



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-323181-25

Development	Construction of a house and all associated site works.
Location	Milltown Road, Ashbourne, Co. Meath, A84 WP73.
Planning Authority	Meath County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	24420
Applicant(s)	Clifford Kerrigan
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Milltown Residents Association
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	31/10/2025
Inspector	Emma Gosnell

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
6.0 The Appeal	9
7.0 Assessment.....	11
8.0 AA Screening.....	17
9.0 Recommendation.....	18
10.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	18
11.0 Conditions.....	18
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening and Form 2: EIA Preliminary Examination	
Appendix 2 – AA Screening Determination	
Appendix 3 – Screening for Water Framework Directive Assessment Determination	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site forms part of the rear garden of an existing 2-storey detached residential property located on the northern side of Milltown Road in Ashbourne, Co. Meath.
- 1.2. The site is bounded to the south by the rear garden of the aforementioned property, to the north by Milltown Estate (a residential cul-de-sac), to the west by a large, gated yard (used for the parking of vehicles) to the rear of a detached bungalow, and to the east by the rear garden of a large detached 2-storey dwelling.
- 1.3. There are a public footpath, public lighting pole and road turning head area located within the Milltown Estate to the immediate north of the appeal site. A pedestrian laneway connecting the adjoining section of Milltown Estate to the main estate entrance (to the south-west) runs along the boundary wall to the north-west of the appeal site.
- 1.4. The c. 0.033ha site comprises part of a rear garden and is laid out as lawn. There is no information on file in respect to the size of the overall landholding.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for a 2-storey 3-bed detached dwelling (c.152sq.m) with a max. height of c. 7.5m and a car port (c. 37sq.m), all to be accessed via the Milltown Estate off the Milltown Road in Ashbourne, Co. Meath.
- 2.2. Further Information (FI) stage changes concerned drainage arrangements only.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission granted on 04/07/2025 subject to 7 no. conditions including the following:

“3. Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit a landscape plan carried out by a suitably qualified person, or the written agreement of the Planning Authority. This landscape plan shall also provide details and drawings of all boundaries including the front and rear boundary”.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

2 no. planning reports formed the basis of the planning authority's (PA) assessment:

Planner's Report (12/12/2024) – Initial Application Stage

Key points of note raised in the report are as follows:

- *Principle of Development* – proposal compliant with A1 zoning and with policy on backland and infill development.
- *Private Open Space* – 40sq.m required, proposed to side rather than to rear and no details provided on landscaping or delineation of same from parent property. PA sought to address matters by condition.
- *Impact on Residential Amenity* – design will not give rise to overlooking, overbearing or loss of sunlight to neighbouring properties.
- *Access* – proposal to remove part of c. 1.85m high blockwork boundary wall to Milltown Estate in order to create a new vehicular access is acceptable. Given works proposed are outside red line they are subject to a road opening license.
- *Site Servicing* – concerns raised re: compliance with drainage policy, proposal to connect to public surface water network and to an existing foul main which is on third party lands. **This matter formed part of FI request.**

A request for Further Information (FI) issued on 13/12/2024 in relation to 1 no. item.

The applicant's response to the FI request was received on 11/06/2025 and consisted of a cover letter, revised plans and technical reports. The response was not found to be significant.

Planner's Report (03/07/2025) – Further Information Stage

This report provided an assessment of the FI received as follows:

Item 1 (a) – revised proposal to connect into existing surface water drain to north in Milltown Estate roadway acceptable.

Item 1 (b) – letter of consent (from applicant's parents) for proposed connection to existing foul sewer main in garden acceptable. No response from Uisce Eireann noted.

Item 1 (c) – proposal to direct all foul drainage to above foul sewer main acceptable.

Item 1 (d) – proposal to use SuDS measures (outlined in report by Hydrocare Environmental Ltd.) and not to use soakaways acceptable on basis of site constraints.

Item 1 (e) – all drainage works to be carried out in compliance with the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works, Volume 6.

Permission was granted for the full proposal subject to conditions (as per Section 3.1).

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Initial Application Stage

Transportation Planning Section (12/12/2024) - no objection subject to conditions.

