



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500522-MH-25

Development	Demolition of a house and construction of 27 houses and associated site works.
Location	Old Road, Bailis, Athlumney, Navan, Co. Meath
Planning Authority	Meath County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	25/13
Applicant(s)	Crisis Developments Limited
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Crisis Developments Limited
Observer(s)	Thomas Lynch Denis Coughlan Frances & Margaret Cahill
Date of Site Inspection	26 th March 2026
Inspector	Aisling MacNamara

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The proposed development is located on a 0.79ha site located within the settlement of Navan in County Meath. The site is located near the eastern outskirts of the town and is accessed via the Old Road L 34001 Local Tertiary road. The site contains an existing bungalow dwelling with frontage to road with the remainder of the site to the rear in undeveloped pasture.
- 1.2. This area is a developing urban area, characterised by a mixture of housing and rural land uses. Housing in the area is a mixture of one off rural houses and newer housing schemes including Tubberclaire Meadows to the west of the site on Old Road, Wood Stream to the east of the site and Caislean Mainear to the rear of the site and accessed from Kentstown Road to the south.
- 1.3. The land adjoining the eastern boundary of the site contains agricultural buildings and a single dwelling. The land adjoining the western boundary of the site contains a single dwelling, agricultural buildings and undeveloped land.
- 1.4. There is an open stream (Millrace Stream/ Ferganstown and Ballymacon) running along the northern side of Old Road.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The proposed development is as follows:

- demolition of an existing 118sqm dwelling house
- construction of 27 no. 2 storey 2 and 3 bed terraced houses
- associated car parking and landscaping including new road entrance

It is proposed to construct 23 x 2 bed house and 4 x 3 bed houses and 54 car parking spaces.

Further information received on 19/09/2025 which was advertised as 'significant'.

The proposal remains as 27 no. terrace units.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By order dated 26/11/2025, the planning authority decided to refuse permission for the following reasons:

1. The site is zoned A1-Existing Residential under the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 where the objective is *'to protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities'*. Having regard to the layout of the proposed development relative to the existing dwelling to the west, and the limited separation distance provided, the Planning Authority considers that the proposal would appear overbearing, would restrict sunlight/daylight, and would seriously injure the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. Furthermore, the proposed development, by reason of its overbearing impact and associated loss of amenity, would detract from the established amenity and character of neighbouring properties and would therefore be contrary to this zoning objective. Accordingly, to permit the development would set an undesirable precedent for similar forms of overdevelopment and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. It is a policy INF POL16 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 *"To ensure that all planning applications for new development have regard to the surface water management policies provided for in the GDSDS."* The proposed surface water attenuation system is not considered to comply with the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study (GDSDS) Regional Drainage Policies, Volume 2 for New Developments, nor with the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works, Volume 6. The design relies on the use of third-party lands without written consent and proposes an outfall to an OPW channel that is known to flood regularly. Accordingly, the system is not acceptable to Meath County Council's Environment Flooding – Surface Water Section as it fails to demonstrate the orderly collection, treatment and disposal of surface water. Having regard to Section 6.10 – Surface Water and Flood Risk Management of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027, and in the absence of adequate information to demonstrate compliance with the GDSDS, it is considered that a grant of permission would be prejudicial to public health and would be contrary to Section 6.10 and to Policy INF POL 16 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027.
3. It is an objective SH OBJ22 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 *"To secure 15-30% of dwellings and / or apartments in new residential developments 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 requirements of the 'Housing Options for Our Ageing Population Policy Statement' (2019)". The development proposed makes no provision of Age Friendly Lifetime Adaptable Homes and a Universal Design statement has not been provided. Based on the foregoing, the Planning Authority is of the opinion that the proposals materially contravene SH OBJ22 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 and to permit same would set an undesirable precedent for future developments of this nature, would represent a piecemeal development type and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the County.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The first report of the Case Planner dated 19/03/2025 sets out a recommendation for further information in relation to 20 items.
- The planning authority requested Further Information (FI) on 20/03/2025 as follows:
 1. Submit plans of existing structures to be demolished.
 2. Demonstrate dwellings comply with Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Best Practice Guidelines 2007.
 3. Demonstrate compliance with SH OBJ22 (15-30% are friendly lifetime adaptable homes, submit Universal Design Statement.
 4. Demonstrate that housing mix is acceptable, in accordance with DM POL6.
 5. Demonstrate compliance with objectives DM OBJ15 and DM OBJ16 in relation to plot ratio and site coverage.
 6. Demonstrate compliance with DMPOL2, DM OBJ5 in relation to energy efficiency.
 7. Submit revised drawings showing increase in separation distance between west elevation of Terrace A and the west site boundary by min1m.
 8. Landscaping plan shows swale around each area of public open space which renders these areas unusable – requested to omit swale and provide alternative SuDS measures, demonstrate public spaces are designed for universal use and biodiversity, show location of proposed wild flower meadow, identify trees to be

retained, submit arboricultural assessment with tree removal plan, submit revised landscaping plan.

9. Submit revised boundary treatment plan addressing items (i) to (v).
 10. Submit proposals for bin stores to each dwelling in accordance with DM OBJ 52.
 11. Address items in relation to roads and transportation (i) topographic plan, (ii) sightlines from entrance, (iii) car parking in accordance with CDP/DMURS, (iv) provide 2m footpath along L34001, (v) internal footpaths to be as per DMURS, (vi) corner radii as per DMURS, (vii) show unobstructed sightlines at internal junctions in accordance with DMURS and revise boundary treatment as necessary, (viii) internal road should be extended up to western boundary of site to facilitate possible future connectivity.
 12. Submit public lighting designs in accordance with specifications.
 13. Demonstrate compliance with Part V.
 14. Submit revised surface water proposals SuDS compliant in accordance with GDSDS, infiltration test report, topographical survey.
 15. Submit Uisce Eireann Confirmation of Feasibility.
 16. Site located in Flood Zone A and Flood Zone B (Meath County Council MapInfo flood mapping) – submit revised SSFRA and apply Justification Test in accordance with Flood Risk Management Guidelines for planning authorities, provide freeboard from flood levels, show no flood risk to site from existing culverts and proposed installation of additional culverts from nearby developments.
 17. Submit details of telecommunication infrastructure for each unit.
 18. Submit Ecological Impact Assessment in accordance with (a) to (d).
 19. Address issues raised in submission of HSE Environmental Health Officer.
 20. Submit response to issues raised in submissions.
- Response to Further Information request was received on 19/09/2025.
 - The response was deemed 'significant' and new public notices were advertised.

- The second report of the Case Planner of 24/11/2025 recommends refusal of permission for three reasons relating to design / overdevelopment / detracts from amenity and contrary to A1 Existing Residential zoning objective, prejudicial to public health / flood risk, lack of age friendly lifetime adaptable homes.

3.3. Other Technical Reports

Environment Flooding-Surface Water Section

Report of 19/03/2025:

Recommends further information in relation to flooding and surface water. Report refers to historic flood issues on the Old Athlumney Road from Millrace watercourse (culverts on channel increase flood risk in area), submit SSFRA to include modelling of Millrace watercourse and blockage analysis of culverts, indicates access road to the site is in Flood Zone A and B. Requested to submit revised surface water network that is SuDS compliant and in accordance with Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study (GDSDS) including topographical survey and infiltration testing report.

Report of 19/03/2025:

Flooding

- The applicant has submitted further information which has been reviewed. The applicant has demonstrated that the site and proposed development is elevated above critical flood levels that may occur from nearby developments proposed culvert installation works. Any culvert works from the neighbouring development will not increase flood risk on the subject site.
- In terms of flooding, has no issues with proposed development subject to condition requiring prior to development that the applicant received written approval from the OPW with regards to the location, type and level details of the proposed headwall and outfall pipe. A section 50 application may be required.

Surface Water

- The development does not meet the Council's requirements for orderly collection, treatment and disposal of surface water.

- The proposed type, sizing and layout of the attenuation system is not acceptable and may need to be relocated / redesigned or the site layout design to be revised to be acceptable.
- The proposed outfall is on third party lands. The applicant has not provided a letter of consent from the third party landowner.
- The proposed surface water outfall and headwall are located in an OPW channel that is flood sensitive and surcharges. The applicant needs written permission from OPW and agree a suitable design with OPW so that the proposed outfall does not impact flows in the watercourse. Details of the headwall to be agreed with Transportation Department due to proximity to carriageway.
- Parts of the proposed surface water system are below the acceptable minimum cover of 1.2m. Concrete surround is acceptable with minimum cover of 750mm but some sections are below the 750mm cover threshold also which is not acceptable.
- The applicant has not submitted sufficient topographical survey data of the existing OPW channel to clearly show that the proposed invert level of the surface water outfall is acceptable and has sufficient clearance from the existing watercourse invert level. Acceptable clearances will require redesign of the surface water system and potential raising of proposed development roads, FFLs and infrastructure.
- The development is not in accordance with Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study Regional Drainage Policies Volume 2 for New Developments and the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works Volume 6. The development does not meet the requirements of the Council's Environment Section with respect to orderly collection, treatment and disposal of surface water. The applicant has not provided sufficient detailed information regarding the design of the proposed surface water system and receiving watercourse. The outfall and headwall are on third party lands and require approval of OPW. The development if permitted would materially contravene INF POL16 of CDP.

Transportation Department

Report of 05/03/2025 recommends further information in relation to layout showing existing topographical detail, sightlines at entrance, car parking in accordance with CDP, 2m footpath on L34001, internal footpaths, corner radii, internal junctions and extension of internal road to western boundary for future connectivity.

Report of 14/10/2025 - No objection subject to conditions in relation to conditions in relation to:

- Unobstructed sightlines from entrance of 45m to nearside road setback 2.4m.
- Unobstructed sightlines from priority junctions within development of 23m x 2.4m.
- Revise corner radii at entrance to 4.5m, maximum corner radii within development of 3m.
- Internal road to be extended up to western boundary for future connectivity.
- Site boundary along L34001 should be setback 9m south of the existing northern road edge to accommodate widening of the road to 6m plus a 3m verge, the roadside boundary shall comprise 1m wide grass verge (provided between road and footpath) and 2m wide concrete footpath, unless otherwise agreed.

Public Lighting

Public lighting designs received 07/10/2025 are acceptable. Lighting drawing required to include ducting, circuits, micropillars, chambers etc. Lighting to be constructed as per Meath County Councils Public Lighting Technical Specification & Requirements.

Housing

Report of 09/10/2025 indicates Part V requirements to be met by the delivery of units on site.

3.4. **Prescribed Bodies**

Health Service Executive (HSE)

Report of 25/02/2025:

- Recommended integrated storage solutions for wheely bins to improve visual appearance and prevent odour, provide for hosing down waste storage area.
- Surface water drainage will be to existing drainage ditch on Old Road opposite front of site – the ditch has flooded previously and has potential to flood, the maintenance of SuDS is important to ensure that no blockage occurs, clarification required regarding legal responsibility for maintenance of surface water drainage system, recommended applicant submits proposals for continuous maintenance and upkeep of landscaping and SuDS features.

- Recommended residential units are designed so that can adopt to needs of users of time.
- Submit energy efficiency design proposals.

Report of 13/11/2025:

- Floor plans show integrated waste storage facilities at terrace houses – recommended that waste areas are provided with drainage and means of hosing down for hygiene.
- The applicant has provided evidence showing compliance with Universal Design Guidelines for Homes in Ireland 2015.
- Engineers reports provide information on surface water engineering and site specific flood risk assessment. On site infiltration tests were carried out. The results showed conditions favourable for infiltration however high water table was encountered. The drainage strategy is therefore to provide as much area within green areas for shallow infiltration whilst avoiding deep infiltration devices.
- Measures are proposed to prevent flooding on site to include SuDS features. Proposed to provide minimum FFL 0.5m higher than 1000 year flood, the site is to retain current ground levels with no cut or fill thereby ensuring no displacement which could affect neighbouring properties. It is acknowledged that Old Road is subject to minimal flooding of 50mm along the northern edge of the road carriageway. The applicant states there is proposal to culvert the Millrace in the future which will mitigate flooding of Old Road along the site frontage. The internal surface water network is source of possible flooding from the system if it were to block. To minimise risk, the role of maintenance in the drainage system is of critical importance to prevent blockages. Recommended that the applicant submit and agrees maintenance proposals for the onsite surface water drainage features with the planning authority.
- A Climate Action Energy Report outlines energy saving proposals. Finished dwellings capable of A BER. Recommended that one external air to water heat pump unit is provided per house.

3.5. Third Party Observations

Third party observations were received at application and further information stage. The key issues raised include concerns in relation to zoning, density, character of area, surface

water drainage/ flooding, traffic impact, capacity of road network, treatment of site boundaries, impact on hedgerows (hedgerow to be maintained), impact on residential amenity, no permission given to applicant for future site linkages, health and safety concerns and potential for chemical or oil spill into River Boyne, lack of clarity regarding the method of sale of the proposed dwellings.

4.0 Planning History

No identified planning history.

Other in the surrounding area:

- **PA 24/60415 / ABP 322341-25** - Albert Developments Ltd – Grant - LRD development consisting of mixed use development with 313 no. dwellings, community centre, sports hall, neighbourhood centre, district public park – includes provision of surface water attenuation measures as well as ancillary development works (reprofiling of site and field drain diversions).

Condition 4(a): “The nine dwellings (numbers 230-238) with vehicular access / egress off Old Road, shall be omitted from the permitted development. Any future consent for dwellings at this location shall either be served by separate vehicular access / egress arrangements from the main body of the overall site or shall be accompanied with a clear and implementable proposals for an improved pedestrian and road carriageway along Old Road, eastwards from the site frontage to the roundabout at the LDR6 Road.” The reason refers to the interests of pedestrian, cycle and traffic safety and to ensure safe and usable vehicular and active travel access to these dwellings.

The Commission Direction points to issues of concern in relation to pedestrian and vehicular access / egress at Old Road and the need for any subsequent application for residential use at this part of the site to be capable of safe pedestrian and vehicular movements from this location eastwards and northwards and with deliverable improvements along Old Road if access / egress is proposed onto Old Road.

- **PA 25/60539 (ABP323854-25 withdrawn)** - Michael Smith - Meath County Council Grant – LRD of 223 no residential dwellings and creche and associated works, connections to Gort Na Glaise Council development, connectivity to west and KRD6 and other lands, footpath and cycle path on western side of application site.

- **PA 23/60342** – Refused – construction of 53 units, vehicular entrance onto R153 Kenstown Road, pedestrian and cyclist only entrance onto Old Athlumney Road. Refusal reason relates to location of development in flood zone B and failure to pass Part 2(i) Justification Test of Flood Risk Management Guidelines, materially contravenes INF POL18 and INF POL20 of CDP.

4.1. **Development Plan**

Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (includes variations no.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.

Navan settlement plan

Navan is designated a Key Town in the Settlement Hierarchy.

Core Strategy Household Allocation 2020-2027 is 3204 units.

Population projection 2027 is 36,073.

Vision: For Navan to continue to function and develop as a multi-modal² Key town in Meath; an important employment centre for administrative, retail, health, and education services, where development in the town centre is balanced by investment in the business and industrial parks, which will enhance its attractiveness as a place to live, work, and invest and thereby support the creation of a sustainable community.

Site is located within Masterplan MP12 – Masterplan agreed 2020

Master Plan 12 relates to lands zoned for residential, mixed-use, employment, community, and open space/recreational uses in the Athlumney/Farganstown area. A Master Plan shall be prepared for these lands that will ensure the delivery of a high quality, appropriately phased development including a suitable mix of house type, community, and employment uses. To ensure there is appropriate service provision in this part of the town, the development of these lands shall also include the provision of local services and facilities including a neighbourhood centre. The development of these lands shall provide for phased and integrated development including the delivery of the distributor road and local services and community facilities in tandem with residential development. The

phasing of the development of the lands shall be agreed in writing with the Executive of the Planning Authority as part of the preparation of the Master Plan.

Note: A new updated masterplan for this area was submitted as part of a recent permitted LRD development (PA24/60415/ ABP 322341-25). The CDP states that all masterplans are non–statutory. I have reviewed the updated Athlumney /Farganstown MP12 Masterplan, June 2024 submitted under that application. Whilst it is unclear if the updated masterplan has been approved, it was used as the basis for the permitted development. There are no provisions of the masterplan which impact on the development site.

Site is zoned A1 Existing Residential

Objective: To protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities

Guidance: Lands identified as ‘Existing Residential’ are established residential areas. Development proposals on these lands primarily consist of infill developments and the extension and refurbishment of existing properties. The principle of such proposals is normally acceptable subject to the amenities of surrounding properties being protected and the use, scale, character and design of any development respecting the character of the area.

