



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

### PL-500311-MH-25

---

<b>Development</b>	The construction of 68 no. residential units, demolition of dwelling and all other site works. Significant further information/revised plans submitted on this application.
<b>Location</b>	Castle Street and Killegland Street Killegland Townland , Ashbourne , Co.Meath
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Meath County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	2560170
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Carrie Flynn
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Refuse Permission
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Carrie Flynn
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	27 <sup>th</sup> February 2026
<b>Inspector</b>	Aisling MacNamara

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

The proposed development relates to a 0.416ha site located within the settlement of Ashbourne in County Meath. The site contains an existing two storey dwelling, ancillary outbuilding and its associated driveway and garden at the northern part of the site. The southern part of the site is undeveloped land.

The northern boundary adjoins Killelland Street. The western boundary adjoins Castle Street. The southwestern edge of the site adjoins the Castle Street roundabout. Lidl supermarket adjoins the eastern boundary of the site. Broad Meadow River and walkway runs close to the southern boundary of the site. Broadmeadow Park extends in linear direction along the river to the south of the site.

The site is within easy walk of services and facilities in the town centre. There is existing housing located within the surrounding area.

The existing dwelling is accessed from an existing vehicular entrance to Castle Street. There are trees and shrubs located within the garden of the dwelling, including predominantly evergreen leylandii, young trees, hedge and garden shrubs.

Levels fall in a southerly direction across the site, from c 67.44 to c 64.3. There is a high retaining wall constructed along the eastern boundary to the adjoining Lidl site and a high boundary wall along the southern boundary to the river walk.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

The proposed development is as follows:

Construction of 68 no. 'age friendly' (independent living for over 55s) residential units to include:

- Block A - 4 storey apartment block consisting of 35 units (16 no. 1 bed units, 19 no. 2 bed units, switch room, plant room, laundry room, storage room and communal bin store)
- Block B – 5 storey apartment block consisting of 33 units (9 no. 1 bed units, 20 no. 2 bed units, 4 no. studio units, communal day room, kitchen,

management office, community care room, GP consultation room, communal bin store, bicycle store, plant room, storage room)

- Demolition of existing two storey dwelling house
- Associated works including alterations to existing roadside boundary and associated footpath to accommodate the proposed development.

The existing house to be demolished is 204sqm.

The gross floor area of proposed works is 5920sqm. A total of 17no. car parking spaces are proposed. A total of 76 no. cycle spaces are proposed. Block A has FFL of 65.55 and Block B has FFL of 65.00.

Revised proposals were submitted at further information stage (significant further information). The revisions include the raising of Block A to FFL66.20 and raising of Block B to FFL66.15 with introduction of a new external walkway for access to address flood risk including revisions for the provision of cycle storage to accommodate 101 cycle spaces, car parking of 17 no. spaces.

Note that revised drawings have been submitted by the applicant with the appeal submission. The drawings show the introduction of louvred screens to the undercroft of the building (Block A FFL66.20, Block B FFL66.15).

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

#### **3.1. Decision**

By order dated 24/10/2025, the planning authority made the decision to refuse permission for the following reasons:

*1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, which would see an intensification of development on site, the location of the proposed development in a highly trafficked urban area in proximity to the Ashbourne town centre and the prevailing pattern of development in the vicinity the Planning Authority considers that the access and parking arrangements for the proposed development are poorly considered and would lead to an overflow of surface car parking from the development, poor permeability and connectivity for pedestrian, cyclists and vulnerable road users and increased pressure for parking and inappropriate turning*

*movements in the immediate environments. If permitted, the proposed development would result in the intensification of unsatisfactory traffic and parking arrangements in the area, would endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard and would contribute to a poor quality public realm. Furthermore, the proposed scheme, due to the lack of adequate bicycle parking and storage facilities, would fail to meet the mobility needs of future residents. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the provisions of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027, including the development management standards set out in Sections 11.9.3 and 11.9.1 respectively of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027.*

*2. The proposed development is located in an area which is designated as 'Flood Zone B', therefore is at risk of flooding, and should the development be permitted would further displace flood waters onto neighbouring public roadways, posing a hazard to road users. Having regard to the provisions of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 in relation to development proposals in areas at risk of flooding, it is considered that, in the absence of adequate information relating to the risk of flooding, analysis of such risk, and appropriate mitigating measures to address any risk, a grant of permission would be contrary to the provisions of Section 6.10.2 and the objectives INF OBJ 20 and 21 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027. Accordingly, to permit the proposed development would be prejudicial to public health and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

## **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

### **3.2.1. Planning Reports**

- The first report of the Case Planner dated 15/04/2024 recommends further information in relation to 13 items.
- Further Information was requested by the planning authority on 17/04/2026 in relation to the following:
  - (1) Provide justification/ clarification regarding percentage of residential properties on B1 zoned land (commercial / town centre).

- (2) Submit additional information in relation to finishes, storage space, impact on development west of site (submit daylight and sunlight assessment).
- (3) Address issues raised by Council's Transportation Department –
  - show sightlines in accordance with DMURS of 49m x 2.4m,
  - car parking cognisant of CDP and Design Standards for New Apartments, revised TTA should be submitted to reflect revised parking quantum,
  - cycle storage in compliance with Design Standards for New Apartments,
  - red boundary of site should be revised to include all works including works on footpath, cycle path, verge outside of physical site boundary.
- (4) Submit phasing plan.
- (5) Submit details of proposed management company arrangements.
- (6) Submit public lighting designs.
- (7) Submit details in relation to broadband connection.
- (8) Submit archaeological impact assessment.
- (9) Submit a more detailed/ revised Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment and apply Justification Test. Proposed development site is partially situated in Flood Zone A.
- (10) Submit information in relation to collection and disposal of surface water:
  - revised surface water system that is SuDS compliant,
  - topographical survey including details of existing surface water network,
  - ground investigation report and details of winter groundwater level,
  - cross section of driveway infiltration system showing roof water drainage discharging to infiltration blanket underneath proposed permeable paving,
  - breakdown of impermeable areas / contributing areas for surface water network / attenuation system,
  - an overland flow exceedance plan showing where exceedance surface water run off will be directed in event of surface water system surcharges,

- all surface water design to comply with Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study (GDSDS),

- all surface water design to comply with Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works.

(11) Carry out Inward Noise Impact Assessment – may experience current or future aircraft noise.

(12) Clarify ownership / submit letters of consent.

(13) Revised notices may be required if response is significant – planning authority will issue notification.

- The applicant submitted a response to the planning authority on 10<sup>th</sup> September 2025. The response was deemed 'significant' and new public notices were advertised (submitted 30<sup>th</sup> September 2025).
- The second report of the Case Planner dated 24/10/2025 recommended refusal for two reasons relating to traffic / parking and flooding.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

#### Environment SW- Flooding

Report of 15/04/2025:

Flooding – site is partially in Flood Zone A and Flood Zone B, a more detailed site specific flood risk assessment required with application of Justification Test.

Surface water treatment and disposal – the development does not meet the requirements of the section with respect to orderly collection, treatment and disposal of surface water - recommends further information.

Report of 24/10/2025:

Flooding

The proposal is contrary to Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines and materially contravenes INF POL18 and INF POL20 of CDP.

Applicant carried out hydraulic modelling and from the assessment has shown the site located in Flood Zone B.

The submitted SSFRA states that the existing floodplain is primarily providing a conveyance function rather than storage during a critical flood event however this is not the case – the existing southern boundary wall of the site will not allow flood waters re enter the Broadmeadow river as suggested and therefore the site provides storage for flood waters. The development could affect flood pathways.

The raising of the blocks above flood levels by piles and supported by concrete slab is not acceptable – not feasible and sustainable type of development.

The development will result in infilling of flood plain with proposed finished ground level 2m above existing ground levels adjacent to car parking spaces 16 & 17 which results in compensatory storage being required. The applicant has not provided information on compensatory storage.

The development does not satisfy part 2(i) and part 2(ii) of development management Justification Test. The development could affect flood pathways and displace flood water therefore increasing flood risk elsewhere.

Surface water treatment and disposal

The development does not meet requirements of the Council for collection, treatment and disposal of surface water - the development would materially contravene POL16 of CDP.

Insufficient information provided in relation to the design of the surface water system.

The applicant has not submitted a detailed revised surface water system that is SUDS compliant.

The applicant has not submitted ground investigation report nor the details of winter ground water levels.

The proposed attenuation system is not acceptable.

The applicant has not submitted overland flow exceedance plan for the proposed development.

The applicant has not submitted detailed cross section of the proposed driveway infiltration system showing roof water drainage discharging into the infiltration blanket underneath the proposed permeable paving.

If permission granted, recommended condition attached.

## Transportation Department

Report of 27/03/2025:

Recommends further information in relation to sightlines, car parking quantum, cycle facilities, red line boundary and works.

Report of 17/10/2025:

Recommends refusal – The proposed development provides insufficient quantum of bicycle and car parking spaces to serve future occupants and visitors and does not comply with development management standards in sections 11.9.3 and 11.9.1 of CDP. Due to lack of parking the proposed development would lead to haphazard parking within and adjacent to the proposed development.

The sightlines submitted are acceptable.

The applicant considers the number of parking spaces provided is sufficient. The development site is located in a peripheral location as defined in Sustainable Compact Settlement Guidelines for which the maximum car parking rate would be 2 no. spaces per dwelling in accordance with SPPR3. The site is not well served by public transport. A car parking ratio as proposed would generally only be considered acceptable for centrally located and highly accessible site locations. Given the low car parking ratio, there are concerns that the development would result in increased overspill and haphazard parking on adjacent roads. The applicant has not demonstrated that adequate car parking for residents and visitors has been provided.

The applicant has proposed 101 bicycle parking spaces through a mixture of private open space, secure enclosures within the buildings, secure enclosure outside the building and visitor parking. The total ground floor secure cycle storage area within Block A building footprint is 14sqm, this appears inadequate to store the 16 bicycles proposed in the schedule. The total ground floor secure cycle storage area within Block B building footprint is 15sqm, this appears inadequate to store the 20 bicycles proposed in the schedule. The ground floor private open space allocation for the development taken from the schedule is 34 bicycle parking spaces while the requirement is 19 no. (1 per bedroom). The applicant has proposed a clear

polycarbonate and metal post shelter as a secure external enclosure. The level of bicycle parking provision is inadequate.

The applicant does not show the red line boundary to include all proposed works. The applicant states that legal consent to alter the red line boundary is not achievable. Works outside the boundary is not covered by planning permission. Where works are required on third party lands, the consent of landowners to carry out the required works should be submitted.

Public Lighting – Recommends further information in relation to public lighting; report at FI stage states that the FI submission is inadequate and recommended condition attached.

Broadband Officer (22/09/2025) – Details of external and internal telecommunications to be provided prior to construction.

Other – Part V requirements to be met by the delivery of units on site (10/03/2025).

### 3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage DAU (10/10/2025) -

The National Monuments Service has examined the archaeological testing report submitted as further information. On the basis of the information in the testing report, the results of the test excavations and conclusions of the report there are no further archaeological recommendations.

Uisce Eireann (13/10/2025) – no objection, conditions recommended.

There are constraints in the UE network, applicant should identify areas in conjunction with local authority where stormwater separation / infiltration removal works to the wastewater network can be identified and carry out works to remove these flows diverting them to surface water bodies or dedicated storm sewers. UE will consider a new connection offset by storm separation works to remove storm runoff with a peak flow the equivalent of a 1 in 1 year storm event equalling no less than 3 times the peak dry weather flow for the new development for wastewater discharge.

UE assets are on the site. Developer has to demonstrate that proposed structures and works will not inhibit the assets – submit drawings and method statement, a

wayleave in favour of UE will be required over assets that are not located within public space.

UE notes the development is very close to a 500mm upvc foul sewer that runs along the west of the site whilst there are also proposals to build a storm sewer connection that dissects the location of this foul sewer. Applicant required to consult with UE and obtain necessary build near agreements.

### **3.4. Third Party Observations**

No third party submissions were received at application stage.

At further information stage, eight submissions were received from residents (including elected representative) of the surrounding Ashbourne area. The issues raised include concerns over insufficient parking, impact of overflow parking on surrounding areas, inadequate public transport service and infrastructure, congestion on roads, development is out of character with the surrounding area, lack of green space in the development.

## **4.0 Planning History**

DA/111033 – Grant – extension of duration of DA60402 – expiry date 29/01/2017

DA/110778 – Refused – extension of duration of DA60402

DA/60402 (PL17.220528 withdrawn) - relates to land at the northern part of the subject appeal site – Grant - demolition of existing dwelling and construction of residential / commercial development in 3 blocks

00/1463 – Grant – second storey extension over existing garage to side of dwelling

## **5.0 Policy Context**

### **5.1. Development Plan**

Meath County Development Plan (CDP) 2021-2027 (as varied by variations 1,2 and 3).

Note: Proposed draft variation no.4 (replacing Maynooth Environs written statement with adopted Maynooth Joint LAP 2025-2030 written statement) was on display during May and June 2025.

Settlement plan for Ashbourne is contained within the CDP

Under the CDP Settlement Hierarchy, the settlement of Ashbourne is designated a Self-Sustaining Growth Town - Important service centre that caters for a wide catchment area. There are opportunities for the town to become more self-sufficient by facilitating economic development and community infrastructure in tandem with residential growth.

The 2027 population target for the town is 15,879 people.

The Core Strategy targets 1349 no. units for the period 2020-2027.

Mode share target for walking 22% (increasing from 15% in 2016); Mode share target for cycling 4% (increasing from 2% in 2016); Mode share target for bus 16% (increasing from 15% in 2016); reduction target for car use 54% (reducing from 64% in 2016).

The site is zoned B1 Commercial Town or Village Centre

Objective: *To protect, provide for and/or improve town and village centre facilities and uses.*

Guidance:

*Town and Village centres are characterised by a concentration of shops, services, meeting points, and places of employment. Centres in the upper tier of the settlement hierarchy have a more comprehensive range of shops and services than smaller settlements.*

*The majority of new commercial and retail uses will be accommodated on B1 lands in towns and villages. Whilst the principle of a retail outlet on town/village centre lands is acceptable in principle, the size and scale of any such development should be reflective of the role and function of the town and village in the settlement hierarchy. Such developments will be assessed against the relevant policies and objectives in the Retail Strategy in Appendix 4, retail policy in Chapter 4 of this Plan, the DECLG 'Guidelines for Planning Authorities Retail Planning' (2012) and Section 6 of this Chapter.*

*The primary land use in B1 zones is employment generating, service and retail provision. In order to achieve balanced development and create vibrant urban communities, residential use can also be considered on these lands. In order to ensure the delivery of commercial uses commensurate with the status of the settlement while also encouraging increased residential occupancy within our towns, the percentage of residential development in B1 zones shall generally not exceed 50 % of the quantum of a development site in any development proposal in Key Towns, Self- sustaining Growth Towns, Self-Sustaining Towns. Exceptions may be facilitated on a case by case basis where a clear evidence base has been demonstrated. Where an applicant proposes a high percentage of residential uses on B1 zoned land, it must be demonstrated;*

- a) that such development proposals have regard to the Asset Test set out in Section 9.3 Housing and Regeneration and Appendix A of the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Eastern and Midland Region 2019-2031.*
- b) that there are substantial commercial vacancies in the area and that there is no demand or need for additional commercial uses.*

**ASH POL 1** To support the consolidation of development of Ashbourne which facilitates the provision of residential development and employment, retail, community, and recreational facilities in order to create a more compact and self-sufficient settlement.

**ASH OBJ 4** To manage flood risk and development in Ashbourne in accordance with policies and objectives set out in section 6.10 of Volume 1 of the County Development Plan 'Surface Water and Flood Risk Management'.

**ASH OBJ 23** To support the utilisation of sustainable principles in the design, planning and development of residential schemes throughout the town.

### Chapter 3 Settlement and Housing Strategy

#### **Settlement Strategy Policies**

**SH POL 2** To promote the consolidation of existing settlements and the creation of compact urban forms through the utilisation of infill and brownfield lands in preference to edge of centre locations.

**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.

### 3.8 Housing

#### Housing Strategy Policies

**SH POL 6** To support the provision of accommodation for older people and for people with disabilities that would allow for independent and semi-independent living in locations that are proximate to town and village centres and services and amenities such as shops, local healthcare facilities, parks and community centres.

#### Housing Development Policies

**SH POL 7** To encourage and foster the creation of attractive, mixed use, sustainable communities that include a suitable mix of housing types and tenures with supporting facilities, amenities, and services that meet the needs of the entire community and accord with the principles of universal design, in so far as practicable.

**SH POL 8** To support the creation of attractive residential developments with a range of housing options and appropriate provision of functional public and private open space that is consistent with the standards and principles set out in the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines (2024), the associated Urban Design Manual and any subsequent Guidelines.

**SH POL 9** To promote higher residential densities in appropriate locations and in particular close to town centres and along public transport corridors, in accordance with the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines (2024).

**SH POL 12** To promote innovation in architectural design that delivers buildings of a high-quality that positively contributes to the built environment and local streetscape.

**SH POL 13** To require that all new residential developments shall be in accordance with the standards set out in the Development Management Standards and Land Use Zoning Objectives set out in Chapter 11 of this Plan, in so far as is practicable.

#### Housing Development Objectives

**SH OBJ 21** To require that, where relevant, all new residential developments shall be in accordance with SSPR 1 to SPPR 4 of the Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities, December 2018 as well as SPPR 1 to SPPR 9 of the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2023. All new residential development should comply with the densities outlined in Chapter 11 of this plan.

**SH OBJ 22** The Planning Authority will require the provision of between 15-30% of dwellings and apartments in new residential developments of ten units or more to be Age Friendly Lifetime Adaptable Homes, suitable to accommodate or adaptable to provide accommodation for people with disabilities and older people in accordance with the requirements of the 'Housing Options for Our Ageing Population Policy Statement' (2019), published by the Department of Housing, Planning and Local Government and the Department of Health and 'Building for Everyone: A Universal Design', 'Universal Design Guidelines for Homes in Ireland' developed by the Centre for Excellence in Universal Design (National Disability Authority) and section 11.5.29 of this Plan. Planning applications will be required to demonstrate compliance with this objective, and to show an accessible route to the residential units from the boundary of the property. Proximity and access to local services must also be considered relative to the units which are accessible. A universal design statement shall be provided as part of all new planning applications to demonstrate this requirement.

## Chapter 5 Movement Strategy

### 5.5 Integration of Land Use and Transportation Planning

**MOV POL 1** To support and facilitate the integration of land use with transportation infrastructure, through the development of sustainable compact settlements which are well served by public transport, in line with the guiding principles outlined in RPO 8.1 of the EMRA RSES 2019-2031.

#### 5.7.2 Cycling & Walking

**MOV OBJ 3** To ensure that design for cycle infrastructure for all relevant developments shall be carried out in accordance with the Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan, other relevant design standards or any successors to these documents.

### 5.7.8 Green Schools

**MOV POL 20** To encourage, where appropriate, the incorporation of safe and efficient cycleways, accessible footpaths and pedestrian routes into the design schemes for town centres/neighbourhood centres, residential, educational, employment, recreational developments and other uses.

### 5.9.2 Regional and Local Roads

**MOV POL 25** To implement the actions of the Meath Road Safety Strategy and promote road and traffic safety measures in conjunction with Government Departments, the Road Safety Authority and other agencies.

**MOV POL 32** To ensure the protection of the existing roads infrastructure while improving the capacity and safety of the road network to meet future demands.

**MOV OBJ 46** To require provision of parking standards in accordance with the standards set out in Chapter 11 Development Management for all developments.

## Chapter 6 Infrastructure

### 6.10 Surface Water and Flood Risk Management

**INF OBJ 15** To require the use of SuDS in accordance with the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works for new developments (including extensions).

**INF OBJ 16** To ensure that all new developments comply with Section 3.12 of the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works V6 which sets out the requirements for new developments to allow for Climate Change.

#### 6.10.2 Flood Risk Management (**referenced in planning authority's reason for refusal**)

**INF POL 18** To implement the "Planning System and Flood Risk Management – Guidelines for Planning Authorities" (DoEHLG/OPW, 2009) through the use of the sequential approach and application of Justification Tests for Development Management and Development Plans, during the period of this Plan.

**INF POL 20** To require that a Flood Risk Assessment is carried out for any development proposal, where flood risk may be an issue in accordance with the "Planning System and Flood Risk Management – Guidelines for Planning

Authorities” (DoECLG/OPW, 2009). This assessment shall be appropriate to the scale and nature of risk to and from the potential development and shall consider the impact of climate change

**INF OBJ 20 (referenced in planning authority’s reason for refusal)** To implement the Planning System and Flood Risk Management-Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoEHLG/OPW 2009) or any updated guidelines. A site-specific Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted where appropriate.

**INF OBJ 21 (referenced in planning authority’s reason for refusal)** To restrict new development within floodplains other than development which satisfies the Justification Test, as outlined in the Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines 2009 for Planning Authorities (or any updated guidelines).

## Chapter 11 Development Management Standards and Land Use Zoning Objectives

### Section 5 Residential Development Standards

#### 11.5.2 Urban Design

**DM POL 4** To require that all proposals for residential development demonstrate compliance with the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines 2024 and the associated Design Manual or any updates thereof.

#### 11.5.3 Density

**DM OBJ 14** The following densities shall be encouraged when considering planning applications for residential development: Key Towns and Large Towns (5000+ population) Centre and Urban Neighbourhoods 40-100 uph.

#### 11.5.17 Apartments

**DM POL 12:** Apartment schemes shall generally be encouraged in appropriate, sustainable, locations, accessible to public transport in the following settlements: Drogheda, Navan, Dunboyne, Kilcock, Maynooth, Ashbourne and Dunshaughlin.

**DM POL 14** All planning applications for apartments are required to demonstrate compliance with ‘Sustainable Urban Housing; Design Standards for New Apartments’ (2023), Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage and any updates thereof. While these Guidelines set out minimum design standards, the

Council strongly encourage the provision of apartments above these standards, in the interest of creating attractive living environments and sustainable communities.

#### 11.5.29 Age Friendly Lifetime Adaptable Homes

### Section 7 – Community Development Standards

#### 11.7.2 Sheltered Accommodation/Step Down Housing, Residential Care Homes, Retirement Homes, Nursing Homes, Retirement Villages

**DM POL 24** To require that residential care homes, retirement homes, nursing homes, retirement villages and sheltered accommodation/step down housing be located in towns and villages for reasons of sustainability, accessibility, social inclusion, and proximity to the availability of services, except where a demonstrated need to locate in a rural environment because of the nature of the care required can be clearly established

**DM OBJ 66** Reduced open space standards may be acceptable for the following development types: residential care homes, retirement homes, nursing homes, retirement villages and sheltered accommodation only in cases where it is clearly demonstrated with a supporting evidence base that it is appropriate by having regard to the specific open space needs of residents and only where suitable accessible public open space is available as part of the development.

**M OBJ 67** Planning applications for the change of use of a residential dwelling or other building to nursing home, residential care home, or for the construction of new residential care homes, retirement homes, nursing homes, retirement villages or sheltered accommodation/step down housing, shall be assessed for compliance with the following criteria:

- The Health Act 2007 (Care and Welfare of Residents in Designated Centres for Older People) (Amendment) Regulations 2010 (or any such other relevant standards and legislation that may be enacted);
- The National Quality Standards for Residential Care Settings for Older People in Ireland, 2009;
- Sustainability is the location served by good public transport links, pedestrian and cycle facilities, close to local services and facilities;

- Suitability of the size and scale of the proposal having regard to the site constraints and the area in which it is located;
- The degree to which the residential amenity of surrounding properties is protected;
- The requirement for a high standard of design and external finishes;
- The adequacy of off-street car parking;
- High quality open space proposals with comprehensive landscaping plans prepared by a fully qualified landscape professional;
- Availability of services.
- It is essential that adequate and suitable open space area and other facilities are provided for residential care homes, retirement homes, nursing homes, retirement villages and sheltered accommodation. It is recognised that reduced quantitative standards may be appropriate in some cases due to the level of care that is provided or by virtue of the location of the facility. Planning applications for such development should include detailed open space and landscaping plans that take account of the location of the facility, the availability/ suitability of existing open space and the needs of the residents of the facility.

## Section 9 Parking Standards

### 11.9.1 Parking Standards (**referenced in planning authority's reason for refusal**)

**DM OBJ 89** Car parking shall be provided in accordance with Table 11.2 and associated guidance notes.

**DM OBJ 91** Car parking provision shall normally be provided within the curtilage of the development site. Where, in the opinion of the Council, it would be impracticable for individual developers to provide for on-site parking, a contribution may be required.

**DM OBJ 93** New residential development should take account of the following regarding car parking:

### 11.9.2 EV Charging Points

**DM OBJ 94** All car parks shall include the provision of necessary wiring and ducting to be capable of accommodating future Electric Vehicle charging points, at a rate of 20% of total space numbers

### 11.9.3 Cycling Parking (**referenced in planning authority's reason for refusal**)

**DM OBJ 96** To require the provision of cycle parking facilities in accordance with the Design Standards for New Apartments 2023, the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines 2024 and Table 11.4 Cycle Parking Standards.

**DM OBJ 97** Cycle parking facilities shall be conveniently located, secure, easy to use, adequately lit and well sign posted. All long-term (more than three hours) cycle racks shall be protected from the weather.

**DM OBJ 99** In residential developments without private gardens or wholly dependent on balconies for private open space, covered secure bicycle stands should be provided in private communal areas.

## 5.2. National policy

- National Planning Framework – First Revision (April 2025)

The National Planning Framework (NPF) is the Government's high level strategic plan for shaping the future growth and development of our country out to the year 2040. Relevant National Policy Objectives (NPOs) include:

National Policy Objective 12 Ensure the creation of attractive, liveable, well designed, high quality urban places that are home to diverse and integrated communities that enjoy a high quality of life and well-being.

National Policy Objective 20 In meeting urban development requirements, there will be a presumption in favour of development that can encourage more people and generate more jobs and activity within existing cities, towns and villages, subject to development meeting appropriate planning standards and achieving targeted growth.

National Policy Objective 43 Prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location.

National Policy Objective 44 Support the provision of lifetime adaptable homes that can accommodate the changing needs of a household over time.

National Policy Objective 45 Increase residential density in settlements, through a range of measures including reductions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration, increased building height and more compact forms of development.

National Policy Objective 78 Promote sustainable development by ensuring flooding and flood risk management informs place-making by: • Avoiding inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding that do not pass the Justification Test, in accordance with the Guidelines on the Planning System and Flood Risk Management; • Taking account of the potential impacts of climate change on flooding and flood risk, in line with national policy regarding climate adaptation.

National Policy Objective 93 Improve air quality and help prevent people being exposed to unacceptable levels of pollution in our urban and rural areas through integrated land use and spatial planning that supports public transport, walking and cycling as more favourable modes of transport to the private car, the promotion of energy efficient buildings and homes, heating systems with zero local emissions, green and blue infrastructure planning and innovative design solutions.

- Delivering Homes, Building Communities (2025)

This document aims to further accelerate the delivery of new homes, to deliver 300,000 by the end of 2030, which will be achieved through the individual and collective effort of the key delivery partners. Local authorities, together with Approved Housing Bodies, the Land Development Agency, and the construction sector, will be critical to delivering and enabling the delivery of the quantum of homes needed over the lifetime of the plan. This is a wide-ranging strategy, encompassing two pillars: Activating Supply and Supporting People.

- Climate Action Plan (CAP) 2025

This is the third Climate Action Plan to be prepared under the Climate Action and Low Carbon Development (Amendment) Act 2021, and sets out what needs to be done into 2025, in order to prepare to take on the challenges of the second carbon budget period 2026-2030.

With regard to Transport, CAP 2025 sets out Actions and Updates to include (at Section 14.2.3) enhanced spatial and land-use planning, noting that the revision of the National Planning Framework presents an opportunity to re-emphasise the cross-linkages between land-use and spatial planning and the transport system. It outlines the policy pathway for cutting transport emissions centres around the 'Avoid-Shift-Improve' approach and specifically, Compact Growth Transport Orientated Development, improved 'Active Travel' infrastructure, better public realm and planning consents for alternative fuel, and EV charging infrastructure.

It further outlines that local authorities have an integral role in decarbonising transport, through the spatial and land-use planning system, promoting public transport-oriented development, ensuring permeability for active modes, implementing sustainable parking policies, delivering public realm improvements, developing appropriate demand management measures, and EV charging provision.

Note: For clarity, Climate Action Plan 2026 is not yet available.

- Ireland's 4<sup>th</sup> National Biodiversity Action Plan 2023-2030

Ireland's 4<sup>th</sup> National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBAP) sets the national biodiversity agenda for the period 2023-2030 and aims to deliver transformative changes to the ways in which nature is valued and protected.

- The Planning System and Flood Risk Management - Guidelines for Planning Authorities (Nov 09)
- The Planning System and Flood Risk Management - Guidelines for Planning Authorities - Technical Appendices (Nov 09)

- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)
- Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities

Note – As per Circular Letter NSP 04/2025 *The Design Standards for Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2025)* are applicable to any application for planning permission and to any subsequent appeal or direct application to An Coimisiun Pleanála submitted after the issuing of the Guidelines, i.e. from 9th July 2025. The application was submitted to Meath County Council in February 2025 and therefore regard is paid to ‘*Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities*’, 2023.

- Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2018)
- Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2013, as amended up to 2025)

### 5.3. Regional policy

- Eastern and Midland Regional Assembly Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy 2019-2031 (RSES)

A RSES is a strategic plan which identifies regional assets, opportunities and pressures and provides appropriate policy responses for the Eastern and Midland Region within which the appeal site is located. At this strategic level it provides a framework for investment to better manage spatial planning and economic development throughout the Region.

The settlement strategy policy and a number of regional objectives applicable to the proposed development include:

Ashbourne is designated a level 3 Self Sustaining Town

RPO 3.2: Local authorities, in their core strategies shall set out measures to achieve compact urban development targets of at least 50% of all new homes within or contiguous to the built up area of Dublin city and suburbs and a target of at least 30% for other urban areas.

RPO 3.3: Local authorities shall, in their core strategies, identify regeneration areas within existing urban settlements and set out specific objectives relating to the delivery of development on urban infill and brownfield regeneration sites in line with the Guiding Principles set out in the RSES and to provide for increased densities as set out in the 'Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas', 'Sustainable Urban Housing; Design Standards for new Apartments Guidelines' and the 'Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities'.

#### **5.4. Natural Heritage Designations**

There are no sites designated for natural heritage within the site or in proximity. The closest natural heritage designated site is Cromwell's Bush Fen pNHA c 12.8km from the site.

#### **5.5. EIA Screening**

The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

### **6.0 The Appeal**

#### **6.1. Grounds of Appeal**

The applicant has submitted an appeal. The grounds of appeal are summarised as follows:

- Information set out in relation to site location and context – Site occupies prominent position on edge of town centre and forms part of urban core, lands comprise infill site, formerly occupied by a single dwelling and garden. The site is bounded by Broadmeadow Linear Park to south which includes a section of the former rear garden of the dwelling on site and was ceded to the Council for provision of established residential and commercial development along Castle Street and emerging regeneration areas to the east and west. The lands are zoned B1 Town Centre. Residential development and sheltered housing are permissible. Given its pedestrian connectivity, central location and proximity to public transport the site is ideally positioned to deliver high quality age friendly housing.
- The decision of the planning authority is reviewed. The Planners report states:
  - The principle of development is acceptable, the quantum of residential is justified, the development is in accordance with NPF, Compact Settlement Guidelines and RSES,
  - Urban design and treatment acceptable,
  - Daylight and sunlight performance acceptable,
  - Bulk storage provision for age friendly scheme deemed acceptable,
  - Archaeological matters resolved,
  - Broadband, Irish Water, Public Lighting and Environment (SW) all raised no objection,
  - Appropriate assessment screening completed – accepted no NIS required,
  - Planning authority acknowledged that engineering surface water solution is achievable, issues can be resolved by condition.
  - Two technical issues remain outstanding at end of process.

Parking, Access and Permeability – The Transportation section maintained concerns regarding quantum, permeability and road safety. However these concerns are based on standard residential assumptions and did not take account of the age friendly nature of scheme, the town centre location, the

18 on site spaces with two dedicated car share spaces and national policy requiring flexibility in accessible areas.

Flood Risk – Environment section satisfied that the applicant identifies site as in Flood Zone B but dissatisfied with technical aspects of the analysis – compensatory storage, potential displacement of floodwater and potential impact on adjacent lands. The concerns relate to absence of quantitative compensatory storage analysis rather than fundamental objection to the sites suitability. The planners report acknowledges that subject to clarifications, the Flooding Section did not identify any insurmountable constraint and did not state that the proposed development would result in increased flood risk – only that it could not verify this without additional information.

- Revised details submitted with appeal – Apartment Block A was raised by 650mm in response to RFI no.9 in accordance with the DNV's site specific flood risk assessment. This change is shown on the submitted elevations and building sections. To secure the undercroft area of Block A, we propose installing louvres around the building perimeter to prevent children, vermin and debris from entering. The louvre system will provide 75% free air area and will be fixed to a bracket support system designed for easy removal during maintenance. Apartment Block B was raised by 1150mm in response to RFI no.9 and in accordance with the DNV site specific floor risk assessment. These amendments are illustrated on the submitted elevation and building sections. As with Block A, the undercroft to Block B will be secured by installing perimeter louvres. The general access footpaths to both apartment blocks have been elevated to align with the internal floor levels. The pathways will be cantilevered (suspended) from the main ground ring beam supporting the building structure. As a result, the external ground level walkways sit above the 0.1% AEP flood level. In addition, the existing garden wall and railing on the southern end of the site have been removed and replaced with full height open railing to allow floodwater to flow freely through the site into Broadmeadow river.
- Response to Refusal Reason no. 1:

- Locational grounds for reduced parking – immediate access to town centre strong existing pedestrian and cycle connectivity (Broadmeadow Linear Park pedestrian spine, cycle infrastructure through Ashbourne, high quality footpaths), brownfield urban infill (NPO 3a, 3c, 30, Compact Settlement Guidelines, CDP policies for reduced car dependency in regeneration areas), age friendly mobility (residents 55+ have lower car ownership, often use shared mobility) , SPPR 3 (explicitly states that in accessible locations there is no minimum parking requirement).
- Car Share Provision as a Demand Suppressing Measure – The proposal includes 2 car share spaces (1 car share vehicle replaces 10-15 private car spaces) – 18 standard spaces plus 2 car share spaces (2x10space equivalent) equals total effective capacity of 38 spaces – ratio of 0.55 spaces per unit.
- ACP Precedent for Reduced Parking – the appeal lists ACP decisions for approval of reduced parking for older persons housing.
- Using accepted car share equivalence, the proposed scheme delivers effective parking provision comparable to or greater than ACP precedent cases identified and as such there is no basis for claiming overspill parking, there is no basis for claiming traffic hazard, the planning authority has applied suburban parking assumptions, the proposal is consistent with ACP precedent.
- The proposed provision is not merely adequate but is appropriate and policy consistent. The refusal reason relating to parking is unfounded and cannot be justified.
- Response to Refusal no. 2:
  - In response to the FI request, the applicant submitted a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment (SSFRA) prepared in accordance with The Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009). In response to the refusal, a Supplementary Technical Note is prepared by DNV which clarifies and expands on the modelling of the SSFRA and responds to the planning authorities flood related concerns.

Together these documents demonstrate that the flood risk basis for refusal is not supported by the submitted technical evidence.

- Flood Zone Classification – The planning authority correctly identifies the site as being in Flood Zone B and the SSFRA confirms this classification. The 1:100 year flood event does not extend into the site, flooding in 1:1000 event reaches localised low lying areas, Flood Zone B is appropriate for highly vulnerable development provided the Justification Test is satisfied.
- Summary of SSFRA Conclusions set out.
- Finished floor levels (66.15mOD) provide  $\geq 1.0\text{m}$  freeboard above the 1% AEP+ climate change modelled floor level. In the extreme 0.1% AEP + climate change scenario, a minimum freeboard of  $\geq 270\text{mm}$  is retained. Ground levels across all areas subject to flooding are not raised in the revised proposal. The building is elevated on piled structure with a permeable louvered undercroft ensuring flood waters can continue to move through extreme events. The development offers a net improvement in residual risk by removal a structurally vulnerable southern boundary wall and replacing it with a flood compatible permeable boundary. The proposal does not increase flood risk on or off the site.
- Floodplain function and southern boundary wall – This wall is a non engineered, non retaining structure, vulnerable to collapse during flooding over 1m. When modelled as an impermeable structure, the 1%AEP +cc event shows increase in flood level of 26mm and 0.1% AEP +cc shows flood level increase of 160mm. Both are below FFL freeboard margins. The proposal proactively removes this structural hazard by replacing the wall with a permeable fence improving overall flood resilience. The site only becomes inundated in extreme events and behaves as a conveyance corridor, not a volumetric storage cell. Floodplain behaviour is further influenced by capacity constraints at the downstream bridges not by site conditions. The Council's assumption of storage dominated floodplain is not correct.

- Ground level raising – The refusal relies on a drawing that pre dates the revised layout. There is no increase in ground levels anywhere in Flood Zone B. Existing levels between 63.7mOD -64mOD are retained. No displacement of floodwaters arises.
- Compensatory storage – Total displacement caused by piles and stair cores is <27.5sqm during the 0.1% AEP event. The wider floodplain holds c 35000m<sup>3</sup>. The impact is hydraulically negligible and results in a maximum flood level change of 10mm which is within modelling tolerances. Compensatory storage is required only in Flood Zone A as per CDP SFRA 4.9. The site is located in Flood Zone B – compensatory storage is not required.
- Undercroft and maintenance of flow paths – The under croft will be secured using permeable louvered grating not solid panels. The SSFRA incorporates a high roughness factor within the model to conservatively represent piles and grating. Hydraulic modelling shows no meaningful difference between pre- and post- development flood levels upstream or downstream. Flow pathways are maintained.
- Internal services – All services will be mounted tight to the soffit and above the predicted 0.1%AEP flood level. All components are designed to external grade standards. The undercroft deck is graded to prevent flooding. These services do not obstruct flow and have been conservatively represented in the modelling parameters.
- Model extents and cross sections – The modelling information submitted was complete. The SSFRA describes full upstream and downstream events of the model including Dunshaughlin and Ratoath Streams. All nodes and cross section locations are provided, example cross section data is provided, survey beds from July 2025 were integrated.
- Development Management Justification Test - The Justification Test is fully satisfied. Evidence shows part 2(i) and Part (ii) is satisfied.
- Development complies with CDP section 6.10.2 and INF OBJ20 and 21.

- The applicant has supplied a complete SSRA supported by detailed hydraulic modelling and further clarifications in the Technical Note. The findings are conclusive. The proposal does not increase flood risk on or off the site. The proposal does not displace floodwaters onto the public road. Flow paths through the site during extreme events are maintained. Freeboard margins significantly exceed guideline requirements. The development satisfies the Development Management Justification Test. The development complies with Section 6.10.2, INF OBJ20 and INF OBJ 21. The removal of the existing southern boundary wall reduces residual flood risk. The refusal reason relating to flood risk is unfounded and it is requested that the Commission grant permission.
- The following is attached:
  - Appendix 1 sets out details of ABP Precedent – Reduced Parking for Age Friendly / Older Persons Housing
  - DNV Technical Note – Appeal Supplementary Material Relating to Flood Risk

## 6.2. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority submitted a response to the grounds of appeal. This is summarised as follows:

- The contents of the appeal is noted. All matters raised therein have previously been addressed by the Executive Planners reports.
- Request ACP uphold the decision of the planning authority and refuse permission.

## 6.3. Observations

None

## 6.4. Further Responses

None

## 7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all submissions received in relation to the appeal and inspected the site and having regard to relevant local policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in the appeal are:

- Principle of development
- Transport and mobility considerations
- Flood risk
- Communal open space (new issue)

### 7.2. Principle of development

7.2.1. It is proposed to construct 68 no. 'age friendly' apartment units with associated communal and management facilities on a 0.42ha site located within the town centre of Ashbourne.

7.2.2. The site is zoned B1 Commercial Town Centre in the Meath County Development Plan (CDP) 2021-2027 where the objective is to protect, provide for and/ or improve town centre facilities and uses. A residential use is a permitted use in this zone.

7.2.3. The zoning objective guidance states that in order to protect the primary function of B1 zones in self sustaining growth towns such as Ashbourne for employment, services and retail, residential development shall not exceed 50% of development on a site, except where evidence is provided to show that the proposal is acceptable having regard to the Asset Test in Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Eastern and Midland Region and the number of commercial vacancies in the area. The applicant has submitted justification in light of these considerations and the planning authority is satisfied that the proposed residential occupancy on the site is acceptable.

7.2.4. I am satisfied that the proposal to develop the site for a residential development is acceptable in principle and is in accordance with the zoning objective of the CDP.

7.2.5. The planning authority are satisfied that the density, design and height of the development is acceptable. The intensive redevelopment of the site is in accordance with higher order planning policies to deliver compact urban development.

### 7.3. Transport and mobility considerations

7.3.1. The planning authority refused permission for the reason that the access and parking arrangements are poorly considered, would lead to overflow of car parking from the development in the surrounding area and inappropriate turning movements, poor permeability and connectivity and a lack of adequate cycle facilities, resulting in a development that would result in traffic hazard, poor public realm and which is contrary to sections 11.9.1 and 11.9.3 of the CDP.

#### 7.3.2. Site location and accessibility

7.3.3. The Meath CDP contains objectives including MOVPOL1 to facilitate the integration of land use with transportation infrastructure through the development of sustainable compact settlements served by public transport. The Ashbourne settlement plan contains modal share targets to increase walking, cycle and bus use and to reduce car use. It is targeted to increase the mode share of walking from 15% to 22%, to increase the mode share of cycling from 2% to 4%, to increase the mode share of bus from 15% to 16% and to reduce car use from 64% to 54% (from 2016 rates).

7.3.4. The site is located within Town Centre lands at a highly accessible location to shops, services, amenities and public transport. The site is located c 6min walk / 450m to the bus stop on Frederick Street. This bus stop serves a number of routes (103, 109A, 105, 193/194, 195, 197 to Ratoath, Kells, Ashbourne, Drogheda, Trim, Parkway Station, Balbriggan, Swords, Dublin Airport, Dublin) with over 6 buses an hour. Further details of the existing bus network is set out in the submitted Outline Mobility Management Plan which states that the routes provide a high level of service and frequency.

7.3.5. The site is currently served by an existing footpath extending along the full roadside boundary. There is a small section of cycle path along the roadside boundary near the Castle Street roundabout. There is a cycle path extending along the western side of Castle Street and along the northern side of Killelland Street. There are pedestrian crossings near the site on Castle Street and Killelland Street. To the south of the site, the footpath connects to the Broadmeadow riverside walk.

7.3.6. The site layout drawing shows alterations to the existing roadside boundary to allow for a new public footpath, cycle lane and planted verge which is to 'tie into' the existing footpaths/cycle paths. The existing vehicular access serving the existing

house is to be blocked up and the new development is to be accessed via a new vehicular entrance from Killelland Street.

- 7.3.7. The improvements will be of benefit to residents of the development and to the general public, improving pedestrian and cycle connections and the attractiveness of the area. These proposals are in accordance with MOVPOL1.
- 7.3.8. The proposed works for the new footpath, cyclepath and verge are located partly on lands outside of the red site boundary. On foot of the report of the Transport Section, the further information request of 17/04/2025 (item 3d), requested that the applicant revise the red site boundary so that works form part of the application. The applicant's response in the cover letter submitted 10/09/2025 states that the process of taking the road in charge to the front of the site is not yet complete and as such this road is not legally in the ownership of the Council and that legal consent to alter the red line boundary is not therefore achievable. The applicant states that alterations to the road outside the site to be undertaken by the applicant on behalf of the Council, can be agreed in partnership with the Council prior to commencement of development and that a special contribution can be attached to the permission for the provision of works undertaken by the Council and paid for by the applicant. The response was considered by the Council's Transportation Department (report of 27/03/2025) who stated that the applicant has not amended the redline boundary to include the proposed works, notes that legal consent to alter the boundary is not achievable by the applicant and that the works outside the boundary are not covered by the planning permission and where works are required on third party lands, the written consent of landowners is required. The planning authority (as per the report of the Case Planner) noted the report of the Transportation Department and indicated that the further information response is not acceptable.
- 7.3.9. From the information provided, the applicant has not demonstrated that they have the relevant consents required for works on third party lands outside of the redline boundary. In the absence of a mechanism to deliver the cycleway, footway and public realm improvements in association with the proposed development, the proposal would result in haphazard piecemeal development of the site and residents would not be provided with the required footpath / cycleway infrastructure. As the applicant states the road is not taken in charge, I am not satisfied that it is

appropriate to apply conditions to enable the works to be carried out by / in conjunction with the Council.

