



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-322756-25

Development	Demolition of existing structures, construction of a dwelling and all site works.
Location	Creevagh House, Girley, Fordstown, Co. Meath
Planning Authority	Meath County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560292
Applicant(s)	Patrick and Mikaela Dillon
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse permission
Type of Appeal	First Paty v. Refusal
Appellant(s)	Patrick and Mikaela Dillon
Observer(s)	Bernard Dillon
Date of Site Inspection	12/9/25
Inspector	Ronan Murphy

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located on the southern side of Girley Road (L-6836) in the rural town land of Girley which is located c.16km to the west of Navan in County Meath.
- 1.2. The appeal site has a stated area of 1.421ha and is located within an overall land holding within the ownership of the applicant of c.25ha. The site has a predominantly rectangular shape and has a road frontage of c.180m.
- 1.3. The appeal site includes an existing detached five bay two storey dwelling which includes a single storey and a two-storey annex to the rear. The rear of the dwelling faces the Girley Road at close proximity while the front of the dwelling faces into mature gardens within the appeal site. In addition to this, there a number of outbuildings set out in a courtyard formation to the west of the dwelling.
- 1.4. The site is bounded by Girley Road to the north, an existing dwelling to the east and open fields / agriculture to the south and west.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises of the following:

Extensions to existing dwelling

Alterations to the roof and facades of the existing single/two storey rear annex to the North-west side of the house.

- New two-storey extensions to the North-east and South-west sides of the house, a new conservatory at the North-east side including all related internal and external alterations to the house. The extended area would increase the floor area of the house from c.171m² to 440m² and would have a height of c. 7.9m.
- Demolition of existing shed to the west of the dwelling to facilitate the western element of the extension.

New dwelling

- The construction of a new single storey family cottage to the South-east side of the existing yard. The proposed dwelling would have a floor area of 60m² and would have a maximum height of 5.3m (to the top of chimney).

New access

- Alterations to the existing site entrances including upgrading the existing gateway on the West end and the provision of a new avenue, together with all associated landscaping and site works including.

Ancillary

- Decommissioning the existing septic tank and the provision of new proprietary wastewater treatment.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By order dated 16th May 2025, the planning authority decided to refuse planning permission for the proposed development, for 4 no. reasons as set out below:

- 1. The proposed development is located within a “Strong Rural Area” where it is a requirement for applicants to (i) comply with the Local Needs Qualifying Criteria as outlined in Section 9.4 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 and to (ii) demonstrate a rural housing need. It is considered that the local needs of the applicants are not relevant to this application as they are not the intended future occupants of the proposed cottage. It is intended for the applicant’s parents to live in the proposed cottage and as such it is their local needs that have to be assessed. Whilst it is noted that a local need form has been submitted it is considered that the applicant has failed to provide robust evidence in support of their parent’s local needs and hence the Planning Authority is not satisfied that a rural housing need in accordance with the above provisions of the plan has been established. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the policy RD POL 1 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 and the Sustainable*

Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area and would establish a very undesirable future precedent.

- 2. It is an objective of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 that all house extension applications be of “high quality design which respects, harmonises and integrates with the existing dwelling in terms of height, scale, materials used, finishes, window proportions etc” (DM OBJ 50) Having regard to the design of the proposed extension, in particular its excessive scale, excessive bulk, inconsistent finishes and inconsistency with the vernacular character of the existing dwelling and would materially contravene objective **DM OBJ 50** of the Meath County Development Plan, 2021-2027. The proposal therefore would not be in the interest of the visual amenities of the area, would set an undesirable precedent for future development of this kind, and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*
- 3. It is a policy of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 to, “To encourage the retention, sympathetic maintenance and sustainable re-use of historic buildings, including vernacular dwellings or farm buildings and the retention of historic streetscape character, fabric, detail and features”, (HER POL 21) and it is an objective of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027, “To ensure that conversions or extensions of traditional buildings or the provision of new adjoining buildings, are sensitively designed and do not detract from the character of the historic building”, (HER OBJ 23). Having regard to the design of the proposed extension, it is considered that the design would be unsympathetic and seriously detract from the existing vernacular character of the dwelling and will be visually dominant and would be incapable of being satisfactorily assimilated into its surroundings, unduly prominent and obtrusive in this rural landscape and would materially contravene policy **HER POL 21** and objective **HER OBJ 23** of the Meath County Development Plan, 2021-2027. The proposal therefore would not be in the interest of the visual amenities of the area, would set an undesirable precedent for future development of this kind, and*

would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

4. *It is a policy of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027, “To require all applications for rural houses to comply with the ‘Meath Rural House Design Guide’”, (RD POL 9). The proposed development is located in a rural area where the pattern of development is characterised by low-density housing on road frontage sites. Having regard to the siting of the proposed cottage dwelling it is considered that the cottage is built to the rear of the existing building line which has been set by the existing dwelling and it is considered that its siting behind the existing agricultural buildings results in back-land development, furthermore the site is also to be accessed via a new entrance which will result in a large sweeping driveway all contrary to the Meath Rural Design guide; therefore it is considered that the proposed siting is considered to be out of context with the nature of existing development in the area and is contrary to RD POL 9 of the Meath County Development Plan, 2021-2027 and if permitted would constitute unacceptable and haphazard development and if permitted would result in a poor standard of residential amenity for the intended occupants, would impact on the residential amenity of the existing dwelling and adjoining properties, would depreciate the value of the adjoining properties and set an undesirable precedent for future development in the area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

