



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

**ABP-322773-25**

---

<b>Development</b>	Construction of 4 no. semi-detached dwellings and all associated site works.
<b>Location</b>	Balreask Manor, Trim Road, Navan, Co. Meath
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Meth County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	John Patrick Molloy
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	(1) Nicola Kelly (2) Brendan Hurley
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None

**Date of Site Inspection**

31<sup>st</sup> July 2025

**Inspector**

Colin McBride

## Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description .....	5
2.0 Proposed Development .....	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	6
3.1. Decision .....	6
3.2. Planning Authority Reports .....	6
3.3. Prescribed Bodies .....	7
3.4. Third Party Observations .....	7
4.0 Planning History.....	8
5.0 Policy Context.....	10
5.1. Development Plan.....	10
6.0 EIA Screening.....	12
7.0 The Appeal .....	12
7.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	12
7.2. Applicants Response .....	13
7.3. Planning Authority Response.....	14
7.4. Observations.....	14
8.0 Assessment.....	14
9.0 AA Screening.....	19
10.0 Water Framework Directive Screening .....	20
11.0 Recommendation .....	20
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	20
<b>Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination .....</b>	<b>23</b>

## Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

## **Appendix 2 – Water Framework Directive**

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site, which has a stated area of 0.6 hectares, is within the existing housing development of Balreask Manor located approximately 2km from Navan town centre and on the western side of the Trim Road (R161). The site is currently part of an existing green space that is bisected by a section of estate road whose vehicular access is blocked by bollards at its eastern end. The site is bounded to the north by the rear curtilages of No's 132 to 139 Balreask Manor, to the south by No. 127 Balreask Manor and an area of public open space, to the west by undeveloped zoned lands (MP13) and to the east by an estate road.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the removal of an area of hardstanding which was constructed pursuant to planning permission reg. 99/2617 and which now comprises a defunct road, realignment of spine road, the provision of additional open space within this part of Balreask Manor, the construction of 4 no. semi-detached dwellings, extension to existing estate road and footpath, the provision of on-site car parking for each of the proposed houses as well as four communal/visitor spaces within an enlarged area of public open space, connection to the public water supply and sewerage system along with associated site works. Each dwelling has a floor area of 126.58sqm and a ridge height of 7.585sqm. The design of the dwellings is similar in architectural character, scale and external finishes to the existing semi-detached dwellings that make up Balreask Manor.
- 2.2. In response to further information the site layout was revised with the proposed dwelling relocated further north. This has allowed for relocation of the access road that provided for access to adjoining lands further south and such is now providing access to adjoining lands to the west and the proposed new dwellings.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

Permission was granted subject to 25 conditions. Of note are the following conditions.

Condition no. 3: Restrict to individual purchasers.

Condition no. 4: Details of boundary treatment to be agreed.

Condition no. 7: Surface water design to be agreed.

Condition no. 12: Construction and Environmental Management Plan to be submitted and agreed in writing,

Condition no. 17: Hours of construction and noise limits specified.

### 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

#### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

Planning Report (04/02/25):

- Further information required including revisions to address concerns regarding the realignment of the estate road, including retention of the estate road and relocation of the proposed dwellings to the north, submission of a revised surface water system that is SuDs compliant, submission of a public lighting design and the applicant was invited to address the third-party concerns.

Planning Report (13/05/25)

- The applicant was deemed to have addressed the further information request in a satisfactory manner with the proposal considered acceptable in terms of Development Plan policy and allowing for the retention of sufficient open space to serve the existing housing development. A grant of permission was recommended subject to the conditions outlined above.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Environment Flooding-Surface Water Section (31/01/25).

- Further information required including details regarding surface water drainage.

Environment Flooding-Surface Water Section (14/05/25).

- Further information required including details regarding surface water drainage.

Transportation Dept (15/05/25)

- No objection subject to conditions.

Public Lighting (no date)

- Lighting submission not in accordance with Meath County Council standards.

### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

13 submissions were received. The issues raised can be summarised as follows.

Impact on residential amenity through loss of public open space, increased traffic safety/impact on public safety, contravention of Development Plan, noise pollution, devaluation of property.

## 4.0 Planning History

### Appeal site

ABP-313380 (22/118): Permission refused for the construction of 6 no. semi-detached dwellings and associated site works. Refused 2023 based on three reasons.

1. Having regard to the planning history of the site, namely planning register reference number 99/2617, wherein the proposed development is shown to be located on land identified as public open space, it is considered that the proposed development would materially contravene the terms of planning reference number 99/2617 as the proposed development would encroach on lands which have been designated as public open space for Balreask Manor. It is considered that, by reason of the loss of established public open space, the proposed development would seriously injure the residential amenities of residents Balreask Manor, which would be contrary to the residential zoning objective for the area which seeks 'to protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities', would set an undesirable precedent for similar type development in this residential estate, and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Having regard to the location of the site within the established residential development of Balreask Manor, the planning history of Balreask Manor, which provides for a direct access from the R161 Regional (Trim Road ) to zoned lands to the west (Masterplan 13) via the proposed development site, and the layout of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposed development would result in the loss of a direct access link between Balreask Manor and Masterplan 13 lands to the west which would reduce the level of connectivity and permeability between existing and planned residential areas. The proposed development would be prejudicial to the development of Masterplan 13 lands and to the amenities of existing and future residents of the area. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed development would be contrary to the principles of good urban design, as

set out in the Urban Design Manual 2009, would be contrary to the requirements of the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS) and would be contrary to the provision of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027, namely Policy DM POL 4 which requires that 'all proposals for residential development demonstrate compliance with the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas – Cities, Towns & Villages(2009) and the Urban Design Manual – A Best Practice Guide, 2009 or any updates thereof', Policy DM OBJ 22 which state that 'the design of any housing scheme shall have regard to the requirement for connectivity between residential areas, community facilities etc.' and Policy SH POL 3 which seeks 'to support the creation of healthy and sustainable communities that encourages and facilitates walking and cycling and general physical activity through the implementation of best practices in urban design that promotes permeability and interconnecting spaces.' The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development the area.

NA/50484: Permission refused for construction of 6 no. semi-detached dwelling and associated site works. It was considered that the ABP-313380-22 Inspector's Report Page 10 of 24 proposal which would involve the development of lands designated as public open space and lands set aside for vehicular access to zoned lands to the west, under planning permission 99/2617, would contravene that permission, be prejudicial to the preparation of Local area Plan No.4 and lead to substandard residential development. Refused 2006.

### **Balreask Manor**

99/2617: Permission granted for completion and retention of realignment of part of the main road through Balreask Manor and deletion of house no. 128-131 inclusive and associated changes in boundaries. Granted 2002.

98/236: Permission granted to construct a housing development consisting of 85 detached dwelling and 94-semidetached dwellings (revised to 173 no. houses). Granted 1998.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1 The relevant Development Plan is the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027.

5.1.2 Settlement Hierarchy: Navan is identified as a Key Town. Key Towns are settlements with a strong employment base and a broad range of services that serve a wide catchment area.

5.1.3 Zoning: The subject site is zoned A1 Existing residential. The objective for this area is “To protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities” Lands identified as ‘Existing Residential’ are established residential areas. Development proposals on these lands primarily consist of infill developments and the extension and refurbishment of existing properties. The principle of such proposals is normally acceptable subject to the amenities of surrounding properties being protected and the use, scale, character, and design of any development respecting the character of the area. Residential is listed as a permitted use within the A1 zoning.

5.1.4. Density: It is an objective of this Plan to require a density of 45 units/ha on more centrally located and strategic lands in Regional Growth Centres and Key Towns. This density is also a requirement on lands adjacent to existing and future and rail stations in the County. On the remaining, more edge of centre lands in the Regional Growth Centre and Key Towns a density of 35 units/ha will normally be required.

5.1.5. Master Plan: There are 13 Master Plan areas identified in Navan. The purpose of a Master Plan is to ensure an integrated approach is taken to the phasing, management, and development of lands within the Master Plan Area. A planning application will not be considered in the absence of the Master Plan being agreed in writing with the Executive of the Planning Authority.

5.1.6. Master Plan 13 – Balreask Old, lands between Trim Road and Commons Road to the west of the appeal site. Master Plan 13 relates to land situated between the Trim Road and the Commons Road. These lands are to be developed primarily for residential uses. The Master Plan has an area of c.39.6 hectares. To ensure there is appropriate service provision in this part of the town, the development of these lands shall include the provision of local services and facilities including a neighbourhood centre, which may also include small scale enterprises compatible with a residential location, community facilities, and the reservation of a site for a primary school, the size and location of which shall be agreed with the Department of Education.

An integral part of the development of these lands will be the delivery of Local Distributor Road LDR 2(a). The design and delivery of this Distributor Road shall be integrated into any Master Plan for these lands. This Distributor Road shall be delivered in its entirety in conjunction with the development of this Master Plan. Any phasing proposals regarding the development of these lands and the construction of the Distributor Road shall be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority as part of the preparation of the Master Plan. Status: Awaiting preparation

5.1.7. Noted Policy / Objectives.

DM POL 4 To require that all proposals for residential development demonstrate compliance with the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas - Cities, Towns & Villages (2009) and the Urban Design Manual - A Best Practice Guide, 2009 or any updates thereof.

DM OBJ 22: The design of any housing scheme shall have regard to the requirement for connectivity between residential areas, community facilities etc. The design of any walkways, lanes or paths connecting housing estates or within housing estates shall be of sufficient width to allow for the safe movement of pedestrians and cyclists. They shall be adequately overlooked and lit and not be excessive in length.

SH POL 3 To support the creation of healthy and sustainable communities that encourages and facilitates walking and cycling and general physical activity through the implementation of best practices in urban design that promotes permeability and interconnecting spaces.

SOC OBJ 17 To ensure permeability and connections between public open spaces including connections between new and existing spaces, in consultation to include residents.

## 5.2 Natural Heritage Designations

1.7km from the River Boyne and Blackwater SAC (002299) and the River Boyne and Blackwater SPA (004232), which are the nearest European Site(s).

## 6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development is a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Road Regulations). The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment, refer to Form 1 and Form 2 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 and an EIAR is not required.

## 7.0 The Appeal

### 7.1. Grounds of Appeal

A third-party appeal has been lodged by the following:

Nicola Keely

Brendan Hurley

The grounds of appeal are as follows.

- The appellant refers to the reason for refusal for the previous proposal under ABP-313380-22) and note such are still relevant in this case.

It is state that it is unreasonable to increase the number of houses within Balreask Manor by way of loss of established public open space, which would be injurious to residential amenities and set an undesirable precedent.

- The relocation of the service road near the appellants' dwellings is unacceptable and would result in loss of existing greenspace in front of their houses and give rise to child safety concerns,
- There is a lack of clarity regarding the proposed access road in terms of road widths, grass margins and footpaths.
- The egress of house no 1 proposed and turning area is not in compliance with the relevant standards.

## 7.2. Applicants Response

Response by the applicant.

- The response notes the previous reason for refusal relating to ABP-313380-22 and notes that planning policy promotes densification of existing residential areas and provision of residential development with a reasonable level of facilities and services.
- The applicant highlights a previous Board decision (PL17.214150) where a medical centre was permitted on an area of public open space within a housing development. The applicant also refers to a legal case in which it was considered that contravention of conditions that required landowners to not engage in further development was not relevant. The applicant points out that Balreask Manor would retain a generous level of public open space and that the site is of limited value due to its peripheral location and is not overlooked by many homes. It is also noted that an access road across the open space area has been part of the planning history of the development.

- The applicant revised the site layout in response to further information with the approved layout endorsed by the Planning Authority and such addresses the requirements for a link to adjoining lands that was a factor in refusal reason no. 2 under ABP 313380-22. The issue of lack of detail regarding road widths and footpaths could be dealt with by way of condition/agreement.
- There is no overarching principle in planning law and practice which stipulates that land designed or used as a communal open space can never be built on with the applicant referring to Board decision under ref no. PL17.214150.

### 7.3. **Planning Authority Response**

Response by Meath County Council

- The PA notes the grounds of appeal and are satisfied all matters were fully considered over the course of its assessment of the planning application. The PA requests that the Coimisiún upholds the appeal.

### 7.4. **Observations**

None.

## 8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered as follows:

- Principle of the proposed development
- Public open space
- Other Issues

## 8.2. Principle of the proposed development:

8.2.1 The appeal site is in an area zoned 'A1 Existing Residential' with a stated objective for this area is 'to protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities.' Lands identified as 'Existing Residential' are established residential areas. The Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 (MCDP) states that development proposals on these lands primarily consist of infill developments and the extension and refurbishment of existing properties and that the principle of such proposals is normally acceptable subject to the amenities of surrounding properties being protected and the use, scale, character, and design of any development respecting the character of the area. Residential is listed as a permitted use within this zoning.

8.2.2. Having considered the plans and particulars submitted with the application and having inspected the site I am satisfied that the use, scale, character, and design of the proposed development would adequately respect the character of the area. However, I am concerned that the proposed development would result in the loss of public open space and therefore detract from the amenities of Balreask Manor. This issue is considered in more detail in the following section of this report.

## 8.3. Public open space:

8.3.1 The appeal site is currently laid out as open space traversed by an unused section of estate road. It was originally proposed to construct the 4 no. dwellings to the north of dwelling no. 127 with access using the same service road as the adjoining dwellings and provision of a separate access road running along the northern boundary of the site to facilitate future access to adjoining lands to the west. In response to further information the layout was revised with the dwellings relocated further north along the western boundary and provision of an access road running on an east west axis further south that will both provide access to adjoining lands and the new dwellings.

8.3.2 The appeal site is currently laid out as open space bisected by the unused service road that runs east to west through the site. The planning history of Balreask Manor includes the original permission under ref no. 98/236 that allowed for the construction of four houses (identified as unit no's 128 to 131), c0.51 acres (c0.2ha) of public open space and a future access road to then un-zoned lands to the west (now designated Masterplan 13 Lands). A subsequent permission under ref no. 99/2617 was for the completion & retention of the realignment of part of main road through Balreask Manor (thereby altering the alignment of the road as it traverses the appeal site) and the deletion of house nos. 128 to 131 (incl.). Under ref no. 99/2617 the lands within the appeal site (outside the road realignment) were explicitly identified as public open space (MCC Ref. No: 99/2617, Drawing No: 99/jpm /site rev 6, submitted to the planning authority on the 23rd of November 2001). In this case the appeal site including the location of the proposed dwellings is laid out as public open space and is long established as such.

8.3.3 The proposed development would encroach on designated and long established public open space. The appellants argue that there is precedent for granting of permission on existing public open space for another case in Meath (PL.214150) and note a legal case regarding contravention of conditions in the case that would preclude further development. I would also note that the Board has refused permission under ABP-313380-22 for a similar development on this site on the basis of encroaching onto public open space, contravention of the terms of parent permissions and contrary the zoning objective due to loss of residential amenity through reduction in public open space.

8.3.4 The appellant's argument is that there is a sufficient level of open space to serve the existing dwellings with provision of the additional dwellings. I would consider that the loss of existing and long-established open space within the existing housing development to provide for additional dwellings is detrimental to residential amenities of existing properties as it is a loss of clearly defined and long-established open space that was available to such. I do not consider that it is case of establishing what remains after providing the new dwellings is sufficient, there is clear loss of long-

established and designated public open space as a result of the proposed development. In this regard the proposal would be detrimental to residential amenities of existing properties and would be contrary to the zoning objective of the site, which is zoned A1 Existing residential with a stated objective “to protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities”.

8.3.5 The applicant/appellant points to a precedent under PL17.214150 where a medical centre was permitted on an area of public open space. I have looked at this case and consider that it is not a relevant precedent that would merit granting permission in this case. In that case some consideration was given to the provision of open space on nearby site that would benefit the development as well the fact the provision was for a community use in the form of medical centre that would benefit the community including the existing housing development it was located in. In this case the proposal is for additional dwellings that will reduce the level of open space available to the existing dwellings that has been designated and long-established at this location. The applicant has not provided any reference to relevant precedents where additional dwellings have been approved on an existing open space area of an established residential scheme.

8.3.6 The applicant also refers to a legal case in which it was considered that contravention of conditions that required landowners to not engage in further development was not relevant. In this case I would consider that the nature of the proposal would materially contravene the terms of planning reference number 99/2617 as the proposed development would encroach on lands which have been designated as public open space for Balreask Manor. I would not consider that this is an unreasonable restriction on the developer in terms of further development and that a level of certainty is attached to designation of public open space in a housing development. I would consider that permitting additional residential development on clearly designated areas of public open space within existing housing developments would set an undesirable precedent regardless of the pressures that existing in terms of housing demand.

8.3.7 I would note that refusal reason no. 1 of the previous proposal (ABP-313380) is still relevant and that the applicant has not provided any justification to consider that such does not apply in this case. I would recommend refusal for a similar reason.

8.4 Other Issues:

8.4.1 The previous refusal for similar development under ABP-313380 included a reason for refusal relating to the loss of direct access to the Master Plan 13 land to the west being prejudicial to the future development of such and the facilitate to provide adequate connectivity and compliance with urban design objectives. The current proposal is different from the previous proposal in this regard. Both the original layout and amended layout submitted by way of further information (permitted layout) provide for a maintenance of an access road linking the existing service road network within Balreask Manor and the western boundary of the site/Masterplan 13 lands. In this regard the reason for refusal (reason no. 2) under ABP-313380 does not apply in this case.

8.4.2 In terms of the permitted layout the third-party submissions raised concerns regarding the lack of detail in the permitted layout that was amended in response to further information, specifically the lack of details regarding carriageway width and footpaths. The permitted layout is deficient in terms of a proper layout drawing illustrating the detailed dimensions of the carriageway and footpaths and it is very basic drawing that is inadequate for assessment purposes. Notwithstanding such, the fundamental issue of concern in relation to public open space renders this issue irrelevant as with the provision of such details, the proposal would still merit refusal on the basis of the fact the development reduces the level of existing public open space that was clearly designated as such is long-established at this location.

8.4.3 The appellants raised concern regarding the access and turning area associated with house 1. I would reiterate the fact that regardless of layout and detailed design the fundamental issue of concern in relation to public open space renders this issue irrelevant as with the provision of an amended layout, the proposal would still merit

refusal on the basis of the fact the development reduces the level of existing public open space that was clearly designated as such is long-established at this location.

## 8.5 Conclusion:

### 8.5.1 The proposal entails the provision of 4 no. additional semi-detached dwellings.

Notwithstanding the fact the design and scale of the proposal is consistent with the design and character of existing dwelling and the level of traffic likely to be generated can be adequately catered for within the existing service road network, the proposal would result in the loss of explicitly designated public open space at the time permission was granted for the original development and such has been long-established at this location with existing dwellings deriving benefit from such. The proposal to encroach on such and reduce the level of such through additional housing would materially contravene the terms of planning reference number 99/2617 as the proposed development and would be contrary to the residential zoning objective for the area which seeks 'to protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities', and set an undesirable precedent for similar type development in this residential estate. The proposal would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 9.0 AA Screening

I have considered the proposal for the construction of 4 no. dwellings and associated site works in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located in an urban area within the housing development of Balreask Manor 1.7km from the River Boyne and Blackwater SAC (002299) and the River Boyne and Blackwater SPA (004232), which are the nearest European Site(s).

The proposed development comprises the construction of 4 no dwellings and associated site works. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of works are small scale in nature and entail connection to existing urban infrastructure and services including surface water drainage and wastewater treatment.
- Location-distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.

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.

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

## **10.0 Water Framework Directive Screening**

10.1. Refer to Water Framework Directive Table in Appendix 2 of this report.

## **11.0 Recommendation**

11.1. I recommend a permission be refused based on the following reason.

## **12.0 Reasons and Considerations**

1. Having regard to the planning history of the site, namely planning register reference number 99/2617, wherein the proposed development is shown to be located on land identified as public open space, it is considered that the proposed development would materially contravene the terms of planning reference number 99/2617 as the proposed development would encroach on lands which have been designated as public open space for Balreask Manor. It is considered that, by reason of the loss of established public open space, the proposed development would seriously injure the residential amenities of the residents of Balreask Manor, which

would be contrary to the residential zoning objective for the area which seeks ‘to protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities’, would set an undesirable precedent for similar type development in this residential estate, and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

---

Colin McBride  
Senior Planning Inspector

02<sup>nd</sup> September 2025

## Appendix 1

### Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

#### No EIAR Submitted

<b>Case Reference</b>	
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Construction of 4 no. semi-detached dwellings and all associated site works.
<b>Development Address</b>	Balreask Manor, Trim Road, Navan, Co. Meath.
	<b>In all cases check box /or leave blank</b>
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>  (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="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.  <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>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?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

<p>development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p><b>No Screening required.</b></p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p><b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b></p>	<p><b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b></p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p><b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b></p>	<p><b>Schedule 5, Part 2, Infrastructure projects</b>  <b>10(b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units.</b></p>

### Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

<b>Case Reference</b>	
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Construction of 4 no. dwelling and associated site works.
<b>Development Address</b>	Balreask Manor, Trim Road, Navan, Co. Meath
<b>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</b>	
<p><b>Characteristics of proposed development</b></p> <p>(In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of</p>	<p><b>Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed.</b></p> <p>The development site measures 0.6 hectares. The size of the development is not exceptional in the context of the existing environment. The proposed development will connect to the public water and</p>

natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	wastewater mains. There is no real likelihood of significant cumulative effects with existing and permitted projects in the area.
<p><b>Location of development</b></p> <p>(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).</p>	The site is located within an established residential and urban area. The subject site is not located within any designated site and is located approximately 1.7km from the River Boyne and Blackwater SAC (002299) and the River Boyne and Blackwater SPA (004232). My appropriate assessment screening under Section 9.0 of this report has determined that the proposed development would not likely result in a significant effect on any European Site. The subject site is located outside Flood Zones A and B for coastal or fluvial flooding.
<p><b>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</b></p> <p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p>	Having regard to the type and characteristics of the proposed development which would be consistent with the existing urban environment, to its location removed from any environmentally sensitive sites and to the fact that there would be no significant cumulative considerations with regards to existing and permitted developments in the area, there is no potential for significant effects on the environment.
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Likelihood of Significant Effects</b>	<b>EIA is not required.</b>

**Inspector:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix 2

### Water Framework Directive

Template 1: Screening the need for Water Framework Directive Assessment Determination.

The subject site is located in the housing development Balreask Manor, Navan, Co. Meath with the nearest waterbody being the River Boyne approximately 1.7km to the northeast of the site.

The proposed development comprises construction of a 4 no dwellings within an established housing development.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

I have assessed the proposal 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.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature of works, which are the provision of new dwellings within an existing housing development that benefits from existing services and infrastructure with connection to existing surface water drainage network and wastewater treatment. are small in scale and nature of the development.
- There is a lack of hydrological connection with the nearest waterbody.

#### Conclusion

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