7.3.10. Car parking

7.3.11. The development contains 68 dwellings (29 no. 1 bed including 4 studio, 39 no. 2 bed). The site layout drawing submitted with the appeal shows the development is to be served by 17 on site car parking spaces (1 accessible space, 1 age friendly, 2 Go Car spaces, 13 standard spaces).

7.3.12. The applicant points to the nature of the proposed development, being an 'age friendly' development, to the mobility profile of residents, to the proposed facilities and to the town centre location. The appeal submission states that the mobility needs of residents, visitors and workers at the site are to be satisfied through a range of measures, including the two Go Car shared spaces, bicycle storage, e charging facilities, mobility scooter storage and the accessible parking spaces.

7.3.13. Section 11.9.1 Parking Standards of the CDP sets out provisions in relation to car parking. Objective DMOBJ89 of the CDP states that car parking shall be provided in accordance with Table 11.2 and the associated guidance notes.

7.3.14. Table 11.2 states that dwellings / apartments at accessible locations are to have a maximum of 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit. The CDP states that an 'accessible' location is defined in the Sustainable Residential and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities. Under these Guidelines an 'accessible' location is defined as 'lands within 500m (i.e. up to 5-6 minute walk) of existing or planned high frequency (i.e. 10 minute peak hour frequency) urban bus service'. The National Transport Authority's Public Transport Accessibility level tool indicates that Frederick Street has a 'medium-high level of service'. I am satisfied that the site is at an 'accessible' location. Therefore, the development is to be provided with a maximum of 102 spaces.

7.3.15. The development is provided with parking that is below the maximum standard in Table 11.2. The guidance notes state that "Residential car parking can be reduced at the discretion of the Council, where development is proposed in areas with good access to services and strong public transport links". This development site is located in the town centre. The development is in close proximity to the bus stop on Frederick Street. This development is located in area with good access to services

and strong public transport links. Having regard to Table 11.2 which indicates that parking standards are 'maximum' standards and to the guidance note which allows for reduced parking, I am satisfied that the CDP allows for reduced parking, that the proposal put forward on this site for reduced parking is acceptable and the proposal is in accordance with the Table 11.2 and associated guidance notes.

- 7.3.16. The guidance notes in Table 11.2 state that accessible car parking spaces shall be provided at a minimum rate of 5% of the total number of spaces. One accessible car parking space is provided. The proposal is in accordance with the guidance.
- 7.3.17. The guidance notes in Table 11.2 state that age friendly car parking spaces should generally be provided where possible in all development. One age friendly space is provided. The proposal is in accordance with the guidance.
- 7.3.18. Having regard to the above, I am satisfied that the proposed car parking is in accordance with DM OBJ 89 of the CDP.
- 7.3.19. Objective DM OBJ94 states that provision should be made for EV charge points at a rate of 20% of space numbers. EV charging is proposed. Final design details can be agreed by condition.
- 7.3.20. Objective DMOBJ93 sets out criteria to be considered in relation to the location and design of car parking. The parking is centrally located, accessible and is overlooked. The external area is landscaped. Final design details regarding materials can be addressed by condition. I am satisfied that the development is in accordance with DMOBJ93.
- 7.3.21. The Sustainable and Compact Settlement Guidelines for planning authorities set out development standards for housing. Specific planning policy requirement (SPPR) 3 relates to car parking. It is a specific planning policy requirement of the Guidelines that: "In accessible locations, defined in Chapter 3 (Table 3.8) car- parking provision should be substantially reduced. The maximum rate of car parking provision for residential development, where such provision is justified to the satisfaction of the planning authority, shall be 1.5 no. spaces per dwelling." I am satisfied that the proposal is in accordance with SPPR3 of the Guidelines.
- 7.3.22. Cycle parking

7.3.23. Section 11.9.3 Cycling Parking of the CDP sets out provisions in relation to cycle parking.

7.3.24. Objective DM OBJ96 is to require the provision of cycle parking in accordance with the Design Standard for New Apartments 2023, the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines 2024 and Table 11.4 Cycle Parking Standards. Objective DMOBJ 97 states that cycle parking facilities shall be conveniently located, secure and easy to use. All long term cycle racks shall be protected from weather. DMOBJ 99 states that in developments without private gardens or dependent on balconies for private open space, covered secure bicycle stands should be provided in private communal areas.

7.3.25. The drawings submitted with the appeal show the provision of the following facilities:

Block A		Total	Considerations
	External visitor	18	Proposed polycarbon/metal frame structure.  Final design of storage structure can be subject to agreement with planning authority.
	14sqm bike store	19	Internal store
	Private balcony (12 apartments – 6 stairs, 6 at level)	24	These units are not at ground level/ have small terrace and therefore a dedicated storage facility is required.
	Cargo bike	1	
	E charging mobility scooter	2	
Block B			
	External visitor	4	Final design of storage structure can be subject to agreement with planning authority.
	15sqm bike store	20	Internal store
	Private balcony ( 5 apartments – 3 stairs, 2 at level)	10	These units are not at ground level/ have small terrace and therefore a

			dedicated storage facility is required.
	E charging mobility scooter	6	

7.3.26. Table 11.4 Cycle Parking Standards of the CDP states the following standards apply to apartments:

- *Minimum of 1 private secure bicycle space per bedroom (note – design should not require bicycle access via living area);*
- *1 visitor bicycle space per two housing units;*
- *Please refer to SPPR 4 of the ‘Sustainable Residential and Compact Settlements Guidelines’ (2024) for further requirements.*

7.3.27. The proposed development contains 107 bed spaces in 68 no. units. There is a requirement for 141 cycle spaces.

7.3.28. I calculate that the development is provided with 61 cycle storage spaces, 1 cargo bike space and 8 mobility scooter spaces. The applicant indicates that ground floor units can store two cycles on their outdoor balconies. I do not consider this arrangement acceptable as many of these units are accessed via steps which compromises access and because storage of cycles on the small private balconies compromises the amenity of the balconies and fails to provide safe, dry storage of the cycles. I also note objective DMOBJ 99. Therefore I have discounted these cycles from the total numbers.

7.3.29. The development is not provided with cycle facilities in accordance with the requirements of Table 11.4. The number of cycle spaces is below the minimum standard of Table 11.4. This is a contravention of the Table 11.4.

7.3.30. At this point, I refer to objective DM OB 67 of the CDP which relates to planning applications for the construction of new residential care homes, nursing homes, retirement villages and sheltered accommodation / step down housing and states that these uses shall be assessed for compliance with certain criteria. The objective states that it is essential that adequate and suitable open space and other facilities are provided at these uses and that it is recognised that reduced quantitative standards may be appropriate in some cases due to the level of care that is provided

or by virtue of the location of the facility, the availability of open space and needs of the residents. This objective allows for reduced quantitative standards in certain cases.

- 7.3.31. Whilst I acknowledge the potential mobility constraints of older people, the location of the site within easy walk of shops, services and facilities and the transport measures such as mobility scooters and car sharing, I consider that good quality cycle storage facilities is required for residents of all residential schemes including those of the proposed 'age friendly' scheme which is to provide independent living for over 55's. The scheme is provided with a limited number of car parking spaces and good quality cycle facilities is particularly important to provide for residents, workers and visitors mobility needs. Residents of such schemes are likely to particularly benefit from quality storage which may include enhanced measures for example separate lockers for larger electric bikes or cargo bikes. I do not consider that a reduced parking is appropriate.
- 7.3.32. As the proposed cycle parking is not in accordance with Table 11.4 and as application of reduced standards is not appropriate, the proposal to provide significantly reduced cycle parking is a material contravention of Table 11.4 standards.
- 7.3.33. The Design Standards for New Apartments (2023) sets out guidance for bicycle parking and storage. The guidelines state that cycling provides a flexible, efficient and attractive option for urban living and the guidelines require that this transport mode is fully integrated into the design and operation of all new apartment development schemes. In particular, planning authorities must ensure that new development proposals in central urban and public transport accessible locations and which otherwise feature appropriate reductions in car parking provision are at the same time comprehensively equipped with high quality cycle parking and storage facilities for residents and visitors. Guidelines are set out in relation to the location, quantity and design of cycle parking. A general minimum standard of 1 cycle storage space per bedroom shall be applied. For studio units, at least 1 cycle storage space shall be provided. Visitor cycle parking shall also be provided at a standard of 1 space per 2 residential units. Any deviation shall be at the discretion of the planning authority and justified with respect to location, quality of facilities and flexibility for

future enhancement / enlargement. Cycle facilities shall be in dedicated facility of permanent construction and should be accessible.

7.3.34. The development is not provided with cycle facilities in accordance with the requirements of the 2023 Guidelines. For the reasons set out above, I do not consider that a deviation from the 2023 Guidelines is justified. The proposal is contrary to the contrary to the 2023 Guidelines which requires this transport mode be fully integrated into the design and operation of apartment schemes in particular schemes at accessible urban sites where reduced car parking is provided.

7.3.35. SPPR4 of the Sustainable and Compact Settlement Guidelines (2024) sets out requirements in relation to cycle parking and storage. It is a specific planning policy requirement of these Guidelines that all new housing schemes (including mixed-use schemes that include housing) include safe and secure cycle storage facilities to meet the needs of residents and visitors. Recommended standards are set out for the quantity and design of cycle storage facilities. The Guidelines require that in the case of units that do not have ground level open space or have smaller terraces, a general minimum standard of 1 cycle storage space per bedroom should be applied plus visitor cycle parking. Any deviation from these standards shall be at the discretion of the planning authority and shall be justified with respect to location, quality of facilities, flexibility etc. Cycle storage facilities should be in dedicated facilities of permanent construction. The development is not provided with cycle facilities in accordance with the requirements of SPPR4. As per above, I do not consider that deviation from the standards is justified. The proposal is contrary to the 2024 Guidelines which requires that this transport mode is fully integrated into the design of all residential schemes.

7.3.36. Universal design (potential new issue)

7.3.37. The development is accessed via direct street access to units fronting Castle Street and Killegland Street and via footpath / raised walkway to the internal access points to Block A and B.

7.3.38. Objective SH OBJ22 of the CDP requires 15-30% of residential units to be designed as age friendly adaptable homes. I also note SHPOL7 which is to encourage a suitable mix of housing types and tenure to meet the needs of the entire community

and accords with the principles of universal design, in so far as practicable. I note that the raising of the finished floor levels is to address flood risk.

