



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-323760-25

Development	The construction of a dwelling, new entrance and connection to existing public services and all associated site works
Location	Eightyeight acres, Athboy, Co. Meath
Planning Authority	Meath County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560157
Applicant(s)	Jim Priest
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Norah Kelly
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	10 th December 2025
Inspector	Emma Nevin

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site, which has a stated area of 0.14 ha, is located in the rural townland of Eighty Eight Acres, to the east of Athboy. Vehicular access to the site would be off the local road L-4003-2, with an existing agricultural entrance.
- 1.2. The site boundaries consist of mature hedgerow to the local road to the front (west), a wooden fence to the rear (east), a wooden fence and shrubbery to the side (north) and an existing single storey dwelling to the other side (south).
- 1.3. Construction works have commenced on site, however there was no construction on-going at time of site inspection.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the construction of a dwelling, new entrance and connection to existing public services and all associated site works.
- 2.2. The dwelling as proposed has a stated floor area of 60 sq. m. and comprises a two bedroom single storey dwelling located centrally in the site, set back some 18 metres from the roadside boundary of the site (west/northwest). The dwelling as proposed has simple linear configuration with a pitched roof to an overall height of 5 metres. The principal elevation would be west/northwest facing, is of simple traditional design with fenestration at ground floor level and entrance door with an overhang roof above the entrance door.
- 2.3. The dwelling house would be accessed via an existing entrance to the west/northwest) of the site, which will be accessed off the existing local road (L4003) Eighty Eight Acres.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. The Planning Authority granted permission, following significant further information request, on 22nd July 2025, subject to 14 conditions, which included the following:

- Condition 1 requests that the development be completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the Planning Authority on 14/02/2025 and revised particulars on 23/06/2025.
- Condition 2 relates to the occupancy of the dwelling.
- Condition 3 relates to finishes.
- Condition 5 (a) requires the applicant to remove the entire roadside boundary hedge and set it back at least 3 metres from the existing road edge. A grass verge, at least 3 metres in width, shall be provided and maintained free of any obstruction, between the edge of the road and the new site boundary.
- Condition 5(b) states the entrance layout shall comply with the Meath Rural Design Guide.
- Condition 5 (c) relates to road drainage requirements.
- Condition 6 relates to landscaping.
- Condition 7 relates to surface water drainage requirements.
- Condition, 8, 9, 10 and 11 are standard construction related conditions.
- Conditions 12, 13 and 14 relate to Development Contributions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning Reports dated 18th July 2025 and 1st April 2025 have been provided.
- 3.2.2. This planning application was assessed under the Meath County Development Plan, 2021 – 2027.
- 3.2.3. The original planning report considered it necessary to seek further information on the following items:
 - To demonstrate unobstructed sightlines of 90metres to the nearside edge of the road from a setback of 2.4metres, in accordance with TII document DN-GEO03060, from the entrance. Where works are required, to achieve unobstructed sightlines, on lands outside the ownership of the applicant then written consent of the landowner should be submitted. The red line boundary

should be revised to include any works required to provide unobstructed sightlines.

- There is a current live permission for a dwelling on the application site as permitted under planning reference no. KA/160032 and 21/950 to another applicant. The applicant is requested to clarify and confirm that he owns the site and that this current application will replace and supersede that grant of permission.
- To submit a revised Site Layout Map showing the location of the proposed soakpits on the site as per BRE 365 standards.

3.2.4. I note that the further information response was deemed to include significant additional data in the context of Article 35(1)(c) of the Planning & Development Regulations 2001 (as amended). The revised Site Notice was dated 1st July 2025, and the revised Newspaper Notice was dated 5th July 2025 and was considered acceptable.

3.2.5. The second planning report considered the further information response as follows:

- The Transportation Department noted, *'The applicant has demonstrated a sightline of 79 metres to the nearside edge of the road in the southwest direction and a sightline of 90 metres to the nearside edge of the road in the northeast direction. This is considered acceptable. Works required to achieve the sightlines have been identified in the site layout plan. No objection to the proposed development subject to conditions'*.
- It was noted in the planners' report that this is the same entrance to that which was granted planning permission on site under Pl. Ref. KA160032 and that the speed limit has now reduced to 60kph at this location.
- The applicant confirmed that they own the application site. The applicant has attached land registry and folio details showing that the application site is in the name of the applicant. They have also stated that in the event of a grant of planning permission of the current application that it will supersede the current Pl. Ref. KA160032 and 21/950. This was considered acceptable.
- The applicant submitted a revised Site Layout Map showing the location of soak pits on the site. This was considered acceptable.

3.2.6. The planners report considered that the further information was acceptable and concluded that permission be granted.