There is one planning report on file dated 16th May 2025. The area planners report notes that the appeal site is located within the RA ‘Rural Area’ Zone and is within a Strong Rural Area. The area planners report highlights concern with respect to the local needs of the applicants’ parents with respect to the proposed single storey cottage proposed on the land. In addition to this, the area planner outlines concern with respect to the impact of the proposed extension on the main dwelling on the land

which has a strong vernacular character. In addition to this, the area planners report states that the siting of the proposed cottage and the driveway would not comply with RD POL 9 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027*. Given these concerns refusal was recommended.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- **Transportation Department:** Report dated 1/5/25 outlining no objection, subject to conditions.
- **Environmental Wastewater Section:** Report dated 15/5/25 outlining no objection, subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1 There are no responses from prescribed bodies on file.

4.0 Planning History

4.1 There is no planning history associated with the appeal site.

Surrounding area

Reg. Ref. 23208. Application to construct a single-storey dwelling, detached domestic garage & store, install a proprietary wastewater treatment system and all associated site development works. Permission granted, subject to conditions.

In this case, the permitted bungalow is on an elevated site to the north of Girley Road.

Reg. Ref. 212294. Application for the demolition of an existing single storey rear extension and the construction of a new 2-storey part side, part rear extension to an existing 2-storey residential dwelling. The development also consists of the installation of a new proprietary wastewater treatment system and percolation area, landscaping and all ancillary site works. Permission granted, subject to conditions.

In this case, the permitted extension increased the floor area of the dwelling from 101m² to 206m².

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 within the RA Rural Area Zone in an area identified as being a strong rural area.

5.1.2 Relevant policies and objectives include:

RDPOL1 which seeks to ensure that individual house developments in rural areas satisfy the housing requirements of persons who are an intrinsic part of the rural community in which they are proposed.

RDPOL9: which seeks to require all applications for rural houses to comply with the 'Meath Rural House Design Guide'

RDPOL38: which seeks to ensure that all development accessing off the county's road network is at a location and carried out in a manner which would not endanger public safety by way of a traffic hazard.

RDPOL43: which seeks to ensure that the required standards for sight distances and stopping sight distances are in compliance with current road geometry standards.

RDPOL48: which seeks to ensure all septic tank/proprietary treatment plants and polishing filter/percolation areas satisfy the criteria set out in the Environmental Protection Agency 'Code of Practice Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10)' (2021) (or any other updated code of practice guidelines).

***HER POL 21:** which seeks encourage the retention, sympathetic maintenance and sustainable re-use of historic buildings, including vernacular dwellings or farm buildings and the retention of historic streetscape character, fabric, detail and features.

***HER OBJ 23:** which seeks to ensure that conversions or extensions of traditional buildings or the provision of new adjoining buildings, are sensitively designed and do not detract from the character of the historic building.

***DM OBJ 50:** which seeks to ensure that all applications for residential extensions in urban and rural areas shall comply with a number of criteria including (inter alia)

- High quality design which respects, harmonises, and integrates with the existing dwelling in terms of height, scale, materials used, finishes, window proportions, etc.
- Impact on amenities of adjacent residents, in terms of light and privacy

*** The Planning Authority considered that the proposed development would materially contravene these policies and objectives.**

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

5.2.1 National Policy Objective (NPO) 28 states it is an objective to ensure, in providing for the development of rural housing, that a distinction is made between areas under urban influence, i.e. within the commuter catchment of cities and large towns and centres of employment, and elsewhere.

- In rural areas under urban influence, facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on the core consideration of demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area and siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements
- In rural areas elsewhere, facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements.

5.2 Design Manual for Quality Housing

5.2.2.1 The intention of this manual is to give guidance on the design of residential site layouts, and on the design of internal layouts of new apartments and houses. The manual is predominantly aimed at local authorities, Approved Housing Bodies and their consultants, who are involved with the design of social housing and with delivering individual social housing developments or larger mixed-tenure developments.

5.3 Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines

5.3.1 Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2005

5.3.1.1 The subject site is located within an area identified as 'Area under strong urban influences' as shown on Map 1: Indicative Outline of the NSS rural area types in the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2005. The Guidelines note that in these areas the objective should be to consolidate and sustain the stability of the population and in particular to strike the appropriate balance between development activity in smaller towns and villages and wider rural areas.

5.3.3 EPA Code of Practice Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems, population equivalent of less than 10, 2021.

5.3.2.1 This document provides guidance on the site characterization, design, operation, and maintenance of domestic wastewater treatment systems.

5.4 EU Water Framework Directive.

5.4.1 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.

5.4.2 An Coimisiún Pleanála and other statutory authorities cannot grant development consent where a proposed development would give rise to a deterioration in water quality.

5.4.3 The appeal site is located c. 660m from the Athboy_050 River Waterbody IE_EA_07A010300. This waterbody is classified as moderate ecological status. In addition to this the appeal site is located c. 667m to the east of the ATHBOY_040 River Waterbody IE_EA_07A010100. This waterbody is classified as poor ecological status. This is illustrated on the EPA mapping (<https://gis.epa.ie/EPAMaps/agriculture>).