- 7.3.39. In this case, the entire development is described as an age-friendly scheme designed to universal design standards with communal facilities that are to serve the needs of residents of the scheme. A universal design statement was submitted at application stage. The raising of the buildings at further information stage resulted in the introduction of additional steps to many of the units fronting the streets and the introduction of a raised pedestrian walkway. I am unclear as to if the revised designs are in accordance with universal design principles. However, I note that the Universal Design Guidelines for Homes in Ireland indicates that a design feature for a universal home is level access from pavement and to avoid ramps and steps wherever possible. Detailed design standards are set out. The standards state that where external steps are provided these should be in conjunction with ramps.
- 7.3.40. This issue was not raised in the assessment of the application and as such is raised for the attention of the Commission as a potential new issue and it is open to the Commission to seek additional information should this be deemed appropriate.
- 7.3.41. Entrance and impact on surrounding roads
- 7.3.42. At further information stage, a revised site layout plan was submitted demonstrating unobstructed sightlines in accordance with DMURS showing unobstructed sightlines of 49m to the nearside road edge from a setback of 2.4m back. The report of the Council's Transportation Department indicates that sightlines are acceptable.
- 7.3.43. A Traffic and Transport Assessment is submitted. This report considers the impact of the development on the nearby junction of Castle Street and Killelland Road. The assessment concludes that post development the junction will operate as busy but still with free flow of traffic at a slower level. The output shows that the local road network will not need any mitigation measures.
- 7.3.44. The planning authority raise concerns that the development would result in overflow of parking in surrounding areas and inappropriate traffic movements. Subject to normal road and parking controls in surrounding areas, I do not consider that the development will result in any significant obstruction on surrounding roads.

7.3.45. I am satisfied that the traffic generated from the development can be accommodated on the surrounding roads without resulting in traffic hazard or obstruction of road users.

#### 7.4. Flood risk

7.4.1. The planning authority refused permission due to flood risk. The refusal reason refers to the location of the development on Flood Zone B lands, the risk that flood water will be displaced onto the public road causing hazard to road users, the absence of information in relation to the flood risk and mitigating measures to address this risk, that the development would be contrary to the provisions of section 6.10.2 and objectives INF OBJ20 and INF OBJ21 of the CDP and to permit the development would be prejudicial to public health.

7.4.2. Section 6.10.2 of the CDP sets out objectives in relation to flood risk management. Objective INF OBJ 20 is to implement the Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities. Objective INF POL20 is to require the carrying out of a Flood Risk Assessment for any development proposal where flood risk may be an issue, which shall be in accordance with the Guidelines, appropriate to the scale and risk and shall incorporate climate change. Objective INF OBJ 21 is to restrict new development within floodplains other than development which satisfies the Justification Test of the Guidelines.

7.4.3. The Office of Public Works (OPW) provides information on flooding on its website [www.flodoinfo.ie](http://www.flodoinfo.ie) (accessed 16<sup>th</sup> March 2026). The CFRAM predictive flood map for the Ashbourne area is currently 'under review'. The CDP Strategic Flood Risk Assessment indicates that the southern part of the site falls within Flood Zone B which has a moderate probability of flooding (i.e. between 1 in 100 and 1 in 1000 year event).

#### 7.4.4. Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment

7.4.5. At further information stage the applicant submitted a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment SSFRA (DNV report). The report is stated to be undertaken in accordance with the approach and methodology set out in the Guidelines. It is stated that consideration has been taken of the likely effect of climate change and that the climate change scenarios reviewed as part of the assessment are in line with the OPW's 2019 Flood Risk Management Climate Change Sectoral Adaptation Plan.

The assessment considers the Mid-Range Future Scenario (+20% of rainfall depth/ flood flow) is appropriate for the scale and nature of the proposed development.

- 7.4.6. The detailed flood risk assessment evaluates the potential flood risks to the proposed development and of its potential impact on flood risk elsewhere and considers the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures. The assessment involved the construction of a 1D-2D hydraulic model of the Broadmeadow River across a wide area to understand catchment wide impacts and hydrological pressures. The model considers the scenario of the existing development (Scenario 1) and the scenario of the proposed development (Scenario 2). A digital terrain model of the floodplain and study site was created using OSI LiDAR and site specific surveys to represent existing topography. A site visit was undertaken and significant features within the channels and floodplains were recorded. The site visit determined the ‘manning’s roughness’ to represent the effects of different surfaces on flow. The Scenario 1 model confirmed that the southern portion of the site is within Flood Zone B with the modelled extent roughly matching that of the CDP SFRA flood extent. The cause of the flooding is water overtopping the left river bank upstream of the Churchfields and Castle Street bridges due to insufficient conveyance capacities of the crossings – waters overtop Castle Street and enter the southern half of the site along its western boundary and flood waters subsequently flow through the site before re entering the Broadmeadow channel downstream of the Castle Street bridge. It is stated that having reviewed the flow direction and velocities in the flood plain, there is minimal out of bank flow from the southern boundary of the site and that the floodplain is providing a conveyance function rather than a storage function. The assessment states that flooding at the site appears as an isolated flood cell constrained by the Churchfields Road and Castle Street bridge.
- 7.4.7. The proposed development scenario incorporates the proposed development. The structures within the floodplain are to be constructed on piles which support a concrete slab. The minimum soffit level of the slab is 65.9mOD. The proposed elevated piled slab was represented in the model using modifications to the floodplain roughness within the building footprint as well as considering the area displaced by the piles and stair landings. The following is the finding of scenario 2:
- 7.4.8. “In a flood event, flood pathways within the site are maintained. The flood level in the 1%AEP+Climate change is 65.14mOD while the 0.1%+climate change flood level is

modelled as 65.67mOD. There is no perceptible effect on flood extents in the vicinity of the site. Minimum FFL (66.15mOD) have been set with an appropriate freeboard as to ensure that even in the most extreme scenarios (0.1%AEP+climate change), the proposed development remains a place of safe refuge. Due to the anticipated storm durations flooding on site recedes quickly (<4hrs), while all elements potentially in contact with flood waters are specified flood resilient materials. All proposed buildings are defended in excess of the 0.1% AEP flood event plus climate change event.”

- 7.4.9. The assessment finds that the proposed development has a negligible impact on flood extents upstream and downstream as demonstrated by the hydrographs and that there is no flood impact on any other properties. The analysis confirms that flooding on the site is conveyance rather than storage and that flooding on the site is an isolated cell. The proposed development will not alter flow rates or volumes.
- 7.4.10. The Council’s Environment (Flooding – Surface Water) Section raised concerns regarding the adequacy of the flood risk assessment models and findings. In the appeal submission, the applicant has submitted a DNV Technical Note to respond to the concerns raised by the Council.
- 7.4.11. The Environment (Flooding-Surface Water) Section raised concerns that the boundaries of the site have not been incorporated into the model and that the site provides storage during a flood event due to the boundary wall along the southern site boundary along the Lidl site and river walk. Concerns are raised regarding the proposed raising of ground levels and infilling of land. It is raised that the proposed development will result in displacement of flood waters and that there is a lack of compensatory storage for displaced flood water.
- 7.4.12. The DNV report states that it is confirmed that existing ground levels will be maintained across the southern portion of the site. It states that the southern wall on the site was recorded as part of the topographical survey. Additional modelling was run to simulate the effect of the southern boundary wall which shows that representing the wall results in increase in flood levels of 26mm for the 1%+cc and an increase in level of 160mm for the 0.1%+cc. The wall is not a retaining structure or flood defence asset and is likely to be damaged in flood (damage likely at 0.6m-1m depth) representing a residual risk and as such it is proposed to replace the wall

with a permeable fence that removes the risk. As per Section 6.2.2 of the SSFRA (DNV 2025) the displacement of pilings and stair landings has been incorporated into the hydraulic assessment. In the 0.1% AEP+cc the displaced volume of <math>27.5\text{m}^3</math> is imperceptible in the context of the wider floodplain (<math>35,000\text{m}^3</math>) and as such compensatory storage is not required.

7.4.13. In this regard I refer to the Technical Appendices of the OPW Guidelines which sets out requirements in relation to compensatory storage. It states in section 3.3.1 Compensation the following: “Where an SFRA has identified that the impact of development on downstream areas at flood risk is negligible for this and other potential development then compensation requirements could be relaxed. In general, level for level compensation should only be applied in areas where flood water is stored. Floodwater is stored in most natural and defended floodplains which are inundated in the 1% AEP event. It is important to ensure flood flow routes should be protected, whatever the cause of flooding.” The DNV report confirms that the floodplain at the site performs a conveyance function and not a storage function. The applicant’s modelling has accounted for the existing boundary walls and for any displaced volume of water in flood. The SSFRA indicates that the development has a negligible impact in the surrounding area and as such any requirement for compensation is relaxed.

7.4.14. The Council’s Environment (Flooding-Surface Water) Section raise concerns that the rising of the building on piles will not allow the floodplain to function and poses difficulties in management and maintenance. The appeal submission contains revised drawings showing the proposed undercroft area beneath the ground floor slab secured using louvred grating (75% free air) extending around the entire structure from ground level to the concrete slab soffit. As set out in section 6.2.2 of the SSFRA, resistance to flow associated with the building footprint including louvres and pillars is demonstrated using a 0.3 manning’s n value. The findings of the hydraulic assessment demonstrates that the effect of the proposed development is negligible. Flood flow is to be maintained and the model has accounted for the impact of the proposed works. The screens to the undercroft area will prevent the void becoming a health and safety issue.

7.4.15. The Council’s Environment (Flooding-Surface Water) Section raise concerns that the routing of services would impact on flood pathways. The DNV appeal submission

report states that all building services installed within the exposed undercroft will be designed in accordance with the relevant mechanical and electrical standards to ensure environmental protection, operational reliability and maintenance. Service trays will be tightly fitted to the underside of the soffit and all services will be located above 0.1% AEP flood level. The attaching of services to the underside of the soffit would have minimal displacement impact of any flood waters and the applicant has set out measures to show flood resilient construction.

- 7.4.16. The Council's Environment (Flooding-Surface Water) Section have raised concerns that insufficient information has been provided on the extent of modelling upstream and downstream. The DNV appeal submission report states that section 6.1.3 of the SSFRA describes the extent of the model and source of the data. The model upstream extends from the entrance to Ashbourne GAA grounds on the Dunshaughlin stream and 380m upstream from the Dunshaughlin stream confluence on the Ratoath stream. The downstream boundary was 50m downstream of the Dublin Road bridge on the Broadmeadow. The 1D model of the river was created from the river cross section surveyed by DNV in July 2025 and supplemented by publicly available surveys. The model node (cross sections and structures) locations are shown in Appendix D of the report. An example of the cross section from the 1D model is included in Fig 6-1. Table 6-3 sets out the calculated results for the 5 model nodes showing existing and post development flood impacts. Diagrams of the flood extents before and post development are also provided. The DNV report sets out details on the methodology and findings including data.
- 7.4.17. Based on the above, having regard to the technical information provided in the DNV reports including the information on surveys, modelling and results (which take account of climate change, the sites boundary features and any displaced flood water arising from the proposed development), I am satisfied that the submitted flood risk assessment is robust and reliable and I accept the findings of the report.
- 7.4.18. Section 7 of the SSFRA sets out details for the management of residual risk. The SSFRA identifies that the proposed development is likely liable to flood in extreme fluvial events. This risk is mitigated by the following design measures:
- Finished floor levels – It is proposed to maintain a minimum freeboard of 300mm between the proposed slab soffit level and the 1%AEP flood +cc throughout the site.

The slab thickness of c 250mm ensures that the internal FFL of the proposed building will be >400mm above 0.1%AEP+cc levels.

- Water compatible design
- Flood emergency response planning – all residents will be provided with a flood emergency response plan.
- Safe refuge – The entire ground floor area and floors above will constitute safe refuge locations
- flood resilient design practices.