Environment Section (Water and Flooding) (PA confirmed to ACP on 30/10/2025 that advice was received via undated phone call to Case Planner) - FI requested as detailed in Section 3.2.1 above.

Further Information Stage

Environment Section (Waste Enforcement & Regulation) (02/07/2025) - no objection subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No submissions received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Initial Application Stage

1 no. submission received (from Jennifer Ellis on the behalf of Milltown Residents Association) raised the following:

- Access concerns.
- Impact on amenities of elderly residents.
- Potential to exacerbate traffic and parking issues.
- Procedural concerns in respect to site notice.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Appeal Site

P.A. Ref. 231045 – Application for development to rear of family home [different site layout/ house configuration to current proposal with dwelling facing west, tight to all other boundaries and no garden space provided for] with entrance from Milltown Estate, refused on 11/01/2024 for 2 no. reasons relating to non-compliance with backland development policy and inadequate private open space. This decision was not appealed.

4.2. Lands at Milltown Road Including Appeal Site

P.A. Ref. 99151 – Application (by Noel Kerrigan) for 2 no. 5-bed 2-storey houses each with detached garages, granted on 01/04/1999 subject to conditions.

4.3. Neighbouring Site

P.A. Ref. 2460310 – Application for demolition of existing bungalow and exterior sheds, construction of a new two storey 4 bedroom dwelling and related works, granted on 30/06/2024 subject to conditions [property c. 15m to east].

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Policy

Project Ireland 2040 – National Planning Framework (2025).

Climate Action Plan (2024 & 2025).

National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBAP) 2023-2030.

The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoHLGH, 2024) – SPPR 2 (Houses' Min. Private Open Space).

Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DoHLGH, 2019).

Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines (2009).

Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes and Sustaining Communities (DoHLGH, 2007).

5.2. Regional Policy

Eastern & Midland Regional Assembly Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy 2019-2031 (RSES): Ashbourne designated as a Self-Sustaining Town.

5.3. Development Plan

The Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (MCDP) applies.

Zoning

The site is zoned 'A1 – Existing Residential' with the objective 'To protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities'. The MCDP guidance states that '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

Section 11.5.1 (Residential Development).

Policies DM POL 4 and SH POL 8 (residential design standards).

DM POL 4/ Section 11.5.1 – quantitative and qualitative housing standards.

SH POL 2 – consolidation of existing settlements & creation of compact urban forms through the utilisation of infill and brownfield lands.

Sections 11.5.19 (Infill Sites) and 11.5.20 (Backland Sites).

Objectives DM OBJ 42 and DM OBJ 43 (infill and backland development).

Policy DM POL7, Table 11.1 and Section 11.5.2 (Private Open Space).

Objective DM OBJ 18 (minimum 16m rear window separation distances).

Section 11.5.13, Policy DM POL 8 and Objective DM OBJ 28 (Boundary Treatments).

Section 11.5.30 (Safe and Secure Design).

Parking and Servicing

Tables 11.2 (Car Parking Standards) and 11.4 (Cycle Parking Standards).

Section 11.9.3 (Cycling Parking) and Policy DM POL 16 (Waste Management).

Objective DM OBJ 93 – residential car parking considerations incl. visitor parking.

Policies INF POL 15 and 16 – compliance with GDSDS and Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice surface water management policies.

6.0 Natural Heritage Designations

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

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

- c. 13km from Rogerstown Estuary SAC (Site Code 000208).
- c. 13km from Malahide Estuary SPA (Site Code 004025).
- c. 13km from Malahide Estuary SAC (Site Code 000205).
- c. 13.5km from North-West Irish Sea SPA (Site Code 004236).
- c. 14km from Rogerstown Estuary SPA (Site Code 004015).
- c. 20km from North-West Irish Sea SPA (Site Code 004236).
- c. 20km from River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (Site Code 002299)
- c. 20km from River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (Site Code 004232).

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

- c. 13km from Knock Lake pNHA (Site Code 001203)
- c. 13km from Rogerstown Estuary pNHA (Site Code 000208)
- c. 13km from Malahide Estuary pNHA (Site Code 000205).

7.0 EIA Screening

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 screening and an EIAR is not required.

8.0 Water Framework Directive Screening

I have concluded, 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 (refer to form in Appendix 2 for details).