3.2.7. Other Technical Reports

- Transportation: Report received on 18th March 2025, recommending further information. Report received 16th July, recommending grant.
- Environment Department (Wastewater), no report received.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.3.1. No prescribed bodies were consulted.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

3.4.1. No third party submissions were received.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. Ref. 21/950: Permission was granted by Meath County Council on 8th July 2021 for the extension of duration of PI. Ref. KA160032.

4.2. Ref. KA160032: Permission was granted by Meath County Council on the 9th March 2016 for the construction of a single storey dwelling, domestic garage, convert existing entrance to splayed and recessed type entrance and connections to public foul sewer, surface water drains and public water main.

4.3. Ref. KA30165: Permission was refused by Meath County Council on the 25th June 2003 for a dormer type dwelling, domestic garage, connect to public sewer and public watermain, erect double shared entrance to serve existing dwelling and proposed dwelling, close existing gate on site and remove existing unauthorised domestic garage to allow access to proposed site.

The notification of decision could not be located from the Councils website.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 (including Variations 1, 2 & 3)

5.1.1. The site is zoned 'RA' Rural Area, with a stated objective *"To protect and promote in a balanced way, the development of agriculture, forestry and sustainable rural-related enterprise, community facilities, biodiversity, the rural landscape, and the built and cultural heritage"*.

5.1.2. The Meath County Development Plan 2007-2013 identifies three area types in the county following detailed research and assessment, which are Area 1 - Rural Areas under Strong Urban Influence, Area 2 - Strong Rural Areas and Area 3 - Low Development Pressure Areas.

The subject site is within the Rural Area under Strong Urban Influence.

5.1.3. The site is located within a 'Lowland Landscape' area, namely the 'The West Navan Lowlands', which has a moderate landscape character value and a moderate landscape character sensitivity.

5.1.4. Chapter 9 of this Plan 'Rural Development Strategy' sets out the settlement policy in respect of rural areas in the County, including rural nodes, and states,

"Rural development should be consolidated within existing villages and settlements that can build sustainable rural communities as set out in the National Planning Framework (NPF) and the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Eastern and Midlands Region (RSES). The Development Plan seeks to accommodate rural generated housing needs¹ where they arise, subject to local housing need criteria and development management standards".

5.1.5. The following are of relevance:

- Section 8.17.4 Landscape Character Types and Areas, the site is located within the River Corridor and Estuary Landscape Character Area.
- Section 9.2, "RUR DEV SP 2", which states that it is an objective of the Council, *"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, subject to compliance with normal*

planning criteria. An assessment of individual rural development proposals including one-off houses shall have regard to other policies and objectives in this Development Plan, and in particular Chapter 8 Section 8.6.1 UNESCO World Heritage Site of Brú na Bóinne”.

- Section 9.4 Persons who are an Intrinsic Part of the Rural Community states, that *“the Planning Authority recognises the interest of persons local to or linked to a rural area, who are not engaged in significant agricultural or rural resource related occupation, to live in rural areas”*, subject to the applicant demonstrating a valid case to locate in the area.
- Section 9.16 Roadside Boundaries, which states *“Roadside boundaries, whether hedgerows, sod and stone bank, stone wall or other boundaries, provide important features that are elements of both the landscape and ecology of rural areas”*.
- Section 9.18 Technical Requirements, specifically RD POL 43, which states; *“To ensure that the required standards for sight distances and stopping sight distances are in compliance with current road geometry standards as outlined in the NRA document Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) specifically Section TD 41-42/09 when assessing individual planning applications for individual houses in the countryside”*.

5.2. National Planning Framework (2025)

5.2.1. The NPF provides an overarching policy and planning framework for the social, economic and culture development of the country. The NPF sets out National Policy Objectives in relation to the strategic planning and sustainable development of urban and rural areas. It further states that a more flexible approach, primarily based on siting and design, will be applied to rural housing in areas that are not subject to urban development pressure. This will assist in sustaining more fragile rural communities and in overall terms, will need to be related to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements.

5.2.2. I note National Policy Objective 28, 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”.

5.3. Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) - Eastern and Midland Regional Assembly (EMRA)

- 5.3.1. The RSES sets out the strategic framework for the economic and spatial development of the Eastern and Midland Region up to 2031. The primary objective of the RSES is to support more sustainable settlement patterns that focus on compact growth, makes the most efficient use of land and infrastructure, and takes an integrated approach to development that provides employment opportunities and improvements to services alongside population and residential growth.
- 5.3.2. The relevant elements of the growth strategy of the RSES that will influence future growth and development in Meath include a focus on investment in rural towns, villages, and rural nodes to combat the decline of rural areas.