#### 7.4.19. Consideration of surface water disposal

7.4.20. In relation to surface water disposal, the applicant has submitted an Engineering and Infrastructure report (submitted 10/09/2025). The report considers the effects of surface water runoff on potential flooding. A Stormwater Management Plan is to be applied to control the rate of runoff from the development via a flood storage attenuation tanks and restricted outlets as a control device. It is stated that the drainage network has been designed in accordance with Dublin Strategic Drainage Study Strategic Drainage Study. The submitted confirmation of feasibility from Uisce Eireann indicates that there are constraints in the public wastewater network and the UE request that the drainage network be designed to remove storm water from the network and divert to surface water bodies or dedicated storm sewers. The Environment (Flooding-Surface Water) Section report raise concerns with the proposed drainage measures however sets out recommended conditions so that final details can be agreed prior to development. Should the Commission grant permission, I am satisfied that this matter can be addressed by a condition that requires final designs to be agreed with the planning authority prior to development.

7.4.21. Having regard to the submitted technical reports and the internal Engineering Section reports of the Council, I am satisfied that subject to condition for final designs of the surface drainage network, that the surface water drainage network can be designed so that the development does not result in storm water flood risk.

#### 7.4.22. Application of Justification Test

7.4.23. The Flood Risk Management Guidelines requires the application of the sequential approach in considering new developments on land at risk of flooding. The proposed

development is located on Flood Zone B lands. The development is a highly vulnerable development where the sequential approach is to first 'avoid' and then 'substitute' development and therefore is 'inappropriate' development in this flood zone. Where a planning authority is considering proposals for development which may be vulnerable to flooding and that would be inappropriate, the following criteria must be satisfied.

7.4.24. Item 1 of the Justification Test is as follows: *The subject lands have been zoned or otherwise designated for the particular use or form of development in an operative development plan, which has been adopted or varied taking account of these Guidelines.*

The subject lands are zoned B1 Commercial Town Centre, which allows for residential use. This item of the Justification Test is satisfied.

7.4.25. Item 2 of the Justification Test is as follows:

7.4.26. The proposal has been subject to an appropriate flood risk assessment that demonstrates:

7.4.27. (i) *The development proposed will not increase flood risk elsewhere and, if practicable, will reduce overall flood risk;*

7.4.28. The applicant has submitted a flood risk assessment that demonstrates that the proposed development will not increase flood risk elsewhere beyond negligible levels.

7.4.29. (ii) *The development proposal includes measures to minimise flood risk to people, property, the economy and the environment as far as reasonably possible.*

7.4.30. The development includes measures to minimise flood risk. The FFL of the buildings is above flood levels and a freeboard of at least 300mm is provided between the FFL and the 1%cc and 0.1%cc floods.

7.4.31. (iii) *The development proposed includes measures to ensure that residual risks to the area and / or development can be managed to an acceptable level as regards the adequacy of existing flood protection measures or the design, implementation and funding of any future flood risk management measures and provisions for emergency services access,*

- 7.4.32. The applicant has set out measures so that residual risks to the area can be managed to an acceptable level.
- 7.4.33. (iv) *The development proposed addresses the above in a manner that is also compatible with the achievement of wider planning objectives in relation to development of good urban design and vibrant and active streetscapes.*
- 7.4.34. The ground floor layout drawings and elevation submitted with the appeal show the location of the louvre screen. The building is at a prominent and highly visible location on the street. I have concerns that the raising of ground levels and treatment of the undercroft with louvred screens provides a poor visual impression on the streetscape, compromising the interface between the building and the street.
- 7.4.35. The west elevation of the buildings have direct access points, balconies and large windows all of which allows passive surveillance of the street. The blocks and undercroft screens are to be setback from the footpath. A detailed landscape plan drawing and boundary plan drawing was submitted with the original application. These were not updated at further information stage. It is feasible, that subject to careful landscaping, boundary treatment and quality materials, that the impacts of the raising of ground levels and introduction of louvred screens can be mitigated and that the development will still provide an active streetscape. Should the Commission grant permission, I am satisfied that this matter can be addressed by a condition that requires final details to be agreed with the planning authority prior to development
- 7.4.36. Having regard to the above, I am satisfied that item (iv) of the Justification Test is complied with.
- 7.4.37. Conclusion
- 7.4.38. In conclusion, I am satisfied that the proposed development has been designed to account for flood risk in accordance with Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines of Planning Authorities and that regard has been paid to climate change, that the proposal satisfies the Justification Test of the Guidelines. I am satisfied that the proposed development is in accordance with INFPOL20 and INF OBJ21 and is in accordance with Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities.

## 7.5. **Communal open space (new issue)**

- 7.5.1. Objective DM POL14 of the CDP states that apartments are required to comply with Sustainable Urban Housing Design Standards for New Apartments 2023.
- 7.5.2. DM OBJ66 states that reduced open space standards may be acceptable for sheltered accommodation only in cases where supported with evidence and where accessible public open space is available as part of the development.
- 7.5.3. Objective OBJ67 states that planning applications for certain facilities such as care homes, retirement homes, nursing homes and sheltered accommodation should have adequate and suitable open space and other facilities and it is recognised that reduced quantitative standards may be appropriate in some cases due to the level of care or by virtue of the location of the facility and that planning applications for such development should include detailed open space and landscaping plans that take account of the location of the facility, the availability / suitability of existing open space and the needs of residents.
- 7.5.4. The Sustainable Urban Housing Design Standards for New Apartments 2023 sets out minimum standards for communal open space. Based on these standards, this development requires 414sqm of communal open space. This is required to be accessible, secure and usable.
- 7.5.5. Based on the submitted site layout drawing, I note that communal open space is provided of 90sqm communal roof garden, and 160sqm central open space. There is also additional communal open space to the western and southern side of Block B.
- 7.5.6. The raising of the building above ground level, including the introduction of the external walkway and additional ramps and steps means that access to these outdoor spaces is more restricted. The communal dining area is now raised above the ground and this restricts direct access to the southern outdoor space.
- 7.5.7. It is not clear the development is provided with an acceptable standard of communal open space that is accessible for users and which is in accordance with the 2023 Apartment Guidelines. Objective DM OBJ67 states that reduced quantitative standards may be appropriate in certain cases. I consider that good quality communal open space in accordance with the minimum standards is necessary for the amenity of future residents. For people with mobility constraints, having access to quality on site external communal open is an important features contributing to the

overall amenity of the scheme. Therefore I do not consider that communal open space below the minimum standards is appropriate.

- 7.5.8. There is potential for contravention of objective DMPOL14. Whilst the issue is not raised by the planning authority, it is raised for the consideration of the Commission. Should the Commission be minded to grant permission, it is suggested that additional information could be sought on this matter requiring the applicant to submit evidence to show that communal open space is provided in accordance with the relevant standards.

## **8.0 Appropriate Assessment screening**

- 8.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. This is attached as an appendix to this report.
- 8.2. 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 the Malahide Estuary SAC and Malahide Estuary SPA and on any other European Site in view of the conservation objectives of those sites and Appropriate Assessment is therefore not required.
- 8.3. This determination is based on:
- the scale and nature of the development,
  - distance from the European site network,
  - the information provided in the submitted screening report,
  - the lack of impact mechanisms that could significantly undermine the conservation status of qualifying interests,
  - No mitigation measures were required to reach the conclusion.

## 9.0 Water Framework Directive screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (WFD). A screening assessment is attached as an appendix to this report.
- 9.2. The site is in the Nanny-Delvin WFD catchment and Broadmeadow\_SC\_010 sub catchment.
- 9.3. The site overlays the Swords groundwater body (good status, not at risk). It is c 10m from the Broadmeadow\_020 river (poor status, at risk) and foul effluent via Ringsend WWTP discharges to Liffey Estuary Lower transitional water body (moderate status, at risk).
- 9.4. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seeks to protect and where necessary, restore surface and ground water bodies in order to reach good status and to prevent deterioration.
- 9.5. 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 water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- 9.6. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The physical separation of the development from the Broadmeadow river,
  - The low risk potential impacts having regard to the proposed drainage measures and mitigation measures.

## 10.0 Recommendation

- 10.1. I recommend permission be refused.

## 11.0 Reasons and Considerations

The Sustainable and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities promotes 'sustainable and efficient movement' as a key indicator of good design and

placemaking to ensure places are well connected and accessible by sustainable modes.

Having regard to the following:

- (i) The development as proposed is dependent upon connections and upgrades, i.e. pedestrian and cycle infrastructure, to the adjacent road network which involves works that are located outside of the red site boundary of the site for which permission is sought. In the absence of written consent from the relevant parties, the Commission considers that there is an absence of certainty that the connectivity and upgrades to the adjacent road network detailed as part of the proposed development can be delivered within the context of the permission sought.
- (ii) The Meath County Development Plan contains objective DM OBJ 96 to require the provision of cycle parking in accordance with the Design Standard for New Apartments 2023, the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines 2024 and Table 11.4 Cycle Parking Standards. The development is provided with substandard cycle facilities, below minimum standards set out in Table 11.4. Therefore the proposal materially contravenes objective DM OBJ 96 of the county development plan.
- (iii) Having regard to the proposed access to the development by steps and ramps, the Commission is not satisfied that the applicant has clearly demonstrated that this 'age friendly' development is designed in accordance with the principles of 'universal design' and will meet the access needs of future residents.

The proposed development fails to provide for the sustainable and efficient transport needs of future residents and would be contrary to Sustainable Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities.

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.

---

Aisling MacNamara

19<sup>th</sup> March 2026

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

<b>Case Reference</b>	500311
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	68 no residential units, demolition of dwelling, other site works
<b>Development Address</b>	Castle Street and Killegland Street, Ashbourne, Co. Meath
	<b>In all cases check box /or leave blank</b>
<p><b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b></p> <p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,</li> <li>- Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)</li> </ul>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.</p>
<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>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.</p> <p><b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested.</b></p>	State the Class here
<input checked="" 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>	
<p><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.</p> <p><b>No Screening required.</b></p>	

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

<b>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)?</b>	
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: \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination**

<b>Case Reference</b>	500311
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	68 no residential units, demolition of dwelling, other site works
<b>Development Address</b>	Castle Street and Killegland Street, Ashbourne, 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 natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposed residential use is compatible with other uses in area,</li> <li>- Medium size and intensity of development,</li> <li>- Minor demolition works,</li> <li>- Located within flood zone – development is designed to accommodate flood risk – SSFRA shows no increased flood risk to surrounding lands, development is designed to protect flood conveyance function on the site, development is to incorporate flood resilient construction, flood mitigation measures set out to protect human health and environment,</li> <li>- Public water supply and foul disposal feasible</li> <li>- Localised ground works,</li> <li>- Modest production of waste,</li> <li>- No significant risk of pollution or nuisance</li> <li>- No significant risk of accidents / disasters to human health</li> </ul>
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Urban area</li> <li>- Located in proximity to Broadmeadow river</li> <li>- Local ecology (trees) only on site</li> <li>- No architectural heritage on site,</li> <li>- Archaeology in the area (archaeological testing found no significant material)</li> <li>- No designated nature heritage sites at the site</li> <li>- Localised impacts on streetscape</li> </ul>
<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>	<p>Having regard to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- nature and scale of the development which is compatible with the existing development in the area,</li> <li>- the localised impact on any environmental features which are not considered to be highly sensitive,</li> <li>- the mitigation measures set out for the protection against flood risk, construction and environmental management plan, landscaping plan, waste management plan, incorporation of sustainable surface water drainage measures (subject to condition),</li> <li>- absence of significant in combination effects,</li> </ul>

	there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Likelihood of Significant Effects</b>	<b>Conclusion in respect of EIA</b>
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.  x	EIA is not required.

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

**DP/ADP:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

**Appendix 3: AA Screening Determination Template Test for likely significant effects**

Screening for Appropriate Assessment	
Test for likely significant effects	
<b>Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics</b>	
Brief description of project	68 no residential units, demolition of dwelling, other site works
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	Existing developed site in urban area. Site contains existing house and outbuildings. Site contains existing garden, trees and shrubs. Broadmeadow river in proximity. Flood risk site.
Screening report	Yes  Gannon and Associates 'Report to Inform Screening for Appropriate Assessment', Feb 2025 concludes the following:  <i>In conclusion, upon examination, analysis and evaluation of the relevant information including, in particular, the nature of the proposed development and the likelihood of significant effects on any Natura 2000 sites, in addition to considering possible in-combination effects, and applying the precautionary principles, it is concluded by the authors of this report that, on the basis of objective information; the possibility may be excluded that the proposed development will have a significant effect on any of the Natura 2000 sites listed below:</i>  - Malahide Estuary SAC  -Regerstown Estuary SAC  - Malahide Estuary SPA  - Rogerstown Estuary SPA
Natura Impact Statement	No
Relevant submissions	No
Planning authority	Planning authority AA screening assessment concludes that the proposed development by itself or in combination with other plans and

	developments in the vicinity, would not be likely to have a significant effect on a European Site and Stage 2 AA is not required.
--	---

**Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites within zone of influence using the Source-pathway-receptor model**

European Site (code)	Qualifying interests <sup>1</sup> Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections <sup>2</sup>	Consider further in screening <sup>3</sup> Y/N
Malahide Estuary SAC  000205	<b>Habitats</b> 1140 Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide 1310 Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand 1330 Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritima) 1410 Mediterranean salt meadows (Juncetalia maritimi) 2120 Shifting dunes along the shoreline with Ammophila arenaria (white dunes) 2130 Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (grey dunes)*  NPWS Conservation Objectives Vers 1, 2013	c 13.7km	Hydrological connection (Broadmeadow river)	yes
Malahide Estuary SPA  004025	Great Crested Grebe (Podiceps cristatus) [A005] Light-bellied Brent Goose (Branta bernicla hrota) [A046] Shelduck (Tadorna tadorna) [A048] Pintail (Anas acuta) [A054] Goldeneye (Bucephala clangula) [A067] Red-breasted Merganser (Mergus serrator) [A069] Oystercatcher (Haematopus ostralegus) [A130]	c 14.1km	Hydrological connection (Broadmeadow river)	yes

	<p>Golden Plover (<i>Pluvialis apricaria</i>) [A140]  Grey Plover (<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>) [A141]  Knot (<i>Calidris canutus</i>) [A143]  Dunlin (<i>Calidris alpina</i>) [A149]  Black-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa limosa</i>) [A156]  Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157]  Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162]  Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]</p> <p>NPWS Conservation Objectives Series, ver 1, 2013</p>			
<p>Rogerstown Estuary SAC  000208</p>	<p><b>Habitats</b>  1130 Estuaries  1140 Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide  1310 Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand  1330 Atlantic salt meadows (<i>Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritima</i>)  1410 Mediterranean salt meadows (<i>Juncetalia maritimi</i>)  2120 Shifting dunes along the shoreline with <i>Ammophila arenaria</i> (white dunes)  2130 Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (grey dunes)*</p> <p>NPWS Conservation Objectives Series, Vers 1 2013</p>	c 14km	No hydrological or ecological connection	no

<p>Rogerstown Estuary SPA</p> <p>004015</p>	<p>Greylag Goose (<i>Anser anser</i>) [A043]  Light-bellied Brent Goose (<i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>) [A046]  Shelduck (<i>Tadorna tadorna</i>) [A048]  Oystercatcher (<i>Haematopus ostralegus</i>) [A130]  Ringed Plover (<i>Charadrius hiaticula</i>) [A137]  Grey Plover (<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>) [A141]  Knot (<i>Calidris canutus</i>) [A143]  Dunlin (<i>Calidris alpina</i>) [A149]  Black-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa limosa</i>) [A156]  Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162]  Shoveler (<i>Spatula clypeata</i>) [A857]  Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]</p> <p>NPWS Conservation Objectives Series, Vers 1 2013</p>	<p>c 14.8km</p>	<p>No hydrological or ecological connection.</p> <p>Due to distance, not likely to impact on feeding or nesting of QI birds.</p>	<p>no</p>
<p>South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA)</p> <p>004024</p>	<p>Light-bellied Brent Goose (<i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>) [A046]  Oystercatcher (<i>Haematopus ostralegus</i>) [A130]  Ringed Plover (<i>Charadrius hiaticula</i>) [A137]  Grey Plover (<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>) [A141]  Knot (<i>Calidris canutus</i>) [A143]  Sanderling (<i>Calidris alba</i>) [A144]  Dunlin (<i>Calidris alpina</i>) [A149]  Bar-tailed Godwit (<i>Limosa lapponica</i>) [A157]  Redshank (<i>Tringa totanus</i>) [A162]  Black-headed Gull (<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>) [A179]</p>	<p>c 20 km</p>	<p>Indirect connection – foul discharge via Ringsend WWTP</p> <p>Note: Ringsend WWTP upgrades completed in 2026 – removes nitrates from receiving waters and ensuring compliance with Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive. The WWTP has capacity available.</p> <p>UE CoF states there are constraints in UE</p>	<p>no</p>

	<p>Roseate Tern (<i>Sterna dougallii</i>) [A192]  Common Tern (<i>Sterna hirundo</i>) [A193]  Arctic Tern (<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>) [A194]  Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]</p> <p>NPWS Conservation Objectives Series, vers 1, 2015</p>		<p>wastewater network but will accept wastewater subject to removal of storm runoff.</p> <p>Due to distance and dilution effect, the UE CoF and upgrades to WWTP, it is considered that the public system has capacity to collect and</p>	
<p>South Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</p> <p>000210</p>	<p>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140]  Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210]  Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310]  Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]</p> <p>NPWS Conservation Objectives Series, Vers 1 2013</p>	c 25km	<p>discharge foul effluent without significant polluting impacts on receiving waters.</p> <p>Significant effects on QIs of Natura 2000 sites not likely.</p>	no
<p>North Dublin Bay SAC</p> <p>000206</p>	<p>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140]  Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210]  Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310]  Atlantic salt meadows (<i>Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritima</i>) [1330]  Mediterranean salt meadows (<i>Juncetalia maritimi</i>) [1410]  Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]  Shifting dunes along the shoreline with <i>Ammophila arenaria</i> (white dunes) [2120]</p>	c 18km		no

	<p>Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (grey dunes) [2130]  Humid dune slacks [2190]  Petalophyllum ralfsii (Petalwort) [1395]</p> <p>NPWS Conservation Objectives Series, ver 1, 2013</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

**Step 3 Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination ) on European sites**

**AA Screening matrix**

Site name	Qualifying interests and conservation objectives	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site	
<p>Malahide Estuary SAC  #000205</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>Impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- construction related impacts from noise, light and dust emissions.</li> <li>-surface water run off during construction and operational stage.</li> <li>- flood risk</li> <li>- domestic noise and traffic,</li> <li>- removal of planting and new planting</li> <li>- water supply via public mains</li> </ul>	<p>Effect:</p> <p>No direct physical impacts on the habitat.</p> <p>Due to distance, construction related emissions will not impact on habitat.</p> <p>Surface water run off during construction is to be contained on site with no impact on river or groundwater – refer submitted outline CEMP.</p> <p>Surface water run off during operational phase to be collected on site by SUDS and to storm water sewer via attenuation tanks with petrol/ silt interceptor and hydrobrake (final designs to be agreed by condition) so no pollution to river or groundwater.</p> <p>- flood resilient construction ensures no risk to river waters during flood.</p>

		Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No	
		If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects: No Planning permissions/ other project consents are subject to AA screening or NIS - no adverse effects on Natura 2000 site. Meath CDP is subject to NIS – no adverse effect on Natura 2000 site.	
Malahide Estuary SPA 004025	As above	As above	No direct physical effects. Due to distance, construction related noise and visual intrusion would not impact on birds. The removal of vegetation on the site is not likely to significantly impact on birds feeding or nesting. No significant risks to water bodies (refer above) at construction or operational phase.
		Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No	
		If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects: No Planning permissions/ other project consents are subject to AA screening or NIS - no adverse effects on Natura 2000 site. Meath CDP is subject to NIS – no adverse effect on Natura 2000 site.	
<sup>1</sup> Summary description / cross reference to NPWS website is acceptable at this stage in the report <sup>2</sup> Based on source-pathway-receptor: Direct/ indirect/ tentative/ none, via surface water/ ground water/ air/ use of habitats by mobile species <sup>3</sup> if no connections: N			

**Screening Determination**

**Finding of no likely significant effects**

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 the Malahide Estuary SAC and Malahide Estuary SPA and on any other European Site in view of the conservation objectives of those sites and Appropriate Assessment is therefore not required.

This determination is based on:

- the scale and nature of the development,
- distance from European site,
- the information provided in the submitted screening report,
- the lack of impact mechanisms that could significantly undermine the conservation status of qualifying interests,
- No mitigation measures were required to reach the conclusion.

## Appendix 4: Water Framework Directive Screening

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING						
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality						
An Bord Pleanála ref. no.	500311	Townland, address	Castle Street and Killegland Street, Ashbourne, Co. Meath			
Description of project	68 no residential units, demolition of dwelling, other site works					
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening	Broadmeadow river to south of site Existing house located on site.					
Proposed surface water details	SUDS to public piped network					
Proposed water supply source & available capacity	Public mains					
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues	To public sewer to Ringsend WWTP					
Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection						
Identified water body	Water body name(s) (code)	Distance to (m)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)
River	BROADMEADOW_020	9m	poor	At risk	River Hydromorphology Pressures River Urban Run Off Pressures River Urban Waste Water Pressures	Storm water drainage Surface water runoff at construction Flood

Ground	Swords	underground	good	Not at risk		Surface water drainage to ground	
Transitional	Liffey Estuary Lower	Via Ringsend WWTP	moderate	At risk	Urban Waste Water Pressures	Foul discharge	
<b>Step 3: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage.</b>							
<b>CONSTRUCTION PHASE</b>							
No.	Component	Waterbody receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	<b>Determination ** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.</b>
	Drainage to ground	Swords		Pollution	Standard best construction; Construction Management Plan	No	Screened out
	River	BROADMEADO W_020		Pollution	Standard best construction; Construction Management Plan	No	Screened out
<b>OPERATIONAL PHASE</b>							
	Foul effluent disposal	Liffey Estuary Lower	Discharge of effluent	pollution	UE has issued CoF.  Ringsend WWTP upgrades complete – will remove nitrates from discharges. The WWTP has capacity.	No	Screened out
	Surface water disposal	Swords  BROADMEADO W_020	Storm water drainage to ground and via	pollution	Drainage collection and disposal via SUDS measures with petrol / silt	No	Screened out

			public network		interceptor and hydrobrake to public drainage network in accordance with GDSDS (condition required)		
	Flood risk	BROADMEADO W_020	flood	Pollution	Flood resilient construction (SSFRA),  Stormwater Management Plan (condition required).  Flood storage attenuation measures	No	Screened out
<b>DECOMMISSIONING PHASE</b>							
	N/A						