



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-500688-MH-26

Development	The development will consist of alterations, demolitions and additions to The Maple Clinic.
Location	The Maple Clinic, Dublin Road, Ashbourne Co Meath.
Planning Authority	Meath County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560354
Applicant(s)	Blossom Properties Ltd
Type of Application	Planning Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse permission
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeals
Appellant(s)	Blossom Properties Ltd
Observer(s)	William McGregor Statia O'Byrne Lisa Doolan
Date of Site Inspection	28 th May 2026
Inspector	Dan Aspell

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1.1. The site is The Maple Clinic, Dublin Road, Ashbourne, Co. Meath. The surrounding area is suburban. The site is accessed off Dublin Road.
- 1.1.2. The site generally comprises a detached 1 & 2 storey building and 3 no. adjacent single-storey buildings. Car parking extends within the south, east, and west of the site. The main building is pitch-roofed. The single-storey buildings are adjacent to the rear, between the main building and northern boundary of the site (referred to as a temporary cabin; 'building 2'; and a shed). The main building is orientated southward, away from the road. All the buildings on site are clustered along the northern boundary. The site area is given as 0.179ha.
- 1.1.3. To the north, adjacent the site boundary, is a single storey semi-detached dwelling ('Brandon House') and a number of flat-roofed structures. To the south is a detached dormer dwelling ('The Lodge'). To the east is the Wafre Lodge housing estate. Dublin Road is to the west. The site boundaries generally comprise block walls.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1.1. The description of development describes the following main elements:
- alterations, demolitions and additions to clinic;
 - change of use of first-floor from storage to medical clinic;
 - demolition of existing single storey structures in accordance with condition 3 of Reg. Ref: 23/60323;
 - alterations to elevations;
 - removal of existing attic second floor;
 - construction of a store and bin store;
 - alterations to site layout, widening of existing entrance.
- 2.1.2. I would describe the proposed development as demolition of the single-storey buildings; remodelling of the main building, including construction of a 2-storey extension to the rear and side, and construction of a 2-storey lift core to the front of; all to create a single, 2-storey, flat-roof building positioned generally adjacent the

northern boundary of the site. No significant changes to the proposal were made in response to Further Information.

- 2.1.3. The applicant submitted to the Planning Authority a cover letter; further information responses; Daylight & Sunlight Assessment Report; Engineering Planning Report; architectural and engineering drawings; and related documents.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Meath County Council issued a notification to refuse permission for 1 no. reason, summarised as follows:

- Reason 1: *Having regard to the nature and overall scale of the proposed Medical Centre, together with the results of the Sunlight/Daylight Assessment, the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of an immediate adjoining dwelling in terms of loss of daylight and overbearing impact which would be contrary to the land use zoning, depreciate the value of property in the vicinity, contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning report: The reports recommended permission be refused. I note the following points:

- Principle: Healthcare practitioner is open for consideration in this zone. Site currently operates as a medical clinic. Development Plan distinguishes between health centre and healthcare practitioner. Health centre is more typically located in B1, G1 and A2 zones. Maple Clinic provides a range of medical services. The scale of proposed development and concentration of professionals and practices is more aligned to a health centre. A medical clinic was granted and established on-site (Ref. 2360323). Proposal is acceptable on balance;
- Layout: The existing first-floor is storage and ground floor is medical clinic. There are 5 no. consulting rooms, nurses room, and ancillary rooms for the clinic.

Proposal would increase the number of consulting rooms to 12 no. and nurses rooms to 4 no. Applicant states that current staff numbers are 20 and proposal would accommodate 23 no. This is a considerable increase and will place significant pressure on site infrastructure;

- Siting & Residential amenity: Removal of 2 no. existing buildings would remove haphazard development. Proposed building would be 2-storey and 7m in height (a reduction in 1.1m in height). The massing would be much larger including a 11.7m rear extension and a 6.5m side protrusion. The proposed ground floor extension would be 1.5m from the northern boundary and 5m from the adjacent dwelling. The first-floor would be 7.2m from the neighbouring dwelling. Proposal addresses overlooking by raising the height of windows in the northern elevation to 2m. Opaque glazing is shown in response to further information;
- Natural light: Report stated concerns of overshadowing the dwelling to the north. A sunlight/daylight assessment was submitted in response to further information and considers vertical sky component, annual & winter probable sunlight hours, and sunlight on rear gardens. Report noted the assessment identified 3 no. instances of 'minor adverse' impact on VSC but assumed some of the windows impacted serve non-habitable room. Planner Report set out a review of the planning application for 'Brandon House' which indicated that some of the windows affected are to a kitchen/dining room. Report was of the opinion that the rooms affected were habitable rooms; that the proposed bulk and massing is not appropriate and could have an impact neighbouring residential amenities although minor; and has the potential to devalue the dwelling;
- Hours of operation: Report notes proposed hours of operation submitted in response to further information and raises concerns regarding lack of clarity in relation to impact on neighbours from evening/night activity on site;
- Design: The design is modern but not out of character and is acceptable. Report notes signage details provided in response to further information. Report in response to further information states the flat roof, bulk, and façade does not integrate well into the area;
- Site coverage / plot ratio: Acceptable in this instance;

- Waste: There is potential for proposed bin stores to impact residential amenity by odour and other nuisance. In response to further information, waste storage is revised and details are provided;
- Transportation / access: Existing access is close to a third party access, and is to be upgraded and widened. Regarding parking, the report stated there is partial compliance with parking requirements, however stated that the nature of some of the rooms and whether there will be staff parking has not been clarified. Swept path analysis is provided. Deliveries are indicated as going to the front of the site which could impact vehicle and pedestrian movement in the site; report stated that deliveries should be to the rear however swept path analysis to the rear has not been provided. Details of cycle shelters, pedestrian access, showers facilities, and staff changing/storage are shown. Report states that there appears to be a 'pinch-point' within the layout, however the Transportation Department state no objection;
- Services: Proposal to be served by mains supply and sewer. Surface water will discharge to permeable paving, porous asphalt, and rainwater harvesters. Report noted the further information response, and stated that no report from the Council Environmental Department was received;
- Flood risk: Site is in Flood Zone C. Flood Zone B is 150m away;
- Archaeology: No known Recorded Monuments or Protected Structures in / adjacent the site;
- Appropriate Assessment: Not required;
- Environmental Impact Assessment: Sub-threshold EIA not required;
- Contributions: Contributions for previous permitted development (Ref. 2360323) remain outstanding;

Other Technical Reports

- 3.2.2. Transportation Department: No objection subject to conditions (parking provision and parking signage).
- 3.2.3. Environment: None.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

- 3.3.1. National Environmental Health Service / Health Services Executive: Submission recommended that the pedestrian access to the building is marked / clearly outlined.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

- 3.4.1. During the planning application stage 5 no. observers made submissions to the Planning Authority. These were Cllr. Nick Killian; William McGregor; Lisa Doolan; Diane O'Reilly; and Brian Leahy. The issues raised related to: access; traffic / traffic movements; pedestrian safety/visibility; absence of road safety audit; insufficient / overspill parking; construction management / construction traffic management; operating hours; size & scale; natural lighting; privacy; overlooking; health & safety/waste; invalid application; ownership; and non-confirmity with previous grant of permission. The submission from Cllr. Nick Killian fully supported the application.

4.0 **Relevant Planning History**

4.1. **Subject site**

- 4.1.1. Reg. Ref. 2360323: Permission granted by the Planning Authority in 2023 for: 1. Retention of change of use of a building from a dwelling to office use and the subsequent change of that building from office use to its current use as a medical clinic, together with retention of an extension to the front of the building and minor alterations to the elevations and internal layout. 2. Retention of an office building approx. 79.2 sqm and retention of the subsequent change of use of this building from office to medical use. 3. Retention of a temporary building approx. 38.9 sqm for medical use. 4. Retention of the change of use of domestic shed to office store and retention of the further change of use from office store to medical store. 5. Together with retention of all associated site development works, car parking, drainage, external lighting and signage.
- 4.1.2. Condition 3 of the above permission provided that the use of the existing building(s) retained shall be restricted to that as detailed in the development description and for no other class of use specified in Part 4 of Schedule 2 of the Planning &

Development Regulations 2001-2023 unless authorised by a further grant of permission. The reason was to prohibit an unacceptable change of use.

4.1.3. Reg. Ref. 211170: Planning permission refused by the Planning Authority for change of use from offices to a Medical Centre, as well as demolitions, alterations and additions to convert the existing partial 1.5 and 2.5 storey building into a partial one, two and three storey structure, new parking layout, connection to all services and all associated site works.

4.1.4. The application was refused for 1 no. reason, which was that the proposal represented a health centre which is a non-confirming use on A1 Residential zoned lands and therefore the proposed development would materially contravene the zoning objective of the Ashbourne Local Area Plan 2009-2015 which forms part of the Meath County Development Plan 2013-2019.

4.2. **Nearby sites:**

4.2.1. None.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **Relevant National & Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines**

National Biodiversity Action Plan 2023, including its Objectives and Targets

Design Manual for Urban Roads & Streets (DMURS) 2019

5.2. **Development Plan**

5.2.1. The site is zoned 'A1 Existing Residential' in the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027. I note the following provisions in particular.

Land Use:

11.14.6 'Land Use Zoning Categories' and Section 11.14.2 'Permissible and Non-Permissible Uses'

Residential Amenity

Sections 11.5.4 'Plot Ratio' and 11.5.5 'Site Coverage'

Section 11.5.16 'Light and Overshadowing' states: "*Daylight and sunlight levels should, generally, be in accordance with the recommendations of Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (B.R.209, 2011), A New European Standard for Daylighting in Buildings IS EN17037:2018, UK National Annex BS EN17037:2019 and the associated BRE Guide 209 2022 Edition (June 2022) and any updates thereof.*"

Section 11.5.7 'Separation Distances'

Healthcare facilities

Section 7.7.4 'Healthcare Facilities', including Policies SOCPOL24, SOCPOL25, SOCPOL26, SOCPOL29 and SOCPOL30. SOCPOL29 seeks: "*To support and co-operate with promoters or operators of public and private health care facilities by facilitating and encouraging the provision of improved health care facilities in appropriate locations*". I also note Objective SOCOBJ5.

Parking:

Section 9 'Parking Standards', Section 11.9.1 'Parking Standards'

Objectives DMOBJ89 and DMOBJ92 and Table 11.2 'Car Parking'

Other

Section 11.5.4 'Plot Ratio'; Objective DMOBJ15; Section 11.5.5 'Site Coverage', and DMOBJ16.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.3.1. Malahide Estuary SAC is 13.22km and Malahide Estuary SPA is 13.25km approximately to the south-east.

6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) screening

- 6.1.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environment impact assessment (See Form 1 & 2 Appendix 1 of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, I consider that there is no real likelihood of

significant effects on the environment. The development, therefore, does not trigger requirement for EIA screening and an EIAR is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of First-Party Appeal

7.1.1. A lengthy first-party appeal was received from John Spain Associated on behalf of the applicant, the main points of which are summarised as follows:

- Introduction: Proposal is for alterations to a clinic. It makes optimum use of the site. Proposal sits comfortably in the site and is designed to reduce impacts on adjoining dwellings. Proposal increases provision of much-needed medical services for Ashbourne, surrounding area, and new residential development nearby. Proposal would alleviate demand pressures for healthcare. Proposal complies with Development Plan policies and land use strategy for Ashbourne. Report set out details of site location and planning history;
- Further information: Appeal sets out detailed commentary in relation to the Planning Authority further information stage:
- Car parking: 26 spaces proposed, including 2 no. accessible spaces and 6 no. EV spaces. There will be 13 no. consulting rooms. Additional rooms (Procedure Rooms, Assessment Rooms, Nurse Rooms) are not classified as consulting rooms and will service the requirements of patients being dealt with in the consulting rooms. Appeal states that nurse rooms will be used by nurses and 'not necessarily' as consulting rooms. Regarding staff parking, the appeal states that the further information response confirmed 4 no. car parking spaces were allocated to staff and that this number will increase subject to grant of permission. Transport Section raised no concerns regarding parking;
- Deliveries / Swept path assessment: Appeal notes the submitted swept path analysis, and states that bin storage was relocated to the access to better suit the refuse truck and avoid a truck having to travel to the rear of site. Appeal states the Transport Department had no objection subject to conditions and considered the issue to be satisfactorily addressed. Planner Report opinion regarding location of deliveries is not considered relevant;

- Traffic: No concerns were raised by the Council Transportation Department. The Planner Report concern for a 'pinch-point' is not relevant;
- Streetscape: Proposal will provide an appropriate form of high-quality, contemporary development which is in-keeping with the residential development in the area. Proposed development has a lower ridge height than existing building, sited greater distance from north boundary than present single-storey buildings. Proposed ridge height is 74.843m, which is 0.313m higher than the neighbour to the south and 1.18m lower than the existing building. Planner's opinion that proposed design "does not integrate well with the existing pattern of development in the residential area" is as opinion only; it is submitted that development complies with all relevant planning policies and accords with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area;
- Sunlight/Daylight Assessment: Sunlight/Daylight Assessment Report prepared by 3D Design Bureau indicated that the development will have a minor adverse impact on 3 no. windows to the north (Brandon House). assessment notes some of these windows may serve non-habitable rooms. The APSH/WPSH: indicated one instance of 'minor adverse' impact for WPSH; APSH shows 'negligible' impact for all windows and rooms. All assessed private gardens experience 'negligible' levels of impact. The Planner's assessment was flawed: Planner relies on opinion that windows at Brandon House serve habitable rooms; 3D Design Bureau noted these may serve non-habitable rooms; even if it was assumed that all 3 no. windows were habitable rooms there would only be a minor adverse impact on these rooms. The impact is only to 3 windows of 1 property affected in a worst-case scenario and as such it should be considered to be a limited impact;
- Opening Hours: Appeal sets out proposed opening hours. These are: Monday to Friday 08:00–21:00; Saturday 09:00–13:00; Sundays and Public Holidays closed. The medical centre is to close at 17:00; only non-medical staff (e.g. administrative, ancillary) to remain on-site after 17:00, and no patients remaining on-site after medical centre closes. Planner report suggestion of overnight care or out-of-hours appointments submitted as not relevant;
- Surface Water: A detailed design proposal is submitted and is acceptable;

- Other matters: Appeal also sets out details for cycle parking; cycle shelter; shower facilities; staff/storage facilities; pedestrian / access routes; climate objectives; waste storage; opaque glazing; signage;
- Grounds of Appeal:
- Clinical need: Proposal amends existing premises to provide improved medical centre; enhanced patient & staff facilities; additional consultation rooms; increased number of patients; and provide much needed healthcare. Maple Clinic is contracted by HSE to provide care for over 4,000 medical card patients and also private patients. The amendments will aid the Clinic in meeting its contractual obligations to HSE and improve services to its 14,000 patients. Proposal would increase patient capacity to 30,000. At present the Clinic cannot accommodate new patients despite multiple queries each week. Clinic to increase to 23 staff (currently 20). Appeal sets out details of other benefits to the town and wider area;
- Scale & design: Proposal aims to reuse existing building and step back the proposed 2-storey extensions from neighbouring dwellings and mitigate impacts including on northerly neighbour. Regarding size, the existing building is 329sqm over 3 floors (upper 2 floors currently not used). Proposal is for 693sqm across 2 floors. Regarding separation distances, appeal states there would be a separation distance of 24m to southern neighbour, and 26.4m and 29.2m from opposing first-floor windows of houses to the east all which exceeds minimum requirement of 16m set out in Section 11.5.7 of Development Plan. Regarding height, the proposed building height would be 1.18m lower than existing ridge height and would sit comfortably within area of single-storey and 2-storey residential dwellings;
- Policy: County Development Plan states any proposals for expansion, improvement or alteration of such uses will be considered on their individual merits. Appeal sets out details of relevant policies and objectives;
- Land use: Medical centre is not a 'Permitted Use' or 'Open for Consideration' in A1 zoning, but has been approved previously; previous Planner report under Ref: 2360323 noted a 'Healthcare practitioner' would be a permissible use and

that a 'Health Centre' is 'open for consideration' on A2 New Residential lands and that any proposal for expansion would be considered on its merits;

- Sunlight/Daylight; The Daylight and Sunlight Assessment Report submitted as further information demonstrates proposal will not negatively impact adjoining properties in terms of daylight, sunlight, & overshadowing. Planner's assessment was flawed: worst-case scenario is only 'minor adverse' effect on 3 no. windows of 1 no. property (Brandon House). Proposal is high quality, respects surroundings, and will not negatively impact residential amenity or character;
- Support: Appeal refers to letters of support submitted from: Darren O'Rourke TD (Meath East), Ashbourne Chamber of Commerce, The Maple Clinic (Appendices 3, 4 and 5); and support expressed by Cllr. Nick Killian;
- Conclusion: Proposal fully complies with Development Plan and represents a sustainable expansion of The Maple Clinic.

7.1.2. The appeal includes letters of support from a local TD, Ashbourne Chamber of Commerce and The Maple Clinic which I have reviewed.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

7.2.1. The Planning Authority response notes the appeal contents and states that the proposal was appropriately considered as detailed in the Planner Reports, and requests the Commission uphold the decision to refuse.

7.3. Observations

7.3.1. Three Observations were received by the Commission, from William McGregor; Statia O'Byrne; and Lisa Doolan, summarised as follows:

7.3.2. William McGregor of the Wafre Lodge estate, made the following points:

- Summary: No objection to medical/healthcare on the site. Concerned with the scale, intensity and form of expansion and resulting impact on residential amenity and parking/traffic;

- Overdevelopment: Proposed scale and form is not appropriate on constrained A1 site. Bulk and height would increase sense of enclosure and visual dominance. The substantial intensification of form and activity in a backland position is not appropriate;
- Daylight, sunlight & overbearing impacts: Observer disagrees that impact would be 'negligible' or 'minor adverse'. No assessment was carried out for Nos. 3 and 4 Wafre Lodge which are the most affected. The assessment report makes assumptions about adjacent room uses and cannot be relied upon. Should the Board be minded to grant permission a revised independent survey is required;
- Parking, traffic & overspill into Wafre Lodge housing estate: The Council stated that up to 42 no. car parking spaces would be required, and the Transport Department raised concerns with parking, staff parking, and on-site circulation. This reinforces the view that the development represents overdevelopment. Development Plan compliance alone does not reflect likely real-world impacts on Wafre Lodge including overspill parking. Application understates staff parking demand, with no empirical survey or trip-generation assessment based on number of consulting rooms and appointment durations. There is no on-street parking. The Board should not accept 'table-based' compliance;
- Hours of operation: Appellant seeks operating hours of 08:00-21:00 Monday to Friday and 09:00-13:00 Saturday, with clinical activity purportedly ending at 17:00. Even if evenings were limited to admin and cleaning it would represent an inappropriate extension of activity in relation to parking, lighting, and noise;
- Construction impacts: There is no construction management plan. There is a risk workers will park in Wafre Lodge, and that noise, dust, and disturbance would seriously affect residents. This would be mitigated by conditions but highlights the sensitivity of the site;
- Conclusion: The appeal does not address fundamental concerns.

7.3.3. Statia O'Byrne, of 'The Lodge', Dublin Road, made the following points:

- Land use zoning & nature of use: Observer does not question the principle of medical use at the clinic, but questions the nature of the proposed use. Observer sets out details of Development Plan provisions in relation to 'healthcare

practitioner'. Current proposal runs contrary to previous Planner Report assessment. Proposal is for a 55% increase in floor area. There would be considerable intensification. Proposal would see an increase from 8 no. consulting rooms to 13 no., plus additional patient facilities. There would also be a two-fold increase in patients;

- Daylight & sunlight: The sunlight & daylight report stated there would be a 'minor adverse' effect in respect of vertical sky component on 3 no. windows in Brandon House. Observer states they have appended photographs from inside Brandon House which demonstrate that 2 no. of the referenced windows are to habitable rooms. Observer states that as such the appellant's statements are false, and that the development would cause adverse, albeit minor, affects on the 2 no. windows serving habitable rooms. The appellant has not demonstrated how the Council's assessment is flawed. Accordingly it is clear that the amenities of Brandon House will not be protected and the proposal would be contrary to the A1 zoning objective;
- Car parking: There are currently 29 no. car parking spaces and 26 no. are proposed. There is ambiguity on the proposed staff levels. Observer sets out details of what it considers are the current staffing levels which it states contradicts the application details. Observer reiterates points as to the intensification of development and inadequacy of proposed car parking as there would be additional staff. This will result in parking overspill which would have an adverse impact on residential amenity contrary to the A1 land use zoning objective;
- Road safety: Observer sets out details of observed traffic movements around the site, and states that two vehicles cannot access and enter the site simultaneously. It states the proposed widening makes no measureable difference. The proposed arrangement and increased traffic will create considerable traffic hazard for motorists & pedestrians. Whilst the required sightlines are achieved, due to the speed cars drive on the road they should be viewed with caution. These issues would have featured in an auditors assessment;

- Conclusion: Observer does not object to the permitted use, but instead to the proposed intensification for the reasons set out above.

7.3.4. The Observation includes photographs which the Observation states were taken from inside Brandon House, adjacent to the north of the site.

7.3.5. Lisa Doolan, made the following points:

- Traffic disorder / confusion: Entering the property is traffic chaos. Proposal only widens the gate by 1m. Observer believes a separate entrance and exit is needed. Proposal will not improve traffic disorder / confusion that it creates on the road. Observer sets out details of movements around the access;
- Pedestrian safety: Observer states existing wall restricts visibility and is a risk to pedestrians, and believes the wall should be set back.
- Parking, traffic & overspill into Wafre Lodge housing estate: There is no traffic management plan. The proposed 4 no. staff spaces significantly underestimates staff parking demand. Application includes no survey of existing staff & patient parking or analysis of impact on streets. The shortfall in parking will spill into nearby residential streets, in particular Wafre Lodge estate. Observer sets out estimates of traffic movements and states that no traffic assessment is provided. Observer sets out concerns regarding intensity of development and site capacity, and road safety concerns for residents / children.
- Visibility of patients & staff: Proposal shows disregard for privacy of adjoining dwellings as a result of visibility by patients and staff;
- Construction management: There is no construction plan for demolition or construction plan;
- Bins: Observer raises concern regarding odour, health, and pest infestations as result of proposed bin storage beside the adjacent property (The Lodge)

7.4. Further Responses

7.4.1. None.

8.0 Assessment

8.1.1. Having regard to the foregoing; having examined the application, appeal, Planning Authority reports, and all other documentation on file including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal; and having inspected the area within and around the site; and having regard to relevant local, regional and national policies, objectives and guidance, I consider the main issues in this appeal are as follows:

- Principle of development;
- Residential amenity;
- Access;
- Related matters raised in the course of the appeal.

8.2. Principle of Development

8.2.1. The proposed development is generally for alterations, demolitions, and additions to The Maple Clinic, and change of use of first-floor storage space to 'medical clinic'.

8.2.2. Retention permission for a medical clinic' was granted in 2023 (Ref. 2360323). The development included retention of change of use of a building from a dwelling to office use and the subsequent change of that building from office use to use as a medical clinic; change of use of an office building from office to medical use; retention of a temporary building for medical use; and retention of the change of use of domestic shed to office store and retention of the further change of use from office store to medical store.

8.2.3. The site is zoned 'A1 Existing Residential' in the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027. The A1 land use zoning objective is: "*To protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities*".

8.2.4. Within this zone 'Healthcare Practitioner' is included as 'Open for Consideration Uses'. Section 11.14.6 'Land Use Zoning Categories' states that: "*A Healthcare Practitioner is a practice operated by the owner/occupier of a dwelling and which is ancillary to the primary use of the dwelling as a normal place of residence*". Given the nature of the development proposed, I am satisfied the proposed development is not a 'Healthcare Practitioner' use as defined in the Development Plan.

8.2.5. 'Medical Clinic' is not referenced in the Development Plan. 'Medical & related uses' and 'Medical and Related Uses (includes hospital)' are uses which are permitted in other land use zones in the Development Plan (that is, land use zones D1 and E1 respectively). 'Health Centre' is also referenced in the Development Plan and is an 'Open for Consideration Use' in the A2 zone and a 'Permitted Use' in the B2, C1, and G1 zones. Accordingly I note that medical clinic and health centre are not permissible or open for consideration uses in the subject A1 zoning.

8.2.6. Development Plan Section 11.14.2 'Permissible and Non-Permissible Uses' states that "*Any use not listed in the permissible or open for consideration categories is deemed not to be acceptable in principle. Such uses will be considered on their individual merits and will only be permitted if they enhance, complement, are ancillary to, or neutral to the zoning objective*". It also states that: "*There are instances across the County of established uses that do not conform to the zoning objective for the particular location. Any proposals for the expansion, improvement, or alteration of such uses will be considered on their individual merits*".

8.2.7. Accordingly, I consider that the proposed use should be considered on its individual merits and will only be permitted if it enhances, complements, is ancillary to, or neutral to the zoning objective.

8.3. Residential amenity

8.3.1. Refusal reason 1 related to sunlight, daylight and overbearing impacts. I address these matters separately. I note the related points made by the appellant, and also the Observers regarding residential amenity, including in relation to size, scale, height, form, intensity of development, natural light, privacy, and overlooking.

Existing and proposed development

8.3.2. The existing 2-storey element is positioned to the north of the site. It is approx. 8.2m tall at maximum. The dormer element of the existing building is approx. 9m at closest to the single-storey dwelling to the north, Brandon House. I note the existing building is angled away from Brandon House and has a pitched / saltbox roof.

8.3.3. The proposed 2-storey element would be approx. 7.2m from Brandon House, that is, it would be approx. 1.8m closer than the existing dormer element. The proposed building would be approx. 7.0m tall; however, whilst the proposed building would be

approx. 1.2m lower, the flat-roof parapet would be approx. 2m above the eaves level of the existing building. Overall then I consider that whilst the proposed building would be lower in height, it would be closer to Brandon House; would be significantly wider; and would have a significantly greater scale and massing particularly as it relates to Brandon House.

- 8.3.4. I also note that Brandon House is orientated southward such that the majority of windows are located in the southern elevation facing toward the subject site at a relatively short distance from the shared boundary.
- 8.3.5. Regarding design, layout, and scale, the proposal would in general convert the existing 1- and 2-storey pitched/saltbox roofed building into a 2-storey flat-roofed building. Whilst the majority of buildings in the area are pitch-roofed, there are a number of flat-roofed structures on the subject site and neighbouring site. The parapet height would be approx. 1.3m higher than Brandon House and lower than the existing building on the site. The existing clinic measures 446sqm (of which 324sqm is used); has 8 no. medical care rooms; and 20 no. staff. The proposed clinic would measure 693sqm; would have 27 no. medical rooms; and 23 no. staff. As such there would be a significant intensification of development on the site. The proposed plot ratio and site coverage levels are within Development Plan thresholds.

Sunlight & daylight

- 8.3.6. I note the points made by the appellant, Observers, and Planner Reports in this regard. I have reviewed the submitted plans and particulars including the Daylight and Sunlight Assessment Report prepared by 3D Design Bureau.

Submitted Daylight & Sunlight report

- 8.3.7. The Assessment Report stated that the assessment was carried out in accordance with the BRE Guidelines (BR209 2022). The report covers Vertical Sky Component (VSC); Annual & Winter Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH & WPSH); and Sun On Ground (SOG) for the rear gardens of neighbouring dwellings. It states that all properties and amenity spaces that may potentially experience a level of effect were included in the study. The report also states that as the majority of surrounding properties are situated a considerable distance from the subject site, only the property to the north (Brandon House) was included in the daylight & sunlight

assessment, and that only Brandon House and 5 Wafre Lodge were assessed for sun on ground. The report states that only 'minor adverse' impacts were identified.

8.3.8. Within the report Section 1.2 and the Appendix set out results for the windows/rooms and areas impacted by the development. The report indicates that all of the windows/rooms and private amenity areas assessed would experience a negligible impact with the exception of 3 no. windows/rooms that would experience a 'minor adverse' impacts in terms of VSC, and 1 no. window/room that would experience a minor adverse effect in terms of WPSH. The report indicated that no windows/rooms would experience a minor adverse impact in terms of APSH, and no windows/rooms or external areas would experience moderate or major impacts in terms of VSC, WPSH/APSH or SOG.

8.3.9. All of the 3 no. windows/rooms showed to experience minor adverse impacts are in the southern elevation of Brandon House. A total of 8 no. windows in Brandon House were assessed, with the remaining 5 no. windows indicated as experiencing negligible impact. The existing VSC levels for the three windows are 28.81%, 30.15%, and 28.66%. These levels would decrease to 20.48%, 21.21%, and 21.22%. This would bring the VSC for each window below the 27% threshold, and below the 0.8 ratio (0.71, 0.70 and 0.74 respectively). The third of these windows would also see a reduction in WPSH from 12.74% to 4.35% (ratio of 0.34). The report characterises all of these impacts as 'minor adverse'. The report does not identify these impacts as BRE compliant.

Brandon House – internal layout

8.3.10. Regarding Brandon House, whilst the assessment report does not confirm the use of the rooms served by the 3 no. windows, one Observation provides photographs which indicate that two of these windows are to a habitable room (a kitchen-diner). The third window is shown to be a bathroom. The Planner Report also stated that some of the windows affected are to a kitchen/dining room, and that this was based on review of the planning history. It was not possible to confirm the use of these rooms during my site visit, however based on the information on file I am satisfied that 2 no. of the windows are to a habitable room.

Policy and guideline context

- 8.3.11. Development Plan Section 11.5.16 'Light and Overshadowing' states that: "*Daylight and sunlight levels should, generally, be in accordance with the recommendations of Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (B.R.209, 2011), A New European Standard for Daylighting in Buildings IS EN17037:2018, UK National Annex BS EN17037:2019 and the associated BRE Guide 209 2022 Edition (June 2022) and any updates thereof.*" I have had regard to the document "*Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight, A guide to good practice (BR 209 2022)*".
- 8.3.12. The Guide states (Section 2.2 'Existing Buildings') that if VSC is greater than 27% then enough skylight should still be reaching the window of the existing building, and that any reduction below this level should be kept to a minimum. It also states that if the VSC, with the new development in place, is both less than 27% and less than 0.80 times its former value, occupants of the existing building will notice the reduction in the amount of skylight. It states that the area lit by the window is likely to appear gloomier, and electric lighting will be needed more of the time. It also states that, as a general rule the aim should be to minimise the impact to the existing property, and that this is particularly important where successive extensions are planned to the same building.
- 8.3.13. The Guide further states that if any part of a new building or extension, measured in a vertical section perpendicular to a main window wall of an existing building, from the centre of the lowest window, subtends an angle of more than 25° to the horizontal, then the diffuse daylighting of the existing building may be adversely affected. It states that this will be the case if either the VSC measured at the centre of an existing main window is less than 27%, and less than 0.80 times its former value, or the area of the working plane in a room which can receive direct skylight is reduced to less than 0.80 times its former value. I have reviewed the information submitted which indicates that the proposed building would subtend the angle of 25° (Daylight and Sunlight Assessment Report, Figure 2.3).
- 8.3.14. I also note that whilst the Development Plan states that daylight and sunlight levels should, generally, be in accordance with the recommendations, there is flexibility within the Guide. In this regard, Section 1.6 of the Guide states that the advice given is not mandatory and the guide should not be seen as an instrument of planning policy, and that its aim is to help rather than constrain the designer. It further states

that although it gives numerical guidelines, these should be interpreted flexibly since natural lighting is only one of many factors in site layout design.

Assessment

8.3.15. I am broadly satisfied as to the neighbouring dwellings considered in the assessment. Those dwellings were assessed as the properties north of the site.

8.3.16. In relation to nature light, I consider the following:

- The scale, massing and proximity to Brandon House would increase significantly;
- The height would be reduced. The height of the building would be only 1.3m above Brandon House;
- The proposed building would be set back from the shared boundary;
- Brandon House is orientated toward the site, with the majority of windows facing the proposed development, which I consider increases the sensitivity of Brandon House;
- The only house impacted by the development beyond the 'negligible' level is Brandon House, with only 3 of the 8 no. windows assessed having more significant impacts. I am satisfied two of the windows serve a habitable room (kitchen-diner). The report considers the impacts to be 'minor adverse';
- Daylight levels on those 3 no. windows would decrease to 20.48%, 21.21%, and 21.22% VSC, which would bring the VSC for each window below the 27% threshold, and below the 0.8 ratio (0.71, 0.70 and 0.74 respectively). One of the windows would also see a minor adverse impact on sunlight in winter (reduction in WPSH from 12.74% to 4.35% (ratio of 0.34) but not over the annual period;

8.3.17. The report characterises the impact as 'minor adverse' rather than negligible. Based on the assessment report and BRE Guidelines I would characterise the impact on those rooms as noticeable. I consider that users within the kitchen-diner in Brandon House would notice a reduction in the amount of skylight, and that the room would be likely to appear gloomier, and electric lighting needed more of the time. I also consider that the building design has sought to minimise the impacts by setting the

building away from the boundary; stepping the building away from Brandon House; and utilising a flat roof.

- 8.3.18. The A1 land use zoning objective is: *“To protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities.* Whilst I note the impacts on sunlight and daylight as set out above, I consider that on balance the proposed development provides a reasonable degree of protection of existing natural light in the area.

Overbearance

- 8.3.19. I have had due regard to the submitted plans, and the points made by the appellant, Observers, and Planner Reports. I consider the proposed building would have a significantly greater scale and massing than the existing, and greater proximity to Brandon House which would significantly accentuate the sense of scale from that dwelling. I also note that Brandon House is in close proximity to the shared boundary and is predominantly orientated toward the proposed development. I note again that the existing building is positioned adjacent the northern site boundary, and that the proposed development extends northward closer to the boundary with Brandon House. The Development Plan makes no reference to overbearing impacts. I consider that the proposed building, whilst of greater scale, massing and proximity, would be set back a reasonable distance from the boundary with Brandon House, with the first-floor further stepped back, and would be only approx. 1.3m taller than Brandon House. On balance, I do not consider there would be undue impacts in terms of overbearance.

Overlooking & privacy

- 8.3.20. I note the points made by Observers in these regards and the points from the appellant. The existing building has 2-storey and dormer elements. The dwelling to the north is single storey; to the south is a dormer; and those to the east are 2-storey. The dwelling to the north would be approx. 7.2m away from the proposed 2-storey element. The dwellings to the east would be approx. 26m away at closest, and the dwelling to the south would be approx. 24m away. The applicant response to further information indicated that all of the proposed windows at first-floor would be opaque. Those rooms would be consulting; assessment; procedure/equipment; and nurse rooms. Noting the nature of the proposed rooms and the nature of the adjoining development, I consider that the proposed distances, the elevated position

of the proposed windows, and the opaque glazing proposed would provide for a reasonable degree of privacy and the protection of both users and neighbouring dwellings, including with regard to overlooking, subject to the attachment of a condition requiring opaque windows to be maintained.

Hours of operation

- 8.3.21. I note the points made by Observers and the Planner Report in relation to hours of operation. The appellant clarifies that the proposed opening hours would be Monday to Friday 08:00–21:00; Saturday 09:00–13:00; with Sundays & Public Holidays being closed. The medical centre is to close at 17:00, with only non-medical staff (e.g. administrative, ancillary) to remