980).

Malahide Estuary SAC

This site is located c. 21.5km to the east of the appeal site. A site-specific conservation objective has been developed for Malahide Estuary SAC (Site Code 000205) which can be summarised as *to maintain the favourable conservation condition of Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide, Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand, Mediterranean salt meadows (Juncetalia maritimi)*, in the Malahide Estuary SAC. Site-specific conservation objectives also include *to restore the favourable conservation condition of Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritimae), Shifting dunes along the shoreline with Ammophila arenaria ('white dunes') and fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation ('grey dunes')* in the Malahide Estuary SAC. This site was screened out as there was no source-pathway-receptor connectivity between the appeal site and the SAC.

Malahide Estuary SPA (Site Code 004025)

This site is located c. 21.9km to the east of the appeal site. A site-specific conservation objective has been developed for Malahide Estuary SPA (Site Code 004025) which can be summarised as to maintain the favourable conservation condition of Light-bellied Brent Goose, Shelduck, Pintail, Goldeneye, Red-breasted Merganser, Oystercatcher, Golden Plover, Grey Plover, Knot, Dunlin, Black-tailed Godwit, Bar-tailed Godwit, Redshank and the wetland habitat in Malahide Estuary SPA as a resource for the regularly-occurring migratory waterbirds. This site was screened out as the existing overgrown drainage ditches on-site comprise a natural buffer to the movement of any potential surface waters containing pollutants and due to there being no hydrological pathway for impact during the operational phase of the proposed development.

River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (Site Code 002299)

This site is located c. 13.2km to the north-west of the appeal site. A site-specific conservation objective has been developed for the *River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (Site Code 002299)* which can be summarised as to maintain the favourable conservation condition of Alkaline fens, Alluvial forests with *Alnus glutinosa* and *Fraxinus excelsior* (*Alno-Padion*, *Alnion incanae*, *Salicion albae*), River Lamprey (*Lampetra fluviatilis*), Atlantic Salmon (*Salmo salar*) and Otter (*Lutra lutra*) in the River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC. This site was screened out as there is no source-pathway-receptor connectivity between the proposed development and the SAC. There is no potential for impact.

River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (004232)

This site is located c. 13.2km to the north-west of the appeal site. A site-specific conservation objective has been developed for the *River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (004232)* which can be summarised as to maintain the Favourable conservation condition of Kingfisher in the River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA. This site was screened out as there is no source-pathway-receptor connectivity between the proposed development and the SPA. There is no potential for impact.

Rye Water Valley/Carton SAC (Site Code 001398)

This site is located c. 13.9km to the south of the appeal site. A site-specific conservation objective has been developed for the *Rye Water Valley/Carton SAC (Site Code 001398)* which can be summarised as to restore the favourable conservation condition of Petrifying springs with tufa formation (*Cratoneurion*), Narrow-mouthed Whorl Snail (*Vertigo angustior*) and to maintain the favourable conservation condition of Desmoulin's Whorl Snail (*Vertigo moulinsiana*). This site was screened out as there is no source-pathway-receptor connectivity between the proposed development and the SAC. There is no potential for impact.

In Combination Effects

The Appropriate Assessment Screening Report also considered planning applications in proximity to the appeal site and considered Reg. Ref. 2360181 which comprises of an LRD which comprises of modifications to a permitted SHD 232 residential units and neighbourhood centre.

The Appropriate Assessment Screening Report does not come to any conclusion with respect to in combination effects. I make the Coimisiún aware that I have reviewed the Appropriate Assessment Screening Report, the Department of Housing, Local Government and heritage's National Planning Application database and the Meath County Council's planning register, and I am satisfied that all appropriate planning applications have been considered and that there is no in-combination effects associated with the proposed and surrounding developments, having regard to drainage provision and mitigation measures outlined within that application.

The Appropriate Assessment Screening Report concludes that upon the examination, analysis and evaluation of the relevant information including, in particular, the nature of the proposed development and the likelihood of significant effects on any Natura 2000 sites, in addition to considering possible in-combination effects, and applying the precautionary principles, it is concluded by the authors of this report that, on the basis of objective information; the possibility may be excluded that the proposed development will have a significant effect on any European sites.

Appropriate Assessment Conclusion

The proposed development has been considered in light of the assessment requirements of Sections 177U and 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

Following an Appropriate Assessment Screening exercise, it has been determined that the proposed development, individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not adversely affect the integrity of the European site No's: 000205, 004025, 002299, 004232 and 001398 or any other European site, in view of the sites' Conservation Objectives.