9.0 The Appeal

9.1. Grounds of Appeal

A third party appeal from Jennifer Ellis on the behalf of Milltown Residents Association was received on 30/07/2025. The grounds of appeal (GOA) can be summarised as follows:

- *Principle of Development* – no previous or existing access into the appeal site from the Milltown Estate.
- *Access* – proposed gateway is 110cm, substandard and will not be able to accommodate heavy goods vehicles or parking. The entrance into Milltown Estate has already been narrowed on account of recent local commercial development, causing delays for traffic entering and existing the cul-de-sac of 75 no. houses.
- *Oral Hearing* – the appellants requested an Oral Hearing as part of their GOA.

The GOA are accompanied by:

- 2 no. maps, one which illustrates the width of the roadway adjoining the appeal site to the north and the width of the proposed gateway leading from same and, a second map which seeks to show the direction of traffic flow within the Milltown Estate.
- A series of undated photographs of the boundary wall between the appeal site and Milltown Estate and from within the cul-de-sac showing the current footpaths, driveways and parking arrangements therein.
- A copy of the appellant's third party submission dated 23/10/2024 which is summarised in Section 3.4 of this report. In addition to raising access concerns as above, it also raised issues with parking, procedure and impacts on elderly residents.
- Copies of the decision notices issued by the PA with the advice notes ii, iv, vii, xii (which relate to legal title/ ownership, construction stage parking etc.) highlighted.

Oral Hearing

The appellant made a request for an Oral Hearing (OH) as part of their GOA. This OH request was considered at a meeting of the Commission on 11/09/2025 where it was determined that there was sufficient written evidence on file to enable an assessment of issues raised. Therefore, the holding of a hearing was considered not to be required. I refer the Commission to Direction CD-020645-26 dated 11/09/2025 on the file.

9.2. Applicant Response

The applicant's response to the appeal was received 20/08/2025. Points of note are:

- *Principle of Development* – proposal is compliant with site's A1 zoning and with urban infill policy.
- *Legal Ownership* – boundary wall to Milltown Estate, where new entrance is proposed, is in the ownership of the applicant's parents.
- *Residential Amenity* – proposed access is in-keeping with the character and form of existing accesses in the estate and will not negatively impact the amenity or security of the area or the mobility/ movement of existing residents on account of the negligible increase in traffic and footfall arising.
- *Access* – clarifies that entrance width is 3m with further design details to be provided by way of planning condition.
- *Construction* – activity and traffic associated with same would not be exceptional or not in-keeping with the natural evolution/ development of an urban environment and can be managed in line with best practice construction measures.

9.3. Planning Authority Response

The PA, in their response received 15/08/2025, state that the matters raised in the third party appeal have previously been addressed in their PA reports on the application and they seek that the Commission uphold their decision to grant permission.

9.4. Observations

None received.

9.5. Further Responses

None received.

10.0 Assessment

Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the report(s) of the local authority, 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 are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Access
- Other Matters

10.1. Principle of Development

10.1.1. The appeal site is zoned 'A1 – Existing Residential' with the objective 'To protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities'.

10.1.2. Having regard to the fact that residential use and development ancillary to same is permitted in principle under the A1 zoning, I consider the infill proposal to be acceptable in principle and in general compliance with national to local urban consolidation and compact growth policy, subject to a more detailed consideration of the impact of the proposal on the amenities of surrounding properties.

10.1.3. The appellant raises an issue with the principle of developing a new vehicular access off Milltown Estate given that there is no previous or existing access to the appeal site from same. The matter of access is dealt with under Section 10.2 of this report.

10.2. Access

10.2.1. The applicant proposes to remove part of c. 1.85m high blockwork boundary wall to Milltown Estate in order to create a new vehicular access to serve their 2 no. in-curtilage car parking spaces. The new (replacement) section of wall is to be 1.35m high in order to provide for adequate driver visibility for safe access and egress.

10.2.2. The applicant in their response to the appeal clarifies that the width of the new entrance is 3m and the site layout drawing shows that it will be splayed and setback

c. 2.5m - 3m from the adjoining kerb in Milltown Estate, with a perpendicular arrangement to the vehicular access serving the dwelling at No. 103 (offset c. 3.5m from same).