5.4.4 I have assessed the application for a the extension of an existing dwelling, a new dwelling, wastewater facilities 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.

5.4.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale and nature of the development; and
- The adequate treatment of wastewater with the site.

5.5 Natural Heritage Designations

5.5.1 The subject site is not located within or adjacent to a European Site. The nearest designated sites are the River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (Site code: 002299) which is located c.639m to the north-west of the site, Girley (Drewstown) Bog SAC (Site code: 002203) which is located c. 635m to the north of the site, Killyconny Bog (Cloghbally) SAC (Site Code: 000006) which is located c. 13.4km to the north-east of the site, Lough Bane and Lough Glass SAC (Site Code 002120) which is located c.14.51km to the north-west of the site and Lough Lene SAC (Site Code 002121) which is located c. 17.3km to the west of the site.

5.5.2 The appeal site is also located c. 8.7km to the south of the River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (Site code: 004322) and c. 24.4km to the northeast of the Lough Derravaragh SPA (Site code: 004043).

5.5.3 In addition to this, the appeal site is located c. 618m to the south of the Girley Bog NHA (Site Code 001580) and 6.08km to the north-west of the Jamestown Bog NHA (Site Code 001324) and 6.4km to west of the Lough Shesk pNHA (Site Code 000556)

5.5.4 A screening exercise for Appropriate Assessment will be undertaken in Section 8 below.

5.6 EIA Screening

5.6.1 The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no

real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required. Please see Appendix 1.

6 The Appeal

6.1 Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal has been received from Michael Halligan Planning Consultant on behalf of Patrick and Mikaela Dillon. The appeal includes a detailed rebuttal by Liam Mulligan Architects and a set of Verified View Montages. The appeal can be categorised and summarised below:

Reason No.1 Parents Local Needs

- This is not a standard application for a rural dwelling where the son / daughter is looking to construct a dwelling on the family farm. The intended owner / occupiers of the new cottage do not own Creevagh House which they currently occupy. This house is owned by their daughter.
- The family have long links to the area, and the land has been in the family ownership for 500 years. Bernard Dillon has lived and worked on the farm his whole life. His son Patrick has now taken over the running of the farm and needs to live nearby to attend to the livestock and to live near his elderly parents. Patrick Dillon currently rents a house nearby but needs to be on site at the farm to attend to lambing, calving, and foaling.
- The proposed development of a small dwelling on the family farm would enable Patrick and Maureen Dillon to live on the family land holding where they have lived all of their lives in a cottage much more suited to their needs.
- Maureen Dillon ran the local branch of the Irish Girl Guides for the last 35 years and has served as commissioner, regional commissioner, assistant chief commissioner, and president of the Irish Girl Guides. Has been the secretary of the Girley Harvest Festival Committee from 1995 to 2016, secretary / treasurer of the Girley Community Committee from 2009 to 2018, 3 years on the North-East Region Parent Council, secretary of the National

Secondary School Parents Council and Equine Sectary of the Royal Meath Show.

- Bernard Dillon was the chair of the Parish Hall Committee in the 1990's, donated the land for the New Graveyard in Girley to the parish, involved in the local hunt, the Meath Hunt Club (Master for 5 years in the early 2000's).
- The current proposal gives effect to age friendly policies in the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027* by providing a small 2 bed single storey dwelling for the applicant's parents to continue to live on the historic family farm holding in a modest dwelling.
- There are no objections from the Environment and the Transportation sections of Meath County Council.
- An Appropriate Assessment and an EIA are not required.

Reason No. 2- Design of the extension

- The planning report fails to acknowledge the setting of the main house in a hollow which is well screened from views from the road save when driving directly outside it.
- The heights of the extensions are both lower and subservient to the original house and due to the house being naturally screened by topography, at no stage does any roof height exceed that of a recently consented neighbouring L-shaped bungalow under construction on a more prominent site.
- The design of the cottage provides maximum screening from neighbouring properties and would not depreciate the value of adjoining properties.

Reason 3- Design-vernacular building

The first party response includes a detailed rebuttal by Liam Mulligan-Architect-Chartered Building Surveyors-Historic Building Consultants (outlined in Appendix A of the first party response). The report in Appendix A can be summarised as follows:

- Although the building is not a Protected Structure the house represents a good example of an early nineteenth century strong farmers house in the classical style.

- The house currently requires extensive refurbishment and modernisation. The existing accommodation does not meet the standards of a modern home for the applicant's family.
- Most strong farmers homes belong to the vernacular architectural tradition, are usually of larger scale and are more capable of being of successfully receiving relatively large and more complex additions.
- The linear form of the typical gable ended with a single pile plan means that the most practical and successful way of adding substantial volumes to this structure is to continue the linear plan.
- There are various constraints associated with the site which limit the options for adding substantial extensions to the home, including the proximity of the road to the north, farmyard to the west and a significant decline in ground levels to the east and rising ground to the south.
- The height and scale of the proposed extensions clearly differ to the scale and height of the original structure and are not excessive in this context of the improvement proposed for the property.
- The basic arrangement of the extension in two wings and the incorporation of setbacks from the main south elevation allows the original body of the house to remain legible.
- The scale and heights of the extension to the north side is reduced through the use of a flat roof and the wall have various setbacks to maintain good proportion in the facades and to breakdown the overall mass.
- The existing annexes to the north of the building lack symmetry and balance resulting in an awkward and ungainly appearance. The proposed design seeks to rationalise the form and character and improve the appearance.
- The materials have been carefully selected to complement the existing structure.
- The approach outlined accords with relevant conservation best practice, the relevant development plan policies, and the rural house design guide.