NAV POL 1 To consolidate and strengthen Navan’s position a Key Town and the principle economic and service centre in Meath by continuing to support economic and population growth based on the principles of a sustainable community and a high quality and attractive urban environment.

NAV OBJ 1 To support and encourage residential development on under-utilised land and/or vacant lands including ‘infill’ and ‘brownfield’ sites, subject to a high standard of design and layout being achieved.

NAV OBJ 16 To manage flood risk and development in Navan 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”.

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.

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 10 To require that applications for residential development take an integrated and balanced approach to movement, place making, and streetscape design in accordance with the requirements of the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets, DTTS and DECLG (2013 and updated in 2019).

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 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 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.

6.10.1 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems

INF POL 16 To ensure that all planning applications for new development have regard to the surface water management policies provided for in the GDSDS.

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).

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.

11.5.7 Separation Distances

DM OBJ 18 A minimum of 16 metres separation between directly opposing rear or side windows above ground floor level in the case of detached, semi- detached, terraced units shall generally be observed.

DM OBJ 21 A minimum distance of 2.3 metres shall be provided between dwellings for the full length of the flanks in all developments of detached, semi-detached and end of terrace houses.

11.5.3 Density

DM POL 5 To promote sustainable development, a range of densities appropriate to the scale of settlement, site location, availability of public transport and community facilities including open space will be encouraged.

DM OBJ 14 The following densities shall be encouraged when considering planning applications for residential development:

Key Towns and Large Towns (5000+ population) - Suburban/Urban Extension 30-50 uph, Up to 80 uph open for consideration at accessible suburban/urban extension.

11.5.13 Boundary Treatments

DM POL 8 To require the provision of high quality, durable, appropriately designed and secure boundary treatments in all developments.

DM POL 9 To support the retention of field boundaries for their ecological/habitat significance, as demonstrated by a suitably qualified professional. Where removal of a hedgerow, stone wall or other distinctive boundary treatment is unavoidable, mitigation by provision of the same boundary type will be required.

DM OBJ 28 To require that boundaries between the rear of existing and proposed dwellings shall be a minimum of 1.8 metres high and shall be constructed as capped, rendered concrete block or brick walls, to ensure privacy, security and permanency. Alternative durable materials will be considered.

DM OBJ 32 To encourage the use of measures specifically designed to enhance wildlife in residential schemes such as gaps/holes, should be considered and incorporated into boundary treatments to allow for passage of all wildlife including hedgehogs, bat boxes and swift bricks/boxes.

Section 11.5.29 Age Friendly Lifetime Adaptable Homes

In accordance with the principles of Housing Options for Our Ageing Population – Policy Statement 2019, the Planning Authority will advocate an age-friendly approach with respect to new residential developments in county Meath.

Applicants for residential development should consider the incorporation of homes suitable for older persons within proposed schemes and homes should include the age friendly principles taken from the Ten Universal Design Features in a Lifetime Adaptable and Age Friendly Home, published by Age Friendly Ireland. These set out that an Age Friendly Home should include the following features:

1. Is well-connected to local amenities;
2. Is connected to the outdoors;
3. Is easy to move about in;
4. Is easy to approach and enter;
5. Has a guest bedroom;
6. Has accessible and adaptable toilets and bathrooms;
7. Are energy and cost efficient;
8. Has good technology systems;
9. Has good security systems;
10. Has easy-to-use fittings and fixtures;

The Council will consider proposals, including the development of small infill sites for appropriate forms of residential development for age-friendly housing, including opportunities for those wishing to downsize from larger family homes to more appropriately sized units 'Right-Sizing' with benefits of town centre living and proximity to community infrastructure, transport etc.

Housing proposals specifically aimed at older people should be designed having regard to Universal Design Standards enabling the property to be future proofed for the possible care needs of the occupant and to ensure sufficient floor space to cater for care assistance/visitors. In this regard, development proposals will be required to comply with any future technical guidance relating to design specifications for housing for older people in place at the time of making the planning application.

4.2. **Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines**

- National Planning Framework – First Revision, April 2025

- Eastern and Midland Regional Assembly Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy 2019-2031 (RSES)
- Delivering Homes, Building Communities 2025
- Climate Action Plan (CAP) 2025
- Ireland's 4th National Biodiversity Action Plan 2023-2030
- The Planning System and Flood Risk Management - Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2009
- The Planning System and Flood Risk Management - Guidelines for Planning Authorities - Technical Appendices, 2009
- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024
- Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2013, as amended up to 2025)
- Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2020

4.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

There are no sites designed for natural heritage at the site or within close proximity. The closest designated sites are:

- River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC located c 0.9km from the site .
- River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA located c 1km from the site.
- Boyne Woods pNHA located c 3.3km from the site.

5.0 **EIA Screening**

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

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The applicant has submitted a first party appeal. The grounds of appeal are summarised as follows:

- Introduction and application history set out.
- Reason for refusal no.1:
 - The refusal reason relies on limited and subjective interpretation of the proposed design and its compliance with A1 zoning objective. It refers generically to impacts on adjoining properties and established amenity without specific analysis.
 - The stated reason significantly contradicts the statement in section 10.3.1 Layout of the Council's planning report of 19/03/2025 which states that layout will not negatively impact on any future development on A1 zoned lands either side of the site. Council's planning report states that density of 34uph is acceptable. Council's planner report states that the proposed development is in accordance with the zoning objective of the site. The submitted Henry J Lyons Planning Report provides basis for design and compliance with CDP and national control objectives.
 - There is no basis that the development would detract from established amenity and character of neighbouring properties. The adjacent properties are in residential commercial use to west, residential commercial agricultural use to east, the lands over the short southern boundary are in recent low density residential use. The boundary on the southwest is considered – gable of existing two storey dormer dwelling is at 90 degree orientation to the development. The proposed development has rear gardens backing onto this boundary – not at unusual proximity.
 - Near the intersection of Old Road /Hodgett Road there is residential development at significantly higher density. The site is small, provides for residential variety between adjacent areas of lower and higher densities, c 15km from Market Square and town centre, houses designed to meet current housing demand for own door affordable homes, diversity of housing supply, small site for medium high density development, design options such as duplex housing were examined but level access own door was chosen with appropriate density.

- There is reasonable basis for the submitted designs in compliance with CDP and national policy.
- Request ACP set aside reason for the refusal.
- Reason for refusal no. 2 (set out in Molony Millar engineers letter):
 - Compliance with GDSDS - Extensive design information submitted. Do not accept that the surface water attenuation system is not in compliance with GDSDS. Engagement carried out with local authority. On foot of Council concerns, original AquaCell units under bioretention area no. 2 were removed. Infiltration tests were carried out. Water table was high and soakaways not feasible. Opted for high level drainage with compliance with nature based solutions and SuDS. SuDS drawing submitted at FI stage shows permeable paving, rain garden planters, filter drains, detention basin, herringbone drains, tree pits. All complies with GDSDS.
 - Mill Race Stream - Millrace stream is located at edge of Old Road, a public road on the northern edge of the road. It is located between the hedge rows on either side of the road. It is reasonable to assume the stream which drains the road is within the public realm. The question of third party ownership was not raised in the FI request. It is reasonable to assume the stream drains to the subject lands as the land slopes northwards down to the Old Road and Millrace Stream. No evidence that Millrace Stream is an OPW channel. If it is in ownership of OPW, permission can be sought from OPW for permission to discharge the surface water to stream. Such permission should be forthcoming as due to the extensive SuDS and NBS measures proposed the rate of discharge is limited to current 'greenfield' rates of discharge. The stream continues northwards and discharges to River Boyne c 850m distant.
 - Flooding - The Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment concludes that the site is in Flood Zone C with the risk of flooding low, less than 1:1000 years. The Old Road is subject to minimal flooding of 50mm on the northern edge. Full emergency access and egress to and from the site is available in the event of extreme flooding of the Mill Race Stream. Proposals to culvert the Millrace Stream will mitigate this.
 - Conclusion -The proposed surface water drainage system as designed complies with GDSDS. The site itself is not subject to flooding. Minor flooding in extreme events can occur at the northern edge of Old Road to a depth of 50mm. This is considered minimal, will not impede the flow of traffic and will be mitigated when future culvert

works take place. The proposed development should not be refused planning permission for the reasons stated in reason no.1.