- 10.2.3. I note that the same access arrangements and quantum of car parking were proposed under P.A. Ref. 231045 and that the PA's Transportation Planning Section raised no issue in principle with same at that time and have again raised no issue with the current proposal (subject to the attachment of conditions). Notwithstanding, I acknowledge the concerns raised by the appellants in respect to the change of their existing cul-de-sac to a road which would provide access to the proposed development. These concerns relate to increased traffic and parking levels, substandard entrance design, road/ pedestrian safety and security, inconvenience and general disturbance.

Parking

- 10.2.4. There was little evidence of ad-hoc on-street parking on the public carriageway within the Milltown Estate cul-de-sac adjoining the appeal site during my site inspection, with the majority of parking taking place in-curtilage. The applicant proposes to provide 2 no. in-curtilage residential parking spaces which I note is in compliance with car parking standards for intermediate locations under Table 11.2 of the MCDP. In terms of the likely impact on ad-hoc on-street parking availability within the estate, I am satisfied that the proposal may only give rise to an minor, occasional and temporary impact arising from the accommodation of visitor car parking on-street within Milltown Estate (i.e. when it cannot be accommodated in-curtilage) and to no permanent loss of allocated, official or metered parking. This is acceptable in light of the available capacity for on street parking and on the basis that it is in line with existing informal parking arrangements within the estate.

Traffic/ Pedestrian Safety

- 10.2.5. The scale of the infill proposal subject of this appeal (1 no. unit) is small relative to the overall scale of the Milltown Estate (circa 100 units) and, as such, I consider that it will only give rise to a very minor increase in traffic and pedestrian footfall within the estate with no potential to exacerbate existing congestion issues which are stated by the appellant to be affecting the movement of traffic in and out of the estate.
- 10.2.6. In respect to construction stage traffic (machinery/ heavy goods vehicles etc.) and related impacts, I do note that there is potential for temporary localised disturbance

within Milltown Estate. However, I consider that such impacts are not out of the ordinary and can be managed and mitigated through the use of standard best practice construction measures (as per the advice notes appended to MCC's grant of permission) and the securing of a road opening license from the Council. I recommend the attachment of a condition to ensure same in the event the Commission are minded to grant permission.

- 10.2.7. The proposal is located at a physical remove from nearby public amenity spaces/ play spaces. The applicant proposes no material changes to the pedestrian pathways adjoining the site, to the pedestrian laneway to the north-west or other development that would affect existing levels of driver and pedestrian visibility within the cul-de-sac. On the basis of its location and the nature and extent of works proposed, I am satisfied that there is no potential for proposal to give rise to traffic hazard or to negatively impact on the mobility or safety of pedestrians (incl. elderly residents) or cyclists.

Entrance Design

- 10.2.8. The design of the proposed vehicular access is generally in-keeping with the form and width of other accesses within the estate, and I consider that there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal would obstruct access to neighbouring properties in the vicinity. However, I do note that no elevation has been provided for same nor details about any potential for the proposal to impact on the existing public lighting pole. I consider that the applicant should be required to submit an agree details of same with the planning authority by condition.

Alternative Access

- 10.2.9. The GOA seek that access to the appeal site is instead provided to the north off Milltown Road and via the adjoining (parental) property. Having visited the lands in question and having considered the alternative access proposal suggested by the appellants, I am of the view that it is unviable on the basis of the as-built arrangements and insufficient width provided to the side of the existing dwelling which would not allow for the safe provision of a vehicular access carriageway.

10.3. Other Matters

Legal Ownership

10.3.1. I note from the information on file that there is some disagreement about the origin of the boundary wall between the appeal site and the Milltown Estate however I note that its legal ownership does not appear to be disputed.

10.3.2. The PA's Roads Department did raise an issue with scope of works proposed falling outside the applicant's legal ownership (i.e. extent of service connections incorporating a public owned carriageway etc.) and recommended they be required to apply for a road opening license by condition. This is standard practice and, given that the PA did not raise a validation issue with the application, I do not have an issue with attaching such a condition in respect to lands in the PA's ownership.