Reason 4- Backland Development

- The issue of backland development relates to infill development in urban areas and ribbon developments. This issue is not relevant in this case given the size and conditions of the existing site with mature gardens and trees and the separation distance between the cottage and other houses.
- The design ensures adequate separation, privacy, and good amenities for both the cottage and the main dwelling and will be occupied by the applicant's parents who will continue to provide help and support with running the farm and provide mutual family support.
- There are a number of strong farm houses along Girley Road that are similar to the position of the existing dwelling on the appeal site, but which have driveways akin to that proposed (including The Grove, Clonleason House and Girley House).

6.2 Planning Authority Response

6.2.1 Letter dated 7 July 2025 stating that the Planning Authority has reviewed the issues raised by the first party and is satisfied that these issues have been substantively addressed in the planning report dated 16th May 2025 and that the Coimisiún is requested to uphold the decision of the Planning Authority to refuse planning permission.

6.3 Observations

6.3.1 An observation has been received from Bernard Dillon. The observation can be categorised and summarised below:

- The family has resided in the area on our farm for hundreds of years as tenant farmers and then owners. The observers are actively engaged in farming and horse sport and in the community and have been for generations.
- The church, graveyard and Girl Guides Cottage in Girley are built on lands donated by the observers. The observers fully comply with RDPOL 1 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027*.
- The original house is owned by the observer's daughter and was built by the family 200 years ago with the back extensions built at a later date. The house

form part of the family heritage and the applicants (son) wishes to conserve and adapt it for modern living.

- The observer's daughter lives and has a family in the UK and the house would be taken over by the observer's son. The house is in disrepair and is not suitable for the observer's needs and the proposed cottage is a good solution.
- Age friendly Ireland actively encourages building habitable accessory units. This type of next-door, multi-generational living is a highly sustainable economic and social model with huge benefits for all.
- If the planner had concerns, these could have been covered by conditions.
- The cottage will not be visible to anyone on Girley Road. No one will be overlooked, and the cottage will not be overlooked.
- There is plenty of land in Creevagh, but limited road frontage and any new house would create a load of houses within a short space of road and be right up against our neighbours and this is not wanted.

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 / observations, the reports of the local authority and inspected the site, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- New House
- Extension to the main dwelling
- Vernacular Character
- Siting and design of the proposed cottage
- Vehicle access and access road
- Wastewater Management
- Flooding

- Appropriate Assessment

7.2 New House

Introduction

- 7.2.1 The proposed development comprises of two elements i.e. the extension of the existing family dwelling and a single storey cottage. At present the parents of the family reside in the existing dwelling on the land. The applicant who wishes to extend the dwelling is the son of the parents who reside in the main dwelling on the land. The applicant wishes to extend the dwelling to provide a house for his family. It is then proposed to develop a cottage on the family holding the parents of the family to downsize into. I make the Coimisiún aware that the existing main dwelling is not owned by either the parents or son (the applicant) but is owned by the daughter of the parents.
- 7.2.2 Reason No.1 for refusal states the Planning Authority is not satisfied that a rural housing need in accordance with the provisions of the plan has been established and that the proposed development would be contrary to the policy RD POL 1 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027.
- 7.2.3 In response the first party appeal includes information with respect to the applicants and their family to the Girley area. In addition to this, a third-party observation outlines that the family has resided in the area on our farm for hundreds of years as tenant farmers and then owners. It also outlines that the observers are actively engaged in farming and horse sport and in the community and have been for generations.
- 7.2.4 The appeal site is with RA ‘Rural Areas’ Zone under which Residential (Subject to compliance with the Rural Settlement Strategy. Section 9.2 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027* sets out the rural strategy for the county. I refer the Coimisiún to map 9.1 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027* which shows that the appeal site is within the category Strong Rural Area. I am satisfied that the proposed development is acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with the rural settlement strategy.
- 7.2.5 While I note the concerns of the Planning Authority, I have considered the information provided by the applicants in the original application (Local Needs Assessment statement prepared by Noeleen Shannon Planning Consultancy, dated 10/3/24) and the information provided in the first party appeal and the third-party observer. I am

satisfied that the applicants have demonstrated strong links to the local area and that RD POL 1 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027* is satisfied in this case and therefore reason No.1 for refusal is not warranted.

Backland development

- 7.2.6 Reason for refusal No.4 outlines concerns that the proposal would lead to backland development and that the siting would not comply with the Meath Rural Design Guide and would be contrary to RD POL 9 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027*.
- 7.2.7 The first party appeal states that the issue of backland development relates to infill development in urban areas and ribbon developments typically arising from previous poor planning decisions. This issue is not relevant in this case. In addition to this, the design ensures adequate separation, privacy, and good amenities for both the cottage and the main dwelling.
- 7.2.8 In my opinion the concept of backland development relates to urban development and not development in rural areas. In this regard I note that Section 11.5.20 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027* states that Backland residential development relates to small scale development located to the rear of existing buildings in built-up areas. Therefore, in my opinion this concept is not relevant to the proposed development.

Siting

- 7.2.9 I have considered the Meath Rural Design guide, particularly Section 3.1 which discourages buildings in back lands behind existing dwellings and encourages a cluster development approach to second dwellings on rural lands. While I note the concerns of the planning authority in my opinion site specific constraints would not allow for a cluster approach as envisaged in the Meath Rural Design Guide. I have come to this conclusion having regard to the location of the existing dwelling in proximity to the northern boundary of the site. In this regard it would be difficult for any new building to maintain the established building line. I also note that the location of the courtyard enclosed by agricultural buildings to the west of the main dwelling which would not allow any potential clustering of dwellings in this area.

- 7.2.10 While I note that there is space to the east of the dwelling and to the west of the agricultural buildings to the front of the site, I would have concerns that placing a dwelling at either of these locations would disrupt the vernacular character of the site and would have an undue impact on the character of the area.
- 7.2.11 The proposed cottage would only be partially visible from the roadside primarily in views from the south-west of the site and therefore would not have an undue impact on the amenity of the area. In this regard I refer the Coimisiún to Proposed View from Viewpoint 2 of the verified photomontage included as part of the first party appeal.
- 7.2.12 In addition to this, I note that the proposed cottage would be in close proximity to the main dwelling, this would allow for safe and secure multi-generational living on the land as envisaged in Section 3.8.8 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027*.
- 7.2.13 Having considered the foregoing including the site-specific constraints, I am satisfied that the location of the proposed cottage and the proposed access road are acceptable and that these elements of the proposal would not have an undue impact on the amenity of the area and are therefore acceptable.

Design and floor area

- 7.2.14 The proposed cottage would have a maximum height of c.5.3m (to the top of the chimney) and would be set back c. 10.5 m from the existing agricultural building to the north and c. 33m to the south-west of the main dwelling on the land.
- 7.2.15 Having regard to the room dimensions provide on the floor plans, it is noted that the proposed cottage would have a floor area of c. 60.74m². Section 5.2.2.2 of the Design Manual for Quality Housing outlines that a 2 bed four-person single storey house should have a floor area of 70m². The proposed development would fail to achieve compliance with this standard. I make the Coimisiún aware that matter relating to the floor area of the proposed cottage is a new issue.
- 7.2.16 As previously discussed, I am satisfied that the proposed cottage would not have any undue off-site impacts and I am of the opinion that this matter could be dealt with by way of condition requiring the dwelling comply with the standards of the Design Manual for Quality Housing.

7.3 Extension to the main dwelling

Scale

- 7.3.1 Reasons No.2 for refusal states that the design of the proposed extension, including its excessive scale, bulk, and inconsistent finishes with the vernacular character of the existing dwelling and that the proposed development would materially contravene POL OBJ 50 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027*.
- 7.3.2 The first party appeal states that that heights of the extensions are both lower and subservient to the original house and due to the house being naturally screened by topography and that at no stage does any roof height exceed that of a recently consented neighbouring L-shaped bungalow under construction on a more prominent site.
- 7.3.3 I note the concerns of the planning authority and the comments set out in the first party appeal and the third-party observation. In broad terms, I would not be opposed to an extension to this dwelling *per se*, from an inspection of the existing floor plans, I note that the layout and area of the dwelling may benefit from a more modern design to accommodate family living. In addition to this, having been on site I acknowledge that there are site specific design considerations and site constraints including the fact that the rear of the dwelling faces the public realm and the proximity of the existing dwelling to the roadside boundary.
- 7.3.4 Notwithstanding this, POL OBJ 50 seeks to ensure that all extensions are of a high-quality design which respects, harmonises, and integrates with the existing dwelling. While I acknowledge the constraints of the site as outlined above, I do have concerns with respect to the overall scale, mass and bulk of the proposed extensions as currently proposed.
- 7.3.5 While I note there is no standard which provides a ratio between the size of extensions in comparison to a main dwelling, in my opinion the scale of the proposed extension is disproportionately large in comparison to the existing dwelling. In this regard, the proposed extension would increase the overall floor area of the existing dwelling by almost 2.5 times (from c.171m² to c.440m²).
- 7.3.6 The first party submission highlights a bungalow permitted in proximity to the appeal site which has a higher roof height than that proposed and is on a more prominent site

(Reg. Ref. Reg. Ref. 23208 refers). While I note that the site of the bungalow is elevated from the roadside, the dwelling is set back from the road and, in my opinion, does not interact with the public realm in the same way as the dwelling on the appeal site.

7.3.7 In conclusion, while I am of the opinion that there is potential for this dwelling to be extended, on balance the scale, mass and bulk of the extension as proposed would not integrate with the existing dwelling and as such would not comply with POL OBJ 50 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027*.

7.3.8 Given these concerns, I recommend the application is refused. The Coimisiún may take the view that concerns relating to the scale of the proposed extension could be dealt with by way of condition, however, I am of the opinion that the design changes would materially alter the design of the proposed development to a degree which would make the development inconsistent with the scheme which as proposed.

Material Contravention

7.3.9 I draw the attention of the Coimisiún to the fact that in reason No.2 for refusal, the Planning Authority has stated that the proposal would materially contravene DM OBJ 50.

7.3.10 In considering whether the proposed development would materially contravene the stated policies and objectives, I have regard to the wording of DM OBJ 50, and it is my opinion that the wording is not definitive, and all allows for a certain level of judgement and discretion for those assessing planning applications. While the planning authority may be of the opinion that the proposal would not comply with the outlined policy DM OBJ 50 in my opinion it does not necessarily follow that a material contravention of the development plan would occur if planning permission were granted. Therefore, I consider that the Planning Authority has erred, and that no material contravention of the development plan arises in this instance.

7.4 Vernacular Character

7.4.1 Reason No. 3 for refusal states that the design of the proposed extension, would be unsympathetic and seriously detract from the existing vernacular character of the dwelling and will be visually dominant and would be incapable of being satisfactorily assimilated into its surroundings, unduly prominent and obtrusive in this rural

landscape and would materially contravene policy HER POL 21 and objective HER OBJ 23 of the *Meath County Development Plan, 2021-2027*.

- 7.4.2 The first party appeal includes a detailed response from Liam Mulligan-Architect-Chartered Building Surveyors-Historic Building Consultants notes that the dwelling can be classified as a strong farmer dwelling which can be considered as a vernacular dwelling and that such structures are more capable of being of successfully receiving relatively large and more complex additions compared to simpler vernacular buildings. In addition to this, it is noted that the basic arrangement of the proposed extension to the side allows the original body of the house to remain legible, while the scale and heights of the extension to the north side is reduced through the use of a flat roof and the wall have various setbacks to maintain good proportion in the facades and to breakdown the overall mass.
- 7.4.3 The third-party observation notes that the original was built by the family 200 years ago with the back extensions built at a later date and that and that the house forms part of the family heritage and the applicants wishes to conserve and adapt it for modern living.
- 7.4.4 I make the Coimisiún aware that the existing dwelling is not a Protected Structure and is not included on the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage, however, it is acknowledged that the dwelling is a good example of a vernacular Irish farmhouse which enhances the character of the area.
- 7.4.5 I have considered the provisions of Section 8.7.3 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027* (including HER POL 21 and objective HER OBJ 23) and while vernacular buildings contribute to the character of an area, there is scope for the retention, sympathetic maintenance and sustainable re-use of historic buildings, including vernacular dwellings in County Meath. Therefore, a balance must be struck between retaining the design of the original building and bringing the building back into use in a manner which is consistent with modern housing standards.
- 7.4.6 In this case, I acknowledge the design challenges presented because of the orientation of the existing dwelling, whereby the rear of the dwelling faces the public realm at close proximity. In addition to this, I acknowledge that the height of the proposed extensions is lower than the existing dwelling and that the proposed

extension would provide an enhanced floor plan which would allow for the sustainable continuation of the residential use of this dwelling.

7.4.7 In overall terms an extension to this building would ensure that the continued residential use of the building is viable and up to modern standards. This would be a positive outcome in terms of retaining a vernacular building which has been in place for a substantial period of time, and which has become part of the character of the area. However, I do have concerns that the scale of the proposed extension would have an undue impact on the character of the vernacular building. In my opinion, the scale, mass and bulk of the proposed extension would appear overly dominant and would mean that the vernacular character of the existing dwelling would be somewhat lost within the extension, especially in views from the public realm along Girley Road to the front of the site. In this regard, I refer the Coimisiún to the verified photomontage: Proposed View from Viewpoint 1 submitted as part of the first-party appeal. In this view, the design and scale of the proposed extensions are clearly more prominent than the existing dwelling and therefore the vernacular aesthetic of the existing dwelling and its contribution to the character of the area is lost.

7.4.8 In conclusion, while there is scope for an extension of the existing dwelling, in my opinion a more modest and subordinate approach to the main vernacular building would be appropriate in this case.

7.4.9 Having considered the foregoing, I am of the opinion that the proposed extension fails to achieve compliance with HER OBJ 23 of *the Meath County Development Plan 2023-2027* and on this basis, I recommend the application be refused on this basis.

Material Contravention

7.4.10 I draw the attention of the Coimisiún to the fact that in reason No.3 for refusal, the Planning Authority has stated that the proposal would materially contravene HER POL 21 and HER OBJ 23 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027.

7.4.11 In considering whether the proposed development would materially contravene the stated policies and objectives, I have regard to the wording of HER POL 21 and HER OBJ 23 and it is my opinion that the wording is not definitive, and all allows for a certain level of judgement and discretion for those assessing planning applications. While the planning authority may be of the opinion that the proposal would not comply with the outlined policy and objective (HER POL 21 and HER OBJ 23), in my opinion it does

not necessarily follow that a material contravention of the development plan would occur if planning permission were granted. Therefore, I consider that the Planning Authority has erred, and that no material contravention of the development plan arises in this instance.

7.5 Vehicle Access and access road

Vehicle Access

- 7.5.1 Access to the site would be from the L-6836 where a speed limit of 60kmph applies. It is noted that the entrance would be via an upgraded entrance to the west of the site. The existing entrance and an unused entrance to the east of the site would be blocked up and no longer used.
- 7.5.2 The site plan submitted with the application shows sightlines of 90 metres to the nearside edge of the road from a setback of 3 metres at the new entrance in both an easterly and westerly direction along the L-6836. I am satisfied that these sightlines are in accordance with Tables 5.4 and 5.5 of the TII Publication DN-GEO-03060.
- 7.5.3 I also note that the Transportation Section of Meath County Council did not object to the proposed development. Having considered the foregoing, I am satisfied that the proposed vehicle access would not endanger pedestrian or vehicular traffic and would not constitute a traffic hazard.
- 7.5.4 In addition to this, the new vehicular access to land would mean that the existing access to the land would no longer be used. This access is narrow and difficult for larger agricultural vehicles to manoeuvre in and out of the site. In my opinion, the blocking up of this entrance would lead to a safer traffic outcome.

Access Road

- 7.5.5 The proposed development seeks permission for a new access road leading from the proposed vehicular access to the west of the site around the proposed cottage to a location to the east of the main dwelling. The access road would follow the contours of the site which initially slope downwards before rising to the rear of the proposed cottage and then falling towards the front of the existing dwelling. The proposed access road would have a gravel surface.

7.5.6 Given the contours of the site and the existing buildings on the land, the proposed access road would only be visible for the western portion, to a location close to the proposed cottage.

7.5.7 I am satisfied that the proposed new entrance and access road arrangement is acceptable, I have come to this conclusion as the proposal would ensure that there would not be a proliferation of vehicular accesses to the land. In addition to this, the new road would only be partially visible for the public realm and therefore would not have any impact on the amenity of the area.

7.6 **Wastewater Management**

7.6.1 It is noted that wastewater will discharge to ground via a wastewater treatment system and percolation areas. Separate wastewater treatment systems are proposed to be installed for the existing dwelling and an additional wastewater treatment system installed for the proposed cottage. In addition to this, the existing wastewater treatment facility will be decommissioned. I note that the Environment Wastewater Section of Meath County Council did not object to the proposed development.

7.6.2 I refer the Coimisiún to the Site Characterisation Forms submitted for both the existing dwelling and the proposed cottage as part of the application material. Surface water is identified as a potential target risk in both cases.

Existing dwelling

7.6.3 The Site Characterisation Form for the existing dwelling shows that shows that the percolation tests carried out on site suggests that the soils and subsoils inherent on the site are suitable for a secondary treatment system and infiltration area. The form shows that soil type is an Acid Brown Earths (75%), Gleys (15%), Brown Podzolics (10%) at surface and a Silt/Clay at subsurface. No bedrock encountered in the trial holes and no water table encountered. The percolation tests yielded a sub-surface T value of 19.8, this would comply with the standards set out in Table 6.4 of the EPA Code of Practice: Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10) 2021.

7.6.4 Having considered the site plan submitted with the application; I am satisfied that the new Wastewater Treatment facility for the existing dwelling exceeds the minimum separation distances as set out in Table 6.2 of the EPA Guidelines excluding the set

back from a road. In this regard the proposed wastewater treatment facility would be set back c. 3.6m from the internal access road. This is considered to be a minor non-compliance and would be acceptable having regard to the gravel finish of the road.

7.6.5 This includes a c.31m separation distance from the proposed new well to the south-west of the proposed wastewater treatment facility.

7.6.6 Having reviewed the Geological Survey Ireland's GIS Mapping; I note that the proposed wastewater treatment system has been sited over a Locally Important Aquifer-Bedrock which is Generally Moderately Productive and has a high vulnerability with a recourse protection categorisation of R1. Having regard to the soil depth and the secondary treatment and percolation area, as shown in the Site Characterisation Form, I am satisfied that the effluent will be suitably treated before reaching the aquifer.

7.6.7 Therefore, I am satisfied that wastewater treatment for the existing dwelling would comply with the EPA Code of Practice: Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10) 2021.

Proposed Cottage

7.6.8 The Site Characterisation Form for the proposed cottage outlines similar information as the report for the existing dwelling in terms of soils / subsoils. In addition to this, a sub-surface T value of 21.77 was recorded. This would comply with the standards set out in Table 6.4 of the EPA Code of Practice: Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10) 2021.

7.6.9 Having considered the site plan submitted with the application; I am satisfied that the Wastewater Treatment facility for the proposed cottage exceeds the minimum separation distances as set out in Table 6.2 of the EPA Guidelines excluding the set back from a road. In this regard the proposed wastewater treatment facility would be set back c. 3.2m from the internal access road. This is considered to be a minor non-compliance and would be acceptable having regard to the gravel finish of the road.

7.6.10 The set back include a c.86m separation distance from the proposed new well to the east of the proposed wastewater treatment facility for the new cottage.

7.6.11 Therefore, I am satisfied that wastewater treatment for the proposed cottage would comply with the EPA Code of Practice: Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10) 2021.

7.7 Flooding

7.7.1 have consulted the flood mapping system (www.floodinfo.ie) and I note that the subject land is within Flood Zone 'C'.

7.7.2 Having considered all the foregoing; I consider the proposed development would not result increase the risk of flood either within the site itself or the surrounding area. The proposal is acceptable from a flood risk perspective.

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 application is for the demolition of existing structures, construction of a dwelling and all site works within a rural area of County Meath.

8.2 The subject site is not located within or adjacent to a European Site. The nearest designated sites are the River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (Site code: 002299) which is located c.639m to the north-west of the site, Girley (Drewstown) Bog SAC (Site code: 002203) which is located c. 635m to the north of the site, Killyconny Bog (Cloghbally) SAC (Site Code: 000006) which is located c. 13.4km to the north-east of the site, Lough Bane and Lough Glass SAC (Site Code 002120) which is located c.14.51km to the north-west of the site and Lough Lene SAC (Site Code 002121) which is located c. 17.3km to the west of the site.