- Reason for refusal no.3:

- This is a small scale development – Type 2 house design have ability to adapt for future enhanced accessibility.
- FI response addressed compliance of proposed house types 1-3 with Centre of Excellence Universal Design Guidelines. Refer to section 2.1.9 Adaptability of the submitted planning report which states the two storey own door housed units facilitate adaptation.
- The Age Friendly Lifetime Adaptable Home in Ireland design guidelines set out 10 principles for universal design. The proposal is in accordance with the design principles (details set out showing compliance with 10 principles).
- Do not accept that the development makes no provision for age friendly adaptable homes.
- The submitted designs have appropriately implemented the development plan standards at the time of application.
- Applicant is willing to accept a condition on grant of permission requiring the submission of specific design and identification of 4-5 house units (15%) as UD standard homes, demonstrating compliance with the relevant standards in Age Friendly Ireland Ten Universal Design Features, Centre of Excellence design guidelines and checklist and Department Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities and Best Practice 2007.
- Based on the submitted house design and analysis, where the achievement of these standards is substantially a matter of internal layout change for the proposed UD homes, we propose that these changes would be relatively minor and not alter the proposed scheme design or materially affect the external appearance of the terraced housing.
- Refusal reason cites SH OBJ 22. Notes that Council's planning report refers to SH OBJ 24. Believe that SH OBJ 22 is the applicable standard – this policy statement is a guide for the promotion and development of appropriate design standards which

assists in either immediate accommodation or future adaptation for universal design whilst taking account of economic and other necessary factors.

- The adaptability of the two storey terraced housing provides flexibility. This could provide potentially for an increase in the provision of UD homes from 15-30%(8-9 units), as relatively minor amendments (not altering the proposed scheme design or materially affecting the external appearance of the terraced housing). This is an attractive feature of the design that allows for varied ownership and tenure.
- Request ACP set aside the reason for refusal and grant permission with a condition as set out above.
- Conclusion – Reference made to CDP section 3.8.2 ‘Challenges in the Delivery of Housing’. The development proposal is made following consultation with AHB developer and the Council where demand for efficient affordable and 2 bed starter homes is identified. This is developable site for housing at density that supports settlement and housing strategy of CDP and design is appropriate. Substantial environmental architectural and engineering design documentation is provided. Certain aspects such as zoning development control and surface water drainage / flood risk assessment have been inconsistently addressed by planning authority. Matters could be addressed by clarification of FI. Refusal is unwarranted and unreasonable. Request ACP to consider the appeal. Applicant offer to accept condition requiring specific design and identification of 4-5 house units as UD standard homes.
- Appendices include record of pre planning meeting, planning application report, further information summary request and response, Molony Millar Consulting Engineers report (relating to refusal no.2).

6.2. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority has responded to the grounds of appeal. The response is summarised as follows:

- The planning authority notes the contents of the first party appeal and the issues raised. The planning authority is satisfied that the subject proposal was appropriately considered throughout the course of the assessment of the planning application as detailed in the Planning Officers report of 19th March 2025 and 24th November 2025. The planning authority request ACP to uphold the decision to refuse permission.

6.3. Observations

Three observations were received from residents of Old Road. The key issues raised are summarised as follows:

- The owner / resident of the adjoining property to the west raises concerns in relation to the impacts of the development on their property:
 - impact on the amenity and character of their property noting overbearing impact, loss of privacy, safety and sunlight/ daylight, limited separation between their home and Terrace A and B,
 - the proposed treatment of boundary – proposed 1.2m parkland railing is not adequate to ensure privacy and safety of their property – the existing hedgerow boundary should be retained and rejuvenated and 2.5m boundary wall erected along full length of western boundary (condition requested for this wall at early stage in construction),
 - risk to public health and safety arising from odour and disease from proposed detention basin and stagnant water– raises concerns regarding future maintenance, potential flood risk to their property,
 - states the design of the proposed surface water relies on the use of their land to which they have not given consent.
 - ‘Potential Future Site Linkage’ onto property is highlighted – the applicant does not currently have any link or right of access to their property.
- Zoning – The proposed development is not in accordance with the zoning objective. Out of character with the surrounding area. Does not enhance the amenity of the area. Concern over locating 27 no. 2 storey terraced houses in high density in an existing area of bungalow/ one off properties along this narrow laneway. Results in overdevelopment.
- Residential amenity

The proposed development will injure the residential amenity of surrounding properties. Lack of consideration for the neighbouring bungalow properties / neighbouring agricultural businesses.

- Flooding and surface waters – This area is prone to flooding during winter. The surface water from this site drains to a small stream on the Old Road. This small stream floods (classified as Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Flood Zone A in CDP Flood Risk Assessment) – resulting in residential properties on Old Road being flooded. There are flood issues downstream in Tubberclaire Meadows estate where the stream goes under bridge (refer 2460415 submission from consulting engineers highlighting flooding issue). There have been 100 houses built along the L34001 and permission for over 200 more. This small stream cannot be relied upon to drain any more sites. Council recognised this in 2360342. The stream does not have capacity to accommodate additional surface water from development. The development will result in flood risk to neighbouring properties.
- Discharge to stream which enters via canal to River Boyne in Armulchan. The potential for chemical or oil spill from discharge of surface water run off from site poses hazard to fish in River Boyne.
- Traffic – The development is to access via Old Road. This road is very narrow, difficult for two cars to pass, used by walkers and agricultural traffic. Additional traffic poses traffic and pedestrian hazard. There has been no engineers study of and report of the traffic load currently on this road. The road is already over capacity and unsafe.

The proposed development plans to access Old Road at the very section of the road that is a single lane bottle neck. The road has been widened and pathways added to west and east of the site to accommodate other developments and allow vehicles pass.

The development cannot exit onto the Kenstown road as this route is blocked by the Caislean Mainear development to the south of the site.

Public transport – No public transport along the Old Road.

- Housing needs of the area is already met by the significant amount of lands zoned New Residential that provides for housing demand of own door affordable homes. A large number of own door affordable homes already under construction in the area.
- Overload of existing roads, services and amenities.
- Lack of communication between the developer and the community.

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 this appeal are as follows:

- principle of development
- residential amenity and character of area
- surface water drainage and flood risk
- universal design of proposed houses
- treatment of boundary to third party land
- roads and transportation

7.2. **Principle of development**

7.2.1. It is proposed to construct 27 no. dwellings on a 0.79ha site located within settlement of Navan. The site is zoned A1 Existing Residential in the Navan settlement plan of the Meath County Development Plan where the objective is 'to protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities'. Residential development is a permitted use in this zone. I am satisfied that the proposal for residential development on lands zoned Existing Residential is acceptable in principle.

7.3. **Residential amenity and character of area**

7.3.1. The planning authority refused permission for reason 1 which states that having regard to the layout of the proposed development relative to the existing dwelling to the west and to the limited separation distance provided, that the proposed development would injure the residential amenity of this western property by reason of overbearing impact and a restriction of sunlight / daylight. The refusal indicates that the proposal would detract from established amenity and character and would be contrary to the zoning objective and to

permit the development would result in an undesirable precedent for similar forms of overdevelopment in the area.

7.3.2. The planner's report indicates concerns in relation to the separation between Terrace A and the adjoining dwelling to the west.

7.3.3. Impact on existing residential amenity

7.3.4. The western boundary of the site is adjoined by an existing dwelling located near the public road. The land to the rear of this dwelling is in use with agricultural / industrial sheds and undeveloped grassland. The eastern boundary of the site is adjoined by agricultural / industrial shed and a dwelling. There is an existing dwelling located near the southwestern corner of the development, part of the Caislean Mainear estate.

7.3.5. *Separation Distances*

7.3.6. Chapter 11 of the CDP sets out development management standards for housing. Section 11.5.7 relates to separation distances.

7.3.7. Objective DM OBJ18 states that a minimum of 16m separation between directly opposing rear or side windows above ground floor level in the case of terrace units shall generally be observed.

7.3.8. Proposed Terrace A is located close to the existing dwelling to the west. Between Terrace A and the western dwelling, there are no directly opposing elevations. I am satisfied that the proposal is in accordance with Objective DM OBJ18.

7.3.9. Proposed Terrace E is located close to the existing dwelling to the south west corner of the site. Between Terrace E and the existing dwelling, there are no directly opposing elevations. I am satisfied that the proposal is in accordance with Objective DM OBJ18.