This conclusion is based on a complete assessment of all aspects of the proposed project and there is no reasonable doubt as to the absence of adverse effects.

Form 3 - EIA Screening Determination Form

A. CASE DETAILS

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-322670-25	
Development Summary	Construction of 94 residential units, creche facility and all associated site works.	
	Yes / No / N/A	Comment (if relevant)
1. Was a Screening Determination carried out by the PA?	Yes	EIA not required.
2. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?	Yes	
3. Has an AA screening report or NIS been submitted?	Yes	An Appropriate Assessment screening report was submitted with the application material. An Appropriate Assessment was screened out, I would concur with this conclusion, refer to Appendix 2 of my report.
4. Is a IED/ IPC or Waste Licence (or review of licence) required from the EPA? If YES has the EPA commented on the need for an EIAR?	N/A	
5. Have any other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment which have a significant bearing on the project been carried out pursuant to other relevant Directives – for example SEA		SEA and AA were undertaken in respect of the <i>Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027</i>

B. EXAMINATION	Yes/ No/ Uncertain	<p>Briefly describe the nature and extent and Mitigation Measures (where relevant)</p> <p>(having regard to the probability, magnitude (including population size affected), complexity, duration, frequency, intensity, and reversibility of impact)</p> <p>Mitigation measures –Where relevant specify features or measures proposed by the applicant to avoid or prevent a significant effect.</p>	<p>Is this likely to result in significant effects on the environment?</p> <p>Yes/ No/ Uncertain</p>
<p>This screening examination should be read with, and in light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith</p>			
<p>1. Characteristics of proposed development (including demolition, construction, operation, or decommissioning)</p>			
<p>1.1 Is the project significantly different in character or scale to the existing surrounding or environment?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The site has an area of c.3.6ha is currently a greenfield site which is in agricultural use and is enclosed by hedgerows and drainage ditches to the south and west and a hedging to the east and is located to the east of Dunshaughlin town centre. The site is relatively flat and is currently vacant and is bound by established residential development to the west and emerging residential development to the south and agriculture to</p>	<p>No</p>

		the east and north (on the opposite side of Lagore Road).	
1.2 Will construction, operation, decommissioning or demolition works cause physical changes to the locality (topography, land use, waterbodies)?	No	The appeal site is relatively flat, greenfield site and the proposed residential and creche development would result in minimal change in the locality, with standard measures to address potential impacts on surface water and groundwaters in the locality. Uses proposed are consistent with land uses in the area.	No
1.3 Will construction or operation of the project use natural resources such as land, soil, water, materials/minerals or energy, especially resources which are non-renewable or in short supply?	No	Construction materials will be typical for residential development of this nature and scale. The loss of natural resources because of the development are not regarded as significant in nature.	No
1.4 Will the project involve the use, storage, transport, handling or production of substance which would be harmful to human health or the environment?	No	Construction activities will require the use of potentially harmful materials, such as fuels and other such substances. Use of such materials would be typical for construction sites. Any impacts would be local and temporary in nature and the implementation of standard construction practice measures as	No

		set out in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and the Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan (CDWMP) as required by conditions would satisfactorily mitigate potential impacts. No operational impacts in this regard are anticipated.	
1.5 Will the project produce solid waste, release pollutants or any hazardous / toxic / noxious substances?	No	Construction activities will require the use of potentially harmful materials, such as fuels and other similar substances and give rise to waste for disposal. The use of these materials would be typical for construction sites. Noise and dust emissions during construction are likely. Such construction impacts would be local and temporary in nature, and with the implementation of the standard measures outlined in the CEMP and the CDWMP as required by conditions, the project would satisfactorily mitigate the potential impacts. Operational waste would be managed through a waste management plan to obviate potential environmental impacts. Foul water will	No

		discharge to the public network. Other operational impacts in this regard are not anticipated to be significant.	
1.6 Will the project lead to risks of contamination of land or water from releases of pollutants onto the ground or into surface waters, groundwater, coastal waters or the sea?	No	Operation of the standard measures listed in the CEMP and the CDWMP will satisfactorily mitigate emissions from spillages during construction and operation. The operational development will connect to mains services and discharge surface waters only after passing through SUDS. Surface water drainage will be separate to foul services within the site. The CEMP required by conditions will contain mitigation measures to prevent the release of pollutants into surface waters from the site.	No
1.7 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	No	There is potential for construction activity to give rise to noise and vibration emissions. Such emissions will be localised and short term in nature, and their impacts would be suitably mitigated by the operation of standard measures listed in the CEMP No operational impacts in this regard are anticipated.	No

1.8 Will there be any risks to human health, for example due to water contamination or air pollution?	No	Construction activity is likely to give rise to dust emissions and surface water runoff. Such construction impacts would be temporary and localised in nature and the application of standard measures within the CEMP would satisfactorily address potential risks on human health. No significant operational impacts are anticipated.	No
1.9 Will there be any risk of major accidents that could affect human health or the environment?	No	No significant risk is predicted having regard to the nature and scale of the development. The site is not at risk from flooding Any risk arising from construction will be localised and temporary in nature. There are no Seveso/COMAH sites in the vicinity.	No
1.10 Will the project affect the social environment (population, employment)	No	Development of this site would result in an increase in residential occupation in this area as envisaged in the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027. This is considered to be a positive social impact.	
1.11 Is the project part of a wider large-scale change that could result in cumulative effects on the environment?	No	The appeal site is located within an area of Dunshaughlin which has undergone	No

		significant residential development in recent years. The proposal comprises of a residential development on residentially zoned land and as such is compatible with surrounding uses and is not a change from that permitted in the surrounding area.	
2. Location of proposed development			
2.1 Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining or have the potential to impact on any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - European site (SAC/ SPA/ pSAC/ pSPA) - NHA/ pNHA - Designated Nature Reserve - Designated refuge for flora or fauna - Place, site or feature of ecological interest, the preservation/conservation/ protection of which is an objective of a development plan/ LAP/ draft plan or variation of a plan 	No	There are no European designated sites within the immediate vicinity of the site. There are 8 (SPA'S, SAC'S and pNHA'S) within 23km of the site. There are no Source-Pathway-Receptor links with any of the sites.	No
2.2 Could any protected, important or sensitive species of flora or fauna which use areas on or around the site, for example: for breeding,	No	The application material included a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal which includes a Bat Survey. This survey noted that there are no records of bat species within 2km of the appeal site. A number of	No

nesting, foraging, resting, over-wintering, or migration, be affected by the project?		bats were observed within 10km of the site. The appeal site is located in an area which is classified as being medium suitability for bats. The trees on site were observed to be immature and with no potential to support bat roosts. Mitigation measures outlined as part of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal would satisfactorily address potential risks.	
2.3 Are there any other features of landscape, historic, archaeological, or cultural importance that could be affected?	No	No. There are no protected structures or archaeological features within the site.	No
2.4 Are there any areas on/around the location which contain important, high quality or scarce resources which could be affected by the project, for example: forestry, agriculture, water/coastal, fisheries, minerals?	No	No such features are in this urban location.	No
2.5 Are there any water resources including surface waters, for example: rivers, lakes/ponds, coastal or groundwaters which could be affected by the project, particularly in terms of their volume and flood risk?	No	The appeal site is within Flood Zone C and the possibility of flooding is low.	No

2.6 Is the location susceptible to subsidence, landslides or erosion?	No	No	No
2.7 Are there any key transport routes (e.g. National primary Roads) on or around the location which are susceptible to congestion or which cause environmental problems, which could be affected by the project?	No	<p>There are no key transport routes on or around the location at the present time. However, the proposed development includes a 300m stretch of the Dunshaughlin Eastern Relief Road. A Transport and Traffic Assessment was included with the application material. The Transport and Traffic Assessment includes a Traffic Management Plan which includes mitigation measures for the construction phase of the proposed development.</p> <p>In addition to this, the Transport and Traffic Assessment concluded that traffic associated with the operational phase of the development would not have a significant impact on the surrounding road network.</p>	No
2.8 Are there existing sensitive land uses or community facilities (such as hospitals, schools etc) which could be affected by the project?	No	No.	No

3. Any other factors that should be considered which could lead to environmental impacts

3.1 Cumulative Effects: Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulative effects during the construction/ operation phase?	No	The Appropriate Assessment Screening Report submitted with the application identifies an LRD application for 232 residential units and neighbourhood centre to the south of the appeal site. I am satisfied that there are no in-combination effects associated with the development. Given the mitigation measures within the required CEMP and CDWMP the proposal would not result in cumulative effects during the construction / operation phase.	No
3.2 Transboundary Effects: Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects?	No	No	No
3.3 Are there any other relevant considerations?	No	No	No
C. CONCLUSION			
No real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EIAR Not Required	
Real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	EIAR Required	