8.3 The appeal site is also located c. 8.7km to the south of the River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (Site code: 004322) and c. 24.4km to the northeast of the Lough Derravaragh SPA (Site code: 004043).

8.4 In addition to this, the appeal site is located c. 618m to the south of the Girley Bog NHA (Site Code 001580) and 6.08km to the north-west of the Jamestown Bog NHA (Site Code 001324) and 6.4km to west of the Lough Shesk pNHA (Site Code 000556)

8.5 There is no hydrological link between the subject site and the European sites.

8.6 Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

8.7 This determination is based on:

- Small scale and domestic nature of the development
- Distance from European sites.
- No hydrological connections to the European sites.

8.8 I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

8.9 Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

9 Recommendation

9.1 I recommend a split decision be made:

Planning Permission is granted for:

- The construction of a new single storey cottage;
- Alterations to the existing site entrances including upgrading the existing gateway on the West end and the provision of a new avenue, together with all associated landscaping and site works including; and
- The provision of new proprietary wastewater treatment associated with the single storey cottage.

Refusal is recommended for:

- Alterations to the roof and facades of the existing single/two storey rear annex to the North-west side of the house.
- New two-storey extensions to the North-east and South-west sides of the house, a new conservatory at the North-east side including all related internal and external alterations to the house.
- Demolition of existing sheds.

Reasons and Considerations (1)

Having regard to the policy and objectives as set out in the *Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027* in respect of rural residential development, the nature, scale and design of the proposed single storey cottage, to the pattern of existing and permitted development in the area it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity, would respect the existing visual character of the area and would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and public health. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

- 1) The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application dated 24th 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) Prior to the commencement of the development the following shall be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority:

- (a) Revised drawings increasing the size of the cottage to comply the floor area requirements set out in *the Design Manual for Quality Housing* Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory standard of development

- 3) (a) The proposed dwelling, when completed, shall be first occupied as a place of permanent residence by the applicant, members of the applicant's immediate family or their heirs, and shall remain so occupied for a period of at least seven years thereafter [unless consent is granted by the planning authority for its occupation by other persons who belong to the same category of housing need as the applicant]. Prior to commencement of development, the applicant shall

enter into a written agreement with the planning authority under section 47 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 to this effect.

b) Within two months of the occupation of the proposed dwelling, the applicant shall submit to the planning authority a written statement of confirmation of the first occupation of the dwelling in accordance with paragraph (a) and the date of such occupation. This condition shall not affect the sale of the dwelling by a mortgagee in possession or the occupation of the dwelling by any person deriving title from such a sale.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed house is used to meet the applicant's stated housing needs and that development in this rural area is appropriately restricted [to meeting essential local need] in the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

- 4) The vehicular access, including visibility splays, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services, details of which shall be agreed in writing prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of traffic and road safety

- 5) The proposed wastewater drainage system shall be in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled "Code of Practice – Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10)" – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

- 6) a) All surface water generated within the site boundaries shall be collected and disposed of within the curtilage of the site. No surface water from roofs, paved areas or otherwise shall discharge onto the public road or adjoining properties.
b) The access driveway to the proposed development shall be provided with adequately sized pipes or ducts to ensure that no interference will be caused to existing roadside drainage.

Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and to prevent pollution

- 7) 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. All existing over ground cables shall be relocated underground as part of the site development works.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity

- 8) Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 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.

- 9) 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 Bord 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.

Reasons and Considerations (2)

1. It is the policy (POL OBJ 50) of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027* that all house extension applications be of “high quality design which respects, harmonises and integrates with the existing dwelling in terms of

height, scale, materials used, finishes, window proportions etc". Having regard to the specific design proposed and the resultant scale, massing, and bulk in relation to the existing dwelling, the Coimisiún is not satisfied that the proposed development would successfully integrate with the existing dwelling. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal would contravene policy POL OBJ 50 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027* and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. It is the policy (HER OBJ 23) of the *Meath County Development Plan 2023-2027* that extensions of traditional buildings are sensitively designed and do not detract from the character of the historic building. Having regard to the specific design proposed and the resultant scale, massing, and bulk, the Coimisiún is not satisfied that the proposed development would not detract from the character of the vernacular building. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal would contravene Objective HER OBJ 23 of the *Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027* and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development 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

19th September 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-322756-25
Proposed Development Summary	Extension of existing dwelling, demolition of existing strictures, construction of a dwelling and all site works
Development Address	Creevagh House, Girley, 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)	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project.' Proceed to Q2.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	Class 10 Infrastructure Projects (b) (i)
☐ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
☐ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
☒ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	Class 10 Infrastructure Projects (b) (i) (i) Proposal is significantly below 500-unit threshold

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 ☐	
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ABP-322756-25
Proposed Development Summary	Extension of existing dwelling, demolition of existing structures, construction of a dwelling and all site works
Development Address	Creevagh House, Girley, Co. Meath
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	The development has a modest footprint, comes forward as a standalone project, does not require demolition works, does not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its residential type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	The development is situated in a rural area with some residences located in proximity, including to the east of the site. The development is removed from sensitive natural habitats, centres of population and designated sites and landscapes of identified significance in the County Development Plan.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent,	Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects,

nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects, and opportunities for mitigation).	there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	No
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	No

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)