7.3.10. Objective DM OBJ 21 states that a minimum distance of 2.3m shall be provided between dwellings for the full length of the flanks in all developments of detached, semi detached and end of terrace houses. The planner's reports raise concerns that 2.3m separation is not achieved between Terrace A and the neighbouring boundary of the property to the west of the site and refers to a 1.1m separation between Terrace A and the western site boundary. There is a separation of c 8.4m between Terrace A and the western house. I am satisfied that the proposal is in accordance with Objective DM OBJ21 which requires 2.3m separation between dwellings.

- 7.3.11. Specific Planning Policy Requirement 1 of the Sustainable and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities relates to separation distances. The SPPR requires a separation distance of at least 16m between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear of side of houses above ground floor. As there are no opposing elevations, I am satisfied that the proposal is in accordance with SPPR1.
- 7.3.12. *Overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing impacts*
- 7.3.13. Proposed Terrace A is located a minimum of 8.4m from the existing dwelling (bungalow) to the west. Terrace A is two storeys with ground to ridge height of 8.7m. The gable end of Terrace A does not contain any windows. Due to the location, orientation, height and scale of the proposed terrace including the separation distances between the terrace and the dwelling, I am satisfied that the proposed development will not adversely impact on the amenity of the western dwelling or its external amenity space by reason of overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing impacts. There is a distance of c 26m between Terrace B and the western dwelling. Due to the distance of Terrace B from the dwelling, I do not consider that Terrace B results in any significant adverse impacts on the amenity of the western dwelling.
- 7.3.14. Proposed Terrace E is a minimum of 9.8m from the existing dwelling (detached dormer) to the southwest. Terrace E is two storeys with ground to ridge height of 8.7m. The gable end of Terrace E does not address the dwelling. The terrace is setback a distance of c 7m from the shared boundary. Due to the location, orientation, height and scale of the proposed terrace including the separation distances between the terrace and the dwelling, I am satisfied that the proposed development will not adversely impact on the amenity of the south western dwelling or its external amenity space by reason of overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing impacts.
- 7.3.15. Having regard to the above, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of adjoining residential properties.
- 7.3.16. Character of the area
- 7.3.17. The zoning objective guidance for the Existing Residential zone states that development proposals on these lands is acceptable subject to the amenities of surrounding properties being protected and the use, scale, character and design of development respecting the character of the area.

- 7.3.18. The site is an infill site located within the built up urban area of Navan. The site is within a developing area. Surrounding lands are developed for a variety of housing types and densities ranging from single one off house to housing estates. New development has been constructed in the area and large scale residential development is permitted to the north. I am satisfied that the proposed development for 27 residential units in two storey terraced format is of a use, scale and design format and layout that is in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.
- 7.3.19. The proposed development has a density of 34/ha. This is in accordance with the density range standards for a Key Town set out in the CDP. I do not consider that the density is excessive. I do not consider that the proposal amounts to overdevelopment of the site.
- 7.3.20. In summary, I am satisfied that the proposal is in accordance with the zoning objective to protect and enhance the amenity and character of the existing residential communities in the surrounding area.

7.4. Surface water drainage and flood risk

- 7.4.1. The planning authority refused permission for reason 2 which indicates that having regard to section 6.10 'Surface Water and Flood Risk Management' of the CDP and the absence of adequate information to demonstrate compliance with the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study (GDSDS), it is considered that a grant of permission would be prejudicial to public health and would be contrary to section 6.10 and Policy INF POL 16 of the CDP.
- 7.4.2. A number of third parties have submitted observations in relation to the stream on the Old Road, indicating it is subject to flooding and raising concerns over the capacity of it to accommodate additional development and surface water outflow to the stream.
- 7.4.3. Surface water disposal
- 7.4.4. Section 6.10 of the CDP sets out guidance in relation to sustainable urban drainage systems and flood risk management. Objective INF POL16 is to ensure that all planning applications for new development have regard to surface water management policies provided for in the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage System.
- 7.4.5. The GDSDS published in 2005 contains 5 volumes. Volume 2 contains technical requirements for designing and constructing drainage infrastructure in new developments. Section 6.3.4 of this document sets out a summary of design criteria for drainage systems. Criterion 1 relates to interception and treatment of runoff. Criterion 2 relates to the control

of discharge rates. Criterion 3 relates to the management of flooding and Criterion 4 relates to river flood protection. The hydraulic criteria requires surface run off from new development to be restricted to 2l/s/ha for the 1 in 100 year rainfall event and requires a maximum discharge rate of QBAR or 2l/s/ha for all attenuation storage where long term storage is not provided. Climate change needs to be applied to all relevant elements of the design parameters used.

- 7.4.6. In response to a further information request from the planning authority, the applicant submitted a revised engineering report (Molony Millar) including hydrological model results, layout drawings showing the proposed surface water network and a site specific flood risk assessment report (Molony Millar). The documentation states that the proposed development is designed in accordance with the GDSDS and sustainable urban design. On site infiltration tests were undertaken showing favourable results for infiltration. A high water table was encountered and the proposed drainage strategy is to use measures for shallow infiltration whilst avoiding deep infiltration devices.
- 7.4.7. It is proposed to discharge surface water run off from the site (after interception and attenuation) to the stream to the north of the site. On site interception storage is provided for in a range of measures including private subsoil filter drains via rain gardens, tree pits, permeable paving to parking areas and a detention basin and stone filter drain. Equivalent greenfield runoff for the site has been calculated as 2.0l/s. Long term storage is not provided. Calculations are submitted to show that for the 100 year return storm (+20% for climate change) a minimum volume of 171m³ is required when applying a constant maximum discharge of 2l/s. Attenuation is provided in excess of the minimum volume at 181m³. A flow restricting hydrobrake is provided in the site outfall manhole to limit final discharge from the site to greenfield discharge rates. The proposed minimum finished floor level of the development is 0.5m above the 1000 year fluvial flood level of the stream on the Old Road and finished floor levels are 150mm above the adjacent road levels. I am satisfied that the proposals are in accordance with the SuDS requirements of the GDSDS and that the proposed development would not result in discharge of surface water beyond existing greenfield run off rates and would not pose a significant additional flood risk to any other properties.
- 7.4.8. The internal report of the Council's Environment Section raise that the submitted designs do not comply with the Council's requirements for the treatment of surface water and that

the type, sizing and layout of the attenuation system is not acceptable and may need to be relocated / redesigned and that the depth of pipes are too shallow. I am satisfied that network is designed in accordance with the criteria of the GDSDS. Any details regarding the type, sizing and location of the network can be agreed by prior to development and that this matter can be addressed by condition.

7.4.9. The internal report of the Council's Environment Section raise concerns that the applicant has not submitted sufficient topographical survey data of the existing OPW channel to show that the proposed invert level of the surface water outfall is acceptable and has sufficient clearance from the existing watercourse invert level. The submitted topographical survey drawing shows that levels fall gently across the site in a northern direction towards the stream. Finished floor levels fall from FFL50.00 at Terrace E to FFL49.30 at Terrace A. The outfall is to be located where the edge of the stream/ditch is 47.03. Surface water will flow from the site to a lower level at the stream. The Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works states the following in section 3.10 Outfalls to Rivers: *Surface water outfalls to streams, rivers, etc. should be unobtrusive and not cause erosion of the bed and banks. A suitable non-return device should be fitted on the outfall pipeline. The Local Sanitary Authority must approve all design details.* I am satisfied that final designs regarding the invert level of the outfall pipe relative to the stream bed can be agreed prior to development and this matter can be addressed by condition.

7.4.10. Concerns are raised in the third party observation that the detention basin will give rise to odour and disease relating to stagnant water posing a risk to public health and to concerns over potential flooding. I note that the report of the HSE at further information stage indicates that should permission be granted a plan should be put in place for the maintenance of surface water features to prevent blockages which could pose a potential flood risk. Firstly, I note that detention ponds are an accepted SuDS component under the GDSDS. Should permission be granted, it is recommended that a condition be attached for the applicant to submit a plan for the written agreement of the planning authority for the long term maintenance and management of the SuDS network and to require the applicant to certify that the system has been constructed in accordance with the relevant standards. The detention basin is located within the public open space. A standard condition can be attached requiring the development to be maintained by the developer until taking in charge by the planning authority. Subject to satisfactory construction and maintenance, I

am satisfied that the detention basin would not result in public health nuisance or pose flood risk.