Security

10.3.3. A photo submitted with the GOA seeks to draw the Commission's attention to security concerns relating to the removal of part of the boundary wall which delineates Milltown Estate from a number of neighbouring properties to the south. I note that the applicant proposes to remove/ amend c. 8m of this c.120m boundary wall in order to provide access to their proposed dwelling (only). Given the permeability and direct access to the estate provided by the existing pedestrian laneway running along this boundary wall together with the factors for consideration outlined under Section 11.5.30 (Safe and Secure Design), I consider the security concerns raised by the appellant to be unfounded. I would also note that the partial opening-up of this blank frontage will create further street level animation within the cul-de-sac and provide for a greater level of passive surveillance.

Residential Standards

10.3.4. The PA did not raise an issue in respect to the proposal's compliance with residential standards (with the exception of the issue of private amenity space which is dealt with in paragraph 10.3.12 of this report) as required in accordance with Policies DM POL 4 and SH POL 8. Having reviewed the proposal against the stated housing quality requirements for 3-bedroom houses detailed in the 2007 and 2024 Housing and Compact Settlement Guidelines, I am also satisfied that proposal complies with same.

Bike Parking and Waste Management

10.3.5. The applicant makes no specific provision for cycle parking as part of their proposal, and this is acceptable given that Section 11.9.3 (Cycling Parking) sets out no minimum

quantitative requirements for bike parking serving individual houses. In respect to waste management, they indicate that bin storage is to be provided to rear of the dwelling along the boundary. This is acceptable and compliant with DM POL 16.

Impact on Residential Amenity

- 10.3.6. The PA considered that the proposed design will not give rise to overlooking, overbearing or loss of sunlight to neighbouring properties. The grounds of appeal raised no issues in this regard.
- 10.3.7. Having regard to the siting of the dwelling relative to that of the parent's property (c. 17m separation) and to its 2-storey height and design which is generally in-keeping with that of neighbouring properties, I am satisfied that there is no potential for the proposal to give rise to overlooking (on account of compliance with Objective DM OBJ 18 and the use of obscured first floor windows) or to unacceptable overshadowing of neighbouring properties at this location on account of its aspect, orientation and positioning relative to neighbouring properties. I am also satisfied that the applicant's parents' property (5-bed house) will be left with a sufficient quantum of private amenity space in compliance with SPPR2 and MCDP Section 11.5.12 & Table 11.1 (Private Open Space) which both require a minimum of 50sq.m in respect of 4-bed+ houses.
- 10.3.8. Furthermore, whilst the dwelling is setback just 1.2m from the western site boundary, I note that no minimum setback distance is required to be achieved to the side of detached units under Section 11.5.7 (Separation Distances). Despite this proximity to a shared boundary, on account of its scale, design and configuration, I consider that the proposal would not give rise to overbearing or visual intrusion on the adjoining land to the west or to prejudice its future development.
- 10.3.9. In light of foregoing, I consider that there is no potential for the proposal to injure existing residential amenities. I am also satisfied that the proposal reflects the established character and pattern of development in the area and does not constitute ad-hoc or piecemeal development on account of its compliance with MCDP policy on infill, backland development (as set out in Sections 11.5.19 and 11.5.20 and Objectives DM OBJ 42 and 43) and local to national policy on sustainable urban compaction and use of serviced urban land.

Procedural Issues

- 10.3.10. The appellant raises a procedural concern in respect to the timing of the erection of the site notice. I note that the PA deemed the application to be valid and were satisfied with the nature and location of the statutory notices.

Other Matters

- 10.3.11. Whilst not raised by the GOA, the following matters were raised by the PA's Case Officer or Technical Departments and are required to be addressed and closed off before a decision on the appeal can be made.