5.4. Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines

- 5.4.1. Having considered the nature of the proposal and the documentation on file, I am of the opinion that the directly relevant S28 Ministerial Guidelines are:

- Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities, April 2005.

The Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines 2005 set out implementation guidelines for Planning Authorities in respect of rural housing having regard to the National Spatial Strategy's overall development framework.

The Guidelines advocate the identification of types of rural areas, such that clear Development Plan policies in respect of rural housing can be formulated. The subject site would be most akin to the 'Rural Areas under Strong Urban Influence' type per Section 3.2 of the Guidelines. Appendix 3 of the Guidelines states that,

in respect of rural areas designated as being under strong urban influence, policies should be formulated such that the housing requirements of the rural community are catered for, whilst urban generated development should be directed into zoned settlement areas of towns, cities and villages. Furthermore, the Guidelines advocate that clear criteria be included in the Development Plan in respect of how the Planning Authority will assess rural housing proposals.

5.5. Other relevant guidance

5.5.1. The following is also of relevance to this appeal:

- Geometric Design of Junctions (priority junctions, direct accesses, roundabouts, grade separated and compact grade separated junctions) DN-GEO-03060, TII, May 2023.

5.6. Natural Heritage Designations

5.6.1. The subject site is not located within a designated European Site. The closest such sites, which are approx. 540m to the west of the site are:

- River Boyne/Blackwater SAC (Site Code 002299), and
- River Boyne/Blackwater SPA (Site Code 004232).

5.7. EIA Screening

5.7.1. I refer the Coimisiún to the completed Form 2 in Appendix 1. Having regard to the nature, size and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations, I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, therefore, is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. A third party appeal was received from Norah Kelly, following the grant of an application for leave to appeal (under ACP:323418-25). The grounds of appeal are summarised below:

- Following the request for further information, the department of transport issued a recommendation on 16th July 2025, stating that the applicant must obtain written consent from the landowner to carry out the works on the land.
- This consent was necessary to ensure the provision and maintenance of unobstructed sightlines.
- The owner of the hedge did not provide this consent to the applicant.

6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. A first party response to the appeal on 20th October 2025, prepared on behalf of the applicants' agent. The submission responds to the issues raised within the third party appeal as follows: -

- The applicant questions the validity of the leave to appeal process.
- It is argued that the correct procedure in respect of leave to appeal was not followed and that the leave to appeal application should be dismissed.
- The leave to appeal was received after the final day of receipt of appeal and therefore should have been deemed invalid.
- There is no indication as to when the leave to appeal application was lodged.
- As there are no conditions requiring prior to commencement of development details to be lodged, the applicant lodged a commencement notice and has commenced works on site.
- Work has ceased on site and will remain stopped pending the outcome of this appeal.

- The appellant left the submission to the last day to exert the maximum grief to the applicant in terms of financial cost and subsequent delays.
- The applicant is the owner of the lands contained under folio number 36193F.
- Permission has been granted on this site previously and is similar to the current application.
- Meath County Council granted permission subject to 14 no. conditions, no conditions were prior to commencement of development cases.
- The basis of the appeal centres around Condition No. 1 and Condition No. 5a.
- The Transportation Department of Meath County Council acknowledged that a sightline in both directions are achieved and acceptable.
- In the absence of the prior to commencement of development recommendation, it is clear that the decision of the local authority refers to the removal of the hedgerow contained within the applicant's site only.
- If the local authority wanted the neighbours hedgerow to be maintained/removed they would have included the prior to the commencement recommendation of acquiring for works on lands outside the ownership of the applicant and conditioned it accordingly.
- In reply to the further information the applicant proposes to remove the existing hedgerow within the boundary of their own site in order to achieve sightlines.
- Given that the hedgerow to be removed is within the applicants site only, and not the neighbouring lands, it is clear that objectives 2, 3 and 4 for leave to appeal applicant have not been met and should be dismissed.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

6.3.1. No response received.

6.4. Observations

None received.

6.5. Further Responses

None received.

7.0 Assessment

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

- I. Boundary and sightlines.
- II. Leave to appeal
- III. Appropriate Assessment, and
- IV. Other Matters.

7.2. Boundary and Sightlines

- 7.2.1. The third party appeal states that consent was necessary to ensure the provision and maintenance of unobstructed sightlines as per the further information request from Meath County Council. The owner of the hedge did not provide this consent to the applicant.
- 7.2.2. The applicants' response to the appeal, considers that the decision of Meath County Council Transportation Department of Meath County Council acknowledged that a sightline in both directions are achieved and acceptable, and in the absence of the prior to commencement of development recommendation, it is clear that the decision of the local authority refers to the removal of the hedgerow contained within the applicant's site only, which is in the ownership of the applicant.
- 7.2.3. Of particular relevance to the decision of this planning application, is the further information request, under which the applicant was requested *"to demonstrate unobstructed sightlines of 90metres to the nearside edge of the road from a setback of 2.4metres, in accordance with TII document DN-GEO03060, from the entrance. Where works are required, to achieve unobstructed sightlines, on lands outside the ownership of the applicant then written consent of the landowner should be submitted. The red line boundary should be revised to include any works required to provide unobstructed sightlines"*.

- 7.2.4. I note that the proposed development is located on the L-4003 inside the 60kph speed limits.
- 7.2.5. The applicant responded to the further information request on the 23rd June 2025, I note that revised public notices were required given the significant additional data in the context of Article 35(1)(c) of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended.
- 7.2.6. The revised site plan (drawing no: FI-24.038-1, dated 20/6/2025), indicates a revised site boundary, with the red line planning application boundary extended to the northeast of the site, to include some 31.88 metres. The revised site plan notes that the hedge to the northeast (over a distance of 31.88 metres), will be maintained by the applicant to maintain sightline, as indicated in light green on the revised site plan drawing.
- 7.2.7. I also note that the applicants' cover letter, accompanying the further information dated 23rd June 2025, where the applicant states that *"Outside the curtilage of the applicants site, in the northeast direct, the applicant has permission from the landowner to maintain the hedgerow at an appropriate height in order to achieve sightlines. The hedgerow to be maintained is shown light green on drawing number FI-24.038-1. Photograph no 1 shows the hedgerow to be maintain and the hedgerow to be removed and replanted"*.
- 7.2.8. The report from the Transportation Department, dated 16th July 2025, noted *"The applicant has demonstrated a sightline of 79 metres to the nearside edge of the road in the south west direction and a sightline of 90 metres to the nearside edge of the road in the north east direction. This is considered acceptable. Works required to achieve the sightlines have been identified in the site layout plan"*.
- 7.2.9. However, no letter of consent from the adjoining landowner accompanies the planning application. I also note that the Transportation Department, noted this in their report noted above. Moreover, as per the third party appeal, I note that the applicant does not have the consent from the adjoining landowner to carry out works to the boundary hedge to the northeast.
- 7.2.10. The planners report notes that "90m sightline is shown on drawing number FI-24.038-1. The applicant proposed to remove the existing hedgerow within the curtilage of their site. Hedgerow to be removed is shown brown on drawing number

FI-24.038-1. The applicant proposed to erect/plant a new front boundary within the curtilage of their site at a location appropriate to achieve the required sightline. The new boundary within the curtilage of the site is shown pink". The planners report further notes "that this is the same entrance to that which was granted planning permission on site under Pl. Ref. KA160032 and that the speed limit has now reduced to 60kph at this location", this is also noted in the applicants' response to the appeal.

- 7.2.11. While I note that all planning applications are assessed on their own merits, having reviewed the proposed site layout plan, under Ref. KA160032, I note that sightlines of 90m metres from the proposed site entrance to the northeast (A-C on the plan), and sightlines of 90m from the proposed site entrance to the southwest (A-B on the plan), were identified.
- 7.2.12. While the applicant in their response to the third party appeal, notes that the conditions attached to the decision to grant permission from Meath County Council do not require works to be agreed prior to the commencement of development on site.
- 7.2.13. I note that Condition No. 1 states that "The development shall be completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the Planning Authority on 14/02/2025 and revised particulars on 23/06/2025 except where conditions hereunder specify otherwise. 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", this is in the interests of the proper planning and development of the area.
- 7.2.14. However, in the absence of the consent of the adjoining landowner, the applicant cannot ensure that the hedge to the northeast of the site, over a distance of 31.88 metres, as indicated on the revised site plan (drawing no: FI-24.038-1, dated 20/6/2025), which is outside of their ownership, can be maintained, to ensure that adequate sightlines are provided and maintained to the northeast of the site.
- 7.2.15. In this regard, I am not satisfied that the applicant has adequately demonstrated that unobstructed sightlines of 90metres to the nearside edge of the road from a setback

of 2.4metres, in accordance with TII document DN-GEO-03060, from the entrance can be achieved within the red site planning application boundary.

7.2.16. In the absence of proposals for such site remedial works to address any impediments to achieving sufficient visibility to the north/northeast, within the applicants ownership, I consider that the proposed development would result in a traffic hazard and would be an endangerment to public safety. I do not consider that this matter can be addressed by condition to ensure a safe means of vehicular access, due the lands not being in the control of the applicant, nor consent of the adjoining landowner obtained.

7.2.17. Having regard to the foregoing, I recommend that permission be refused.

7.3. Leave to Appeal

7.3.1. An application for leave to appeal was granted, under section 37 (6) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, to Nora Kelly (leave to appeal applicant) under ACP-323418-25. The applicants' response to the appeal, queries the validity of the leave to appeal process, the correct procedure in respect of leave to appeal was not followed and that the leave to appeal application should be dismissed.

7.3.2. I note that the leave to appeal was under a separate application ACP-323418-25, lodged 18th August 2025 with a decision date of 15th September 2025.

7.3.3. The decision of the Coimisiún noted that the implications of the permission granted under Ref 2560157, would differ materially from the development as set out in the application for permission by reason of condition number 1 and condition number 5(a) imposed by the planning authority. It was also considered that the imposition of said conditions will materially affect the applicant's enjoyment of the land adjoining the land in respect of which it has been decided to grant permission. Having reviewed the application details I would agree with the conclusion reached by the Coimisiun when adjudicating upon the application for leave to appeal.

7.3.4. As such, I am satisfied that the leave for appeal application was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended.

7.4. Appropriate Assessment

- 7.4.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of S177U the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 7.4.2. The subject site is located in a rural area. It is not located within or immediately adjacent to a European site. The nearest European sites are:
- River Boyne/Blackwater SAC (Site Code 002299) - 540m to the west of the site,
 - River Boyne/Blackwater SPA (Site Code 004232) - 540m to the west of the site.
- 7.4.3. The proposed development comprises the construction of a dwelling, a new vehicular entrance and all associated site works. The appeal site is located in Eighty Eight Areas, on lands zoned 'RA', rural area.
- 7.4.4. No conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 7.4.5. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site.
- 7.4.6. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Small scale nature of the proposed development and the domestic nature of the existing development within the appeal site.
 - The location of the development in a serviced urban area.
 - Location-distance from nearest European Sites and lack of connections.
 - Taking into account the AA Screening determination by the planning authority.
- 7.4.7. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European side either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
- 7.4.8. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore appropriate assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended) is not required.

7.5. Other Matters

7.5.1. Landownership

The first party response to the appeal, references that the applicant is the owner of the lands contained under folio number 36193F. There is no dispute that the applicant owns the lands within the planning application boundary (submitted with the planning application received 14th February 2025).

However, as noted in the forgoing assessment, the applicant does not own or have the consent or otherwise to carry out the works indicated on the revised site plan submitted as part of the further information request (received 23rd June 2025).

7.5.2. Rural Housing Policy

Under the Meath County Development Plan 2021 - 2027, the site is shown as lying within the Rural Area under Strong Urban Influence. Under this policy, applicants must demonstrate that they have a rural generated housing need. To this end, the applicant submitted sufficient documentation to establish a rural housing need at this location and the applicant demonstrated their links specifically to Athboy. As such, the applicant qualifies as a candidate for a rural dwelling house on the subject site due to their compliance with criterion of the Meath County Development Plan.

7.5.3. Site Services

In respect of Water Supply, as outlined in the application form submitted by the applicant the proposed dwelling will be serviced by a new water supply connection through the public mains via a connect to the public mains along the front of the site.

In respect of Wastewater Treatment, foul water treatment is by way of connection to existing public sewer. As such, I consider that the proposed site services to be generally acceptable.

7.5.4. Design and Layout

I am generally satisfied with the modest scale, layout, and traditional layout of the proposed dwelling on site.

8.0 **Recommendation**

- 8.1. I recommend that planning permission should be REFUSED, for the following reasons and considerations.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 9.1. On the basis of the information as submitted with the application and appeal, the Coimisiún cannot be satisfied that the applicant has the legal consent to carry out the development in accordance with the plans and particulars submitted with the application, in particular the further information received on 23rd June 2025, in respect of maintaining adequate sightlines from the proposed entrance to the northeast. It is considered, therefore, that the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard because of the additional traffic turning movements the development would generate at a point where sightlines are restricted in a northeasterly direction. The proposed development would, therefore, 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.

Emma Nevin
Planning Inspector

15th December 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Coimisiún Pleanála Case Reference	ACP-323760-25		
Proposed Development Summary	The construction of a dwelling, new entrance and connection to existing public services and all associated site works		
Development Address	Eighty Eight acres, Athboy, Co. Meath		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	X
		No	
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) or does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes			
No	X		Proceed to Q.3
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)
			Conclusion
No	X	N/A	Development is not a project of type listed in Schedule 5, Part 2
			No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes			

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	X	Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required