7.4.11. Having regard to the above, I am satisfied that subject to conditions as referred to above, that the proposed surface water disposal measures are in accordance with the key criteria of the GSDSDS, that any outstanding issues regarding final design and maintenance can be addressed by condition. The proposals would not be prejudicial to public health. The proposals are in accordance with Objective INF POL16.

7.4.12. Third party consents

7.4.13. The Council's Environment Section raise concerns that the proposed outfall is on third party lands to an OPW channel and that no consent is provided by third parties/ OPW. The Foul & Surface Water Drainage Layout drawing submitted 19/09/2025 shows surface water outfall pipe to stream on the northern side of Old Road. I am satisfied that Old Road itself is taken in charge and in the control of the local authority. The stream is an OPW Arterial Drainage Channel C1/6 Boyne (www.floodinfo.ie drainage maps). Surface water discharge to the OPW channel requires Section 50 Consent under the Arterial Drainage Act. A condition can be attached to any permission to require that prior to development, the developer enters into an agreement with the OPW for the outfall of surface water to the Arterial Drainage Channel.

7.4.14. A third party observer has raised concerns that the lands required for proposed surface water drainage network including the proposed detention basin relies on the use of third party lands and the owner of these lands does not give consent. The submitted Site Location Map shows the red line site boundary in the ownership of the applicant. The application form states that the applicant is in contract to purchase the site. A solicitors letter is submitted stating that the owner gives consent to the application. The submitted Foul & Surface Water Drainage Layout drawing at FI stage shows works associated with the proposed drainage network within the site boundary. Based on the information available, I am satisfied that the proposed drainage works are on lands in the control of the applicant.

7.4.15. Fluvial flood risk

7.4.16. Issues are raised in the third party observations in relation to flood risk associated with the stream on Old Road.

- 7.4.17. The OPW CFRAM Final map dated November 2017 shows the fluvial flood extents for the 1% and 0.1% fluvial event. The map shows that the lands are not subject to flood event. The CDP contains a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Having reviewed the online maps, the maps do not show that the site is at flood risk. On foot of further information request from the Council, the applicant submitted a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment on 19/09/2025. The report conclusion states that the site is located in Flood Zone C. Having regard to the Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities, the site is not at flood risk and there is no requirement to apply the Justification Test for development on the site.
- 7.4.18. The report states that Old Road is currently subject to minimal flooding of 50mm along the northern edge of the road carriageway along the frontage of the site. Any flooding on the public road is a pre existing issue on a local authority road. I do not consider that this level of flooding on the road poses significant constraints for vehicles accessing or egressing the estate. The development permitted under ABP 322341 includes culverts on the stream which may also mitigate flooding on the road. The report of the Council's Environment Section dated 24/11/2025 indicates no issues with the proposed development in relation to flood risk.
- 7.4.19. I am satisfied that the proposed development is not at fluvial flood risk.
- 7.4.20. Impacts on River Boyne (salmonid river)
- 7.4.21. Concerns are raised in relation to the potential for pollution of the Millrace stream which connects to the River Boyne arising from hydrocarbon spills or runoff from the site with discharges to the stream. The River Boyne is a protected salmonid river. There is a channel distance c 1.45km between the site and the River Boyne.
- 7.4.22. Having regard to the distance between the site and the River Boyne, the design of the surface water network in accordance with GSDSDS and the implementation of standard best construction practice, there would not be a significant risk of pollution of the stream. The impact of the development on WFD water bodies and Natura 2000 sites is considered in detail below and in the attached appendices. Conditions are recommended for final SuDS designs with standard integrated pollution controls and for Construction and Environmental Management Plan to be submitted and agreed with the planning authority prior to development.

7.5. Universal design of proposed houses

7.5.1. The planning authority refused permission for reason no. 3 which indicated that the development makes no provision for age friendly lifetime adaptable homes and a Universal Design Statement has not been provided and as such, the proposal materially contravenes SH OBJ 22 of the CDP and to permit same would set an undesirable precedent and would represent piecemeal development.

7.5.2. Objective SHOBJ22 of the CDP states that the planning authority will require the provision of 15-30% of dwellings in new residential developments of ten units or more to be age friendly adaptable homes in accordance with requirements of the stated universal design documents and section 11.5.29 of the CDP. The objective states that planning applications will be required to demonstrate compliance with this objective and show an accessible route to the units from the boundary and a universal design statement shall be provided.

7.5.3. The design policy referred to in SHOBJ22 include:

- ‘Housing Options for Our Ageing Population Policy Statement’ (2019). This is a policy statement to support ageing population and identifies 40 strategic actions to progress housing options. Six principles for housing ageing population are set out as ageing in place, supporting urban renewal, promoting sustainable lifetime housing, using assistive technology, staying socially connected and working together.
- ‘Building for Everyone: A Universal Design’. This is a design series for universal design.
- ‘Universal Design Guidelines for Homes in Ireland’ (2015). This sets out design advice for home location and approach (section 1), entering and moving about the home (section 2), spaces for living (section 3) and elements and systems (section 4). The Centre for Excellence published a 2025 document ‘Internal Layout checklist for Universal Design Homes’ which provides a checklist for compliance with section 2 and 3 of the guidelines.
- Section 11.5.29 indicates that age friendly homes should include ten design features detailed in the Age Friendly Ireland design guide.

7.5.4. The submitted FI response of 19/09/2025 includes a table ‘Universal Design Guidelines For Homes In Ireland – Centre for Excellence in Universal Design 2015: From ‘Universal

Design Guidelines for Homes in Ireland'. The appeal submission outlines how the scheme complies with the ten principles of age friendly design.

- 7.5.5. The report of the HSE dated 13/11/2025 states that the applicant has provided evidence showing compliance with the requirements of the Universal Design Guidelines for Homes in Ireland 2015 published by the Centre for Excellence in Universal Design.
- 7.5.6. Having regard to the information in the appeal including the table submitted at further information stage and to the report of the HSE, I am satisfied that the applicant has submitted information typically found in a universal design statement.
- 7.5.7. The site is within a settlement and benefits from proximity to services and facilities.
- 7.5.8. It is proposed to construct footpath links from the site boundary to residential units.
- 7.5.9. The appeal submission states that the applicant is willing to accept a condition for the submission of a specific design and identification of 4-5 homes (15%) of homes as universal design standard homes. I am satisfied that it is reasonable to attach a condition requiring the applicant to submit revised drawings and details prior to development for the agreement of the planning authority showing the provision of 4 dwellings to be 'age friendly adaptable homes' in accordance with the requirements of 'Universal Design Guidelines for Homes in Ireland'.
- 7.5.10. I am satisfied that subject to condition requiring 4 units of universal design standard, that the development is in accordance with SHOBJ22 of the CDP. Alternatively, it is open to the Commission to seek the submission of design proposals as a further information matter.

7.6. Treatment of boundary to third party lands

- 7.6.1. Concerns have been raised from a third party observer regarding the adequacy of the proposed boundary treatments.
- 7.6.2. Section 11.5.13 of the CDP sets out guidance in relation to boundary treatments.
- 7.6.3. DMPOL8 requires the provision of quality, durable, appropriately designed and secure boundary treatments.
- 7.6.4. DMPOL9 is to support the retention of field boundaries for their ecological significance and where removal of hedgerow is unavoidable mitigation by provision of same boundary type will be required.