Private Open Space

- 10.3.12. The MCC Planner in their report of (12/12/2024) noted issues with the location, landscaping and southern boundary treatment to the applicant's proposed private amenity space and concluded that these matters could be addressed by condition.
- 10.3.13. Policy DM POL7 and Table 11.1 state that 3-bed houses have a private open space requirement of 40sq.m. The site layout plan illustrates that the proposed dwelling will be served by a c. 50sq.m patio area/ private amenity space located to its (east) side (rather than to the rear) which will be directly accessible via the family room. I note that this is compliant with both Table 11.1 and Section 11.5.12 (Private Open Space) which requires that houses have an appropriate and useable area of dedicated private open space to the rear of the front building line.
- 10.3.14. However, I note that this amenity area is bordered to the south by the existing property's single storey garage, with no details provided in respect to the interface with same or with regard to the proposed boundary between the applicant's property and their parent's property to the south. Notwithstanding, I am of the opinion that this boundary matter is a minor detail capable of being addressed by condition to ensure full compliance with the design details set out under Policy DM POL 8 and Objective DM OBJ 28 (require secure solid wall boundary treatments of minimum 1.8m in height) where the Commission are minded to grant permission.

Drainage/ Servicing

- 10.3.15. Issues relating to surface water and foul drainage were addressed to the satisfaction of the PA at RFI stage (as detailed in Section 3.2.1). However, the PA did note in the course of their assessment that Uisce Eireann (UE) had not make a submission in respect to the applicant's servicing proposals. In this regard, I have checked the UE

Wastewater Treatment Capacity Register and Water Supply Capacity Register for Meath (Ashbourne) which both state that there is capacity available. In light of the foregoing, I am satisfied that the scheme's proposed foul drainage and water supply arrangements are matters capable of being addressed by condition should the Commission be minded to grant permission.

11.0 AA Screening

- 11.1. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on European Sites, specifically Rogerstown Estuary SAC (Site Code 000208), Malahide Estuary SAC (Site Code 000205), Malahide Estuary SPA (Site Code 004025), North-West Irish Sea SPA (Site Code 004236), Rogerstown Estuary SPA (Site Code 004015), North-West Irish Sea SPA (Site Code 004236), River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (Site Code 002299) and River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (Site Code 004232), in view of these sites' Conservation Objectives, and Appropriate Assessment (and submission of an NIS) is not therefore required.
- 11.2. This determination is based on:
- The relatively minor nature of the development.
 - The location-distance from the nearest European Site and lack of connections.
 - Taking into account the appropriate assessment screening undertaken by the PA.
- 11.3. I conclude that, on the basis of objective information, the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
- 11.4. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (Stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

12.0 Recommendation

I recommend a GRANT of permission subject to the following conditions.

13.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the zoning of the site, 'A1 – Existing Residential' with the objective to 'To protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities', to the planning policies, objectives and development standards of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027, and to the nature, scale and design of the proposed development relative to the existing pattern and character of development in the neighbouring Milltown Estate and wider area, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development is an acceptable form of development at this location. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

14.0 Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further information received by the planning authority on the 11 th June 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.	Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed dwellings shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area.
3.	Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit a landscape plan carried out by a suitably qualified person, for the written agreement of the planning authority. This landscape plan shall provide details of all proposed site boundaries and shall include details on the nature and extent of the existing and proposed party boundary shared with the existing property to the south. Reason: To protect the amenities of the area.

4.	<p>The detail and layout of the junction between the new driveway and the existing public realm in the Milltown Estate (including elevational details of the proposed boundary and vehicular entrance to the north of the site to include consideration of the impact on the existing public lighting pole) shall be agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the amenities of the area.</p>
5.	<p>Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall apply to the local authority for a road opening license in respect to the works proposed to the public carriageway in the Milltown Estate.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.</p>
6.	<p>The applicant shall comply with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The applicant shall ensure all foul/ grey water shall be directed to a foul sewer system. (b) The applicant shall ensure all surface water/ rainwater shall be directed to a surface water system. (c) Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall agree a surface water outfall connection with the Area Engineer and incorporate it into the revised surface water layout, undertaking any remedial works to the existing surface water drainage network which the Municipal District Engineer considers necessary to facilitate the discharge from the proposed development. (d) All surface water design/work shall comply fully with the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study Regional Drainage Policies Volume 2, for New Developments and the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works, Volume 6. (e) All surface water <p>Reason: In the interests of public health and in order to ensure adequate drainage provision.</p>
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The applicant is asked to submit a Pre-Connection Enquiry to Uisce Eireann (UE) for a new water connection to ascertain the feasibility of connecting to the UE network. Evidence of Confirmation of Feasibility from Uisce Eireann for proposed water connection shall be submitted to the planning authority as soon as possible. (b) The applicant shall sign a connection agreement with Irish Water prior to the commencement of the development and adhere to the standards and conditions set out in that agreement. (c) All development shall be carried out in compliance with Irish Water Standards codes and practices. (d) Any proposals by the applicant to divert or build over existing water or wastewater services shall be submitted to Irish Water for written approval prior to works commencing. (e) Separation distances between the existing Irish Water assets and proposed structures, other services, trees, etc. have to be in accordance with the Irish Water Codes of Practice and Standard Details.

	Reason: To ensure adequate provision of water and wastewater facilities.
8.	<p>All development shall be carried out in compliance with Uisce Éireann's Standard Details and Codes of Practice. Uisce Éireann does not permit Build Over of its assets. Where the applicant proposes to build over or divert existing water or wastewater services the applicant shall have received written Confirmation of Feasibility (COF) of Diversion(s) from Uisce Éireann prior to any works commencing.</p> <p>Reason: To provide adequate water and wastewater facilities.</p>
9.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.</p>
10.	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
11.	<p>All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, public lighting, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and orderly development.</p>

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

Emma Gosnell
Planning Inspector
5th November 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-323181-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of 1 no. dwelling with all associated site works.
Development Address	Milltown Road, Ashbourne Road, Co. Meath, A84 WP73.
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	<p>Part 2, Class 10(b)(i) Infrastructure – dwelling units – 500 units. Proposal is for 1 no. dwelling unit.</p> <p>Part 2, Class 10(b)(iv) - Urban development – 10 hectares (built-up area). Site is c. 0.033 ha.</p>

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ACP-323181-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a house and all associated site works.
Development Address	Milltown Road, Ashbourne Road, Co. Meath, A84 WP73.
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 is for 1 no. dwelling house, a car port and related works and it comes forward as a standalone project, and it does not involve the use of substantial natural resources or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its 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.

<p>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).</p>	<p>The development is situated on a brownfield backland/ infill site located to the rear of an existing residential dwelling in Ashbourne, Co. Meath.</p> <p>The Broadmeadow River is located c. 150m to the south of the appeal site and provides a very indirect hydrological link with Malahide Estuary (SPA (Site Code 004025) and SAC (Site Code 000205)).</p> <p>However, it is considered that there is no pathway from the appeal site to this river as per Section 11 of the Inspector's Report (AA Screening).</p> <p>The development is removed from sensitive natural habitats, dense centres of population and designated sites identified significance in the County Development Plan.</p>
<p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts (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>	<p>Having regard to the 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, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.</p>
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.

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

DP/ADP: _____ **Date:** _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix 2 – AA Screening Determination

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

I have considered the proposal comprising of the construction of 1 no. dwelling and car port with all associated site works at Milltown Road, Ashbourne Road, Co. Meath in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located:

- c. 13km from Rogerstown Estuary SAC (Site Code 000208).
- c. 13km from Malahide Estuary SPA (Site Code 004025).
- c. 13km from Malahide Estuary SAC (Site Code 000205).
- c. 13.5km from North-West Irish Sea SPA (Site Code 004236).
- c. 14km from Rogerstown Estuary SPA (Site Code 004015).
- c. 20km from North-West Irish Sea SPA (Site Code 004236).
- c. 20km from River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (Site Code 002299)
- c. 20km from River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (Site Code 004232).

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:

- Small scale nature of works/ development
- Location-distance from nearest European site and lack of connections
- Taking into account screening report/ determination by PA.

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.

Appendix 3

Screening the need for Water Framework Directive Assessment Determination

The appeal site is located to the rear of an existing dwelling on Milltown Road, Ashbourne, Co. Meath.

The Broadmeadow River is located c. 150m to the south of the appeal site and to the rear of the houses that line the south side of Milltown Road.

The proposal comprises of the construction of 1 no. dwelling and car port with all associated site works – see Section 2.0 of Inspector's Report for further details.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

I have assessed the proposal for permission (described above) on this backland site at Milltown Road, Ashbourne, Co. Meath and I have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and 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 de-minimus small scale nature and scale of the proposal.
- The location-distance from nearest water bodies, intervening land use and/or lack of hydrological connections.

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.