- 7.6.5. Objective DM OBJ28 requires boundaries between existing and proposed dwellings to be a minimum of 1.8, high and constructed as capped, rendered concrete block walls or alternative durable materials.
- 7.6.6. The site is currently bounded by existing native hedgerow which is to be removed for the new development. The proposed boundary plan shows the boundaries to the eastern, western and southern boundaries of the site to be treated by a mix of treatments including 2m fair faced block wall with concrete capping and 1.2m high parkland railing. A native hedgerow is to be planted along parts of the boundaries within the site. The plan appears to show certain sections of existing planting along the boundaries retained, however the retention of existing hedge is not viable if new boundaries / planting are to be installed.
- 7.6.7. The submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment report states that the eastern and western hedgerows are designated category C2, low quality. The submitted Ecological Impact Assessment report state that the removal of hedgerow will have a minor adverse impact at a local level and that adverse impacts are mitigated by the proposed new planting which includes new native hedgerow and pollinator friendly planting and that the overall long term impact on ecology is negligible. Having regard to the low quality of the existing hedgerow and to the proposed planting of new native hedgerows along the boundaries, the development is in accordance with DMPOL9.
- 7.6.8. I am not satisfied that the 1.2m parkland railing is a durable or secure boundary to third party lands. Should permission be granted, it is recommended that a condition be attached to require the provision of a 1.8m capped and rendered concrete block wall along all boundaries with third party lands. I am satisfied that, subject to condition for revised boundary treatment, that the proposed boundaries to third party lands are durable, appropriately designed and secure and that the development is in accordance with DMPOL8 and DMPOL28

7.7. **Roads and Transportation (new issue)**

- 7.7.1. Third party observations have been raised in relation to the capacity of the public road to accommodate additional development.
- 7.7.2. It is proposed to access the site from the L34001 Old Road. Along the section near the site, the tarmac road carriageway is c 4m and there are no footpaths. The road has been improved to the east and west of the site with widened carriageway and footpaths, in conjunction with development. The nearest footpath to the east is located c 145m from the

site boundary. The nearest footpath to the west is c 270m from the site boundary. There is an open stream running along the northern side of the road. On day of site visit, there were considerable number of pedestrians on the road and traffic levels were moderate. The road has a speed limit of 50km/hour.

7.7.3. The closest existing neighbourhood shop is the Applegreen to the west at the junction of the Old Road and R153. The closest bus stops are R153 Athlumney Road which can be accessed west along the Old Road or east via the Hodgett Road.

7.7.4. The reports of the Council's Transportation Department at initial application and further information stage indicate that Department was generally satisfied with the roads proposals subject to conditions relating to sightlines, the internal design and connections to adjoining lands. The planning authority considered the matter could be addressed by conditions.

7.7.5. Capacity of Old Road and connections to the surrounding area

7.7.6. I have serious concerns regarding the capacity of the existing Old Road to accommodate the additional transport needs of the proposed development. The mid section of Old Road has not been improved and is currently substandard having regard to the constrained width and lack of dedicated pedestrian facilities to provide for the considerable numbers walking the road. Whilst the applicant proposes a new 2m wide footpath along the site's roadside boundary, this does not extend beyond the boundary and there is a considerable distance between the site boundaries and the nearest footpaths. The proposed development results in additional traffic movements and additional pedestrians and cyclists on a road where there is inadequate provision for existing users. The proposed development would therefore result in traffic hazard.

7.7.7. The Meath County Development Plan contains objective SH POL3 to implement urban design that promotes permeability and interconnections and facilities walking and cycling. Regard is to be paid to the Sustainable and Compact Settlement Guidelines. These guidelines promote sustainable and efficient movement. Key principles to be considered in planning applications include that new developments should connect to the wider urban street and transport networks and improve connections between communities, to public transport, local services etc and active travel should be prioritised through design measures that create street networks that feel safe and comfortable for pedestrians and cyclists. Residents of the future scheme would not be provided with safe comfortable

pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure from the site to the surrounding area. This is contrary to the principles of good design in the Compact Planning Guidelines and contrary to SHPOL3.

7.7.8. I furthermore note that condition 4(a) of ABP322341-25 (LRD development) omitted vehicular access and nine dwellings to Old Road in the interest of pedestrian, cycle and traffic safety and to ensure usable active travel access. The Commissions Direction refers to the need for deliverable improvements on Old Road.

7.7.9. Sightlines at entrance

7.7.10. At further information stage, the applicant submitted a Proposed Sightline Layout Plan showing clear sightlines of 45m x 2m. The report of 14/10/2025 indicates no objection subject to the applicant demonstrating unobstructed sightlines from the proposed entrance of 45m to the nearside road edge from a setback of 2.4m. The report raises concerns that a splay from a 2m setback would result in vehicles protruding into the carriageway. The Layout Plan shows that the existing block wall along the adjoining roadside boundary to the east is likely to block sightlines from a 2.4m setback. The report also notes sightlines to the west are not to the nearside of the road.

7.7.11. The Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS) requires that a road with a design speed of 50km/hour is provided with a visibility of 45m. DMURS state the following in relation to the 'x' setback:

For this reason, priority junctions in urban areas should be designed as Stop junctions, and a maximum X distance of 2.4 metres should be used. In difficult circumstances this may be reduced to 2.0 metres where vehicle speeds are slow and flows on the minor arm are low. However, the use of a 2.0 metre X distance may result in some vehicles slightly protruding beyond the major carriageway edge, and may result in drivers tending to nose out cautiously into traffic. Care should be taken to ensure that cyclists and drivers can observe this overhang from a reasonable distance and manoeuvre to avoid it without undue difficulty.

7.7.12. The Old Road is a well used urban road with a high number of pedestrians, with narrow carriageway width near the site and a lack of dedicated pedestrian facilities. I am not satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated that there is justification to show that the site conditions warrant flexibility in the application of the standards. In the absence of this, the proposed entrance does not comply with DMURS and results in traffic hazard.

7.7.13. The above raised issues were not raised in the planning authority's refusal reasons. The issues are raised as new issues for the consideration of the Commission. I do not consider that the issues can be addressed by condition. It is open to the Commission to seek additional information, as deemed appropriate or necessary.

7.7.14. Access to adjoining lands

The planning authority in their further information letter requested internal roads be extended to boundary to facilitate future possible connectivity. The owner of the western lands has submitted observations indicating they do not consent to access. The internal report of the Council's Transportation Department requested condition be attached for internal roads to western boundary to facilitate possible future connectivity. Whilst the development can make provision in the layout for potential future links, these links can only be delivered in the future with the consent of landowners. Should permission be granted, it is recommended that condition be attached for the provision of the links up to the boundary in agreement with the planning authority.

8.0 AA 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. 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 River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC, River Boyne and River Blackwater 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 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.

9.0 Water Framework Directive

- 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 Boyne WFD catchment and the Boyne_SC110 sub catchment.
- 9.3. The site overlays the Trim groundwater body (good status, at risk). The site is c 6m from the Ferganstown and Ballymacon river body (moderate status, under review). Foul effluent is to be treated in the Navan WWTP which discharges to the Boyne river (moderate status, under review).
- 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 good status of the Trim groundwater body,
 - the physical separation to the Ferganstown and Ballymacon river,
 - the low risk potential impacts having regard to the proposed drainage measures and mitigation measures including conditions for submission of SuDS designs in compliance with GDSDS with standard integrated pollution control measures and submission of Construction and Environmental Management Plan for agreement with the planning authority prior to development,
 - disposal of treated foul effluent via the Navan WWTP which is compliant with ELV limits set by the EPA and which has capacity for additional load.

10.0 Recommendation

10.1. I recommend refusal of permission.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024 states that 'sustainable and efficient movement' is a key principle of good design and new development.

Policy SHPOL3 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 is 'To support the creation of healthy and sustainable communities that encourages and facilitates walking and cycling and general physical activity through the implementation of best practices in urban design that promotes permeability and interconnecting spaces'.

The proposal to construct 27 new residential units on the site will result in additional transport movements on Old Road. Having regard to the constrained carriageway width of the Old Road and the absence of pedestrian facilities on this road east and west of the development site to connect to existing facilities, it is considered that the proposed development fails to provide for the safe and comfortable movement of pedestrians, cyclists and motorists on Old Road. Furthermore, there is insufficient evidence to show that sightlines can be provided from the site entrance along the Old Road in accordance with the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets which states that sightlines should be from a 2.4m setback.

Therefore the proposed development would result in a development that would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and the proposed development would be contrary to the principles of good design in the Sustainable Residential and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities and contrary to SHPOL3 to promote permeability.

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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

Aisling Mac Namara
Planning Inspector

02 April 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	500522
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of a house and construction of 27 houses and associated site works
Development Address	Old Road, Bailis, Athlumney, Navan, Co. Meath
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
<p>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</p> <p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources) 	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.</p>
<p>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.</p> <p>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested.</p>	State the Class here
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3</p>	
<p>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?</p>	
<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>No Screening required.</p>	

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	Schedule 5, Part 2, 10 (b) (i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units 10 (iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere.

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

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	500522
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of a house and construction of 27 houses and associated site works
Development Address	Old Road, Bailis, Athlumney, Navan, Co. Meath
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed residential use within settlement boundary is compatible with other uses in area - Modest size and intensity of development - Localised impact on natural resources - Connection to public water and foul network. Surface water outfall to stream on Old Road - Modest production of waste - No significant risk of pollution or nuisance - No significant risk of accidents / disasters to human health
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Urban area, site located within settlement boundary - Local ecology only on site. Submitted ecological impact assessment report concludes that subject to mitigation, the project would not have significant adverse effects on ecology. Removal of hedgerow/trees has negative impact however with establishment of proposed planting, any impacts are negligible. No roosting habitats for bats found on site and no significant adverse effect on bats are predicted. - No built heritage on site - No designated sites at the site - Localised impacts on streetscape - No significant risk to water bodies. There is no significant risk to the water quality of the stream on Old Road. Refer to WFD screening. - Site is not at fluvial flood risk. Storm water discharge to stream does not exceeds existing rates of greenfield runoff – no additional flood risk associated with discharge.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity)	Having regard to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - nature and scale of the development, - lack of significant environmental sensitivities on the site, - absence of significant in combination effects,

and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. 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	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics	
Brief description of project	<p>Demolition of a house and construction of 27 houses and associated site works.</p> <p>Urban waste water discharge to Navan WWTP.</p> <p>Surface water discharge on site and to stream on Old Road.</p> <p>Water from public mains.</p>
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	<p>Northern part of site contains house. The main part of the site is in undeveloped grassland.</p> <p>Stream located on northern side of Old Road connects to River Boyne.</p> <p>No streams or ditches on the site.</p> <p>379m natural hedgerow/ trees.</p>
Screening report	<p>Yes</p> <p>'Appropriate Assessment Screening Statement for the Proposed Residential Development at Athlumney, County Meath' by FGE Consulting, Oct 2024 submitted.</p> <p>The report concludes that it is not foreseen that the proposed development will give rise to any significant adverse effect on any designated European sites alone or in combination with other plans or projects and stage 2 NIS is not required.</p>
Natura Impact Statement	No
Relevant submissions	AA not raised as substantial matter in submissions.
Planning authority	Planning authority AA screening concludes that the proposed development by itself for in combination with other plans and development in the vicinity will not be likely to have a significant effect on a European Site and Stage 2 NIS is not required.

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

European Site (code)	Qualifying interests¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections²	Consider further in screening³ Y/N
River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC 002299	Alkaline fens [7230] Alluvial forests with Alnus glutinosa and Fraxinus excelsior (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae) [91E0] Lampetra fluviatilis (River Lamprey) [1099] Salmo salar (Salmon) [1106] Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355] Conservation Objectives Series, 3 rd Dec 2021	c. 0.8km	Indirect hydrological (surface water, foul effluent via Navan WWTP)	Yes
River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA 004232	Kingfisher (Alcedo atthis) [A229] Conservation Objectives Series, 2 nd July 2024	C 0.85 km	Indirect hydrological (surface water, foul effluent via Navan WWTP)	Yes

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	
River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC	Alkaline fens [7230] Alluvial forests with Alnus glutinosa and Fraxinus excelsior (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae) [91E0]	Impacts: - Construction/ demolition related impacts from noise, light and dust emissions.	Effect: No direct physical impacts on the habitat.

	<p>Lampetra fluviatilis (River Lamprey) [1099] Salmo salar (Salmon) [1106] Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355]</p> <p>Conservation Objectives Series, 3rd Dec 2021</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Surface water run off during construction and operational stage. - Waste water treatment and discharge to Navan WWTP with emissions. - Domestic noise and visual disturbance. - Parking – hydrocarbon emissions. - Removal of existing planting and new planting. - Water supply via public mains - Flood risk 	<p>Due to distance, construction related emissions will not impact on habitat.</p> <p>There is no direct hydrological connection.</p> <p>Surface water will discharge to ground via SuDS design. With standard best construction there is no risk to ground water quality.</p> <p>Surface water will discharge to stream on Old Road. This stream travels c 1.45km to the River Boyne. Due to physical separation, distance in stream connection and dilution effect and standard best construction, there would be no risk to the water quality of the stream and no risk to the QIs.</p> <p>Note: Standard best construction includes SuDS design to GSDSDS standard which includes integrated pollution/sediment control measures and Construction and Environmental Management Plan. These are standard measures and are not measures to avoid or reduce impacts on QIs.</p> <p>Note: The submitted Ecological Impact Assessment Report recommends general site management measures and silt fences to protect the stream on Old Road. The stream is c 6m from the site, separated by a public road. This road provides a barrier between the site and the stream. There is minimal risk of runoff between the site and the stream during construction. I consider that the measures are not a required mitigation measure necessary for the protection of the QIs of the Natura 2000 site.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>Effluent is disposed to Navan WWTP. Discharges from the Navan WWTP are compliant with ELVs set by the EPA. There is no risk to water quality of River Boyne.</p> <p>Water supply via public mains.</p> <p>Due to distance, operational impacts via noise, visual intrusion, vehicular emissions will not impact on the habitat.</p> <p>The development site is not at flood risk. The development will not increase storm water to stream beyond existing rates and will not result in any additional flood risk. Access is via Old Road which can flood at times however this is preexisting and of limited duration. No significant risk to water quality or channel regime due to flooding.</p>
		Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No	
		<p>If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects:</p> <p>The Screening report sets out the cumulative impact arising from the development and other plans or projects in 'section 3.5 Other plans and projects'.</p> <p>Extant permissions and Meath CDP 2021-2027 were considered.</p> <p>It is not likely that there would be significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects.</p>	
River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA 004232	Kingfisher (Alcedo atthis) [A229] Conservation Objectives Series, 2 nd July 2024	As above	As above

		Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No
		<p>If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects:</p> <p>The Screening report sets out the cumulative impact arising from the development and other plans or projects in 'section 3.5 Other plans and projects'.</p> <p>Extant permissions and Meath CDP 2021-2027 were considered.</p> <p>It is not likely that there would be significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects.</p>
<p>¹ Summary description / cross reference to NPWS website is acceptable at this stage in the report</p> <p>² Based on source-pathway-receptor: Direct/ indirect/ tentative/ none, via surface water/ ground water/ air/ use of habitats by mobile species</p> <p>³if no connections: N</p>		

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 River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC, River Boyne and River Blackwater 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.	500522	Townland, address	Old Road, Bailis, Athlumney, Navan, Co. Meath			
Description of project	Demolition of a house and construction of 27 houses and associated site works					
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening	No surface water features on the site. Stream located on northern side of Old Road.					
Proposed surface water details	On site via SuDS and to stream on Old Road					
Proposed water supply source & available capacity	Public mains UE CoF states water connection feasible without infrastructure upgrade.					
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues	Navan WWTP - Uisce Eireann Annual Environmental Report 2024 states the Navan WWTP is compliant in Emission Limit Values. The WWTP has remaining organic capacity of PE of 3096pe. UE CoF states wastewater connection feasible subject to upgrades (c 97m of network extension required – applicant will be required to fund these local network upgrades.					
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	FERGANSTOWN_and_BALLYMACON	6m	Moderate	Review	none	Surface water discharge at

							operational stage. Limited potential for pathway during construction (site separated from river by Old Road)
Groundwater	Trim (protected Article 7 Abstraction for Drinking Water)	underground	Good	At risk	Agriculture Anthropogenic Domestic Waste Water		Drainage to groundwater at construction and operational stage
River	Boyne (protected Salmonid River, water dependent SPA/SAC, nutrient sensitive river)	C 1.45km	Moderate	Review	none		Via Navan WWTP

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.

CONSTRUCTION PHASE

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	Determination* * to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.
	Drainage to ground	Trim	underground	Pollution	Standard best construction. Standard Construction and Environmental Management Plan (condition required).	No	Screened out

	Minor risk of emissions to river	FERGANSTOWN_ and_BALLYMACO N	Across road	Pollution/sedimentation	Standard best construction. Standard Construction and Environmental Management Plan (condition required).	No	Screened out
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
	Effluent disposal to Navan WWTP	Boyne	Discharge of effluent	pollution	Navan WWTP has capacity for additional load and is ELV compliant.	No	Screened out
	Storm water to stream	FERGANSTOWN_ and_BALLYMACO N	Storm water discharge	Pollution/sedimentation	Standard best construction. Network to GSDS standards (condition required for final designs prior to development).	No	Screened out
	Drainage to ground	Louth	Storm water drainage underground via SuDS measures (filter drains, tree pits, permeable paving, detention basin)	pollution	Standard best construction. Network to GSDS standards (condition required for final designs prior to development).	No	Screened out
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
	N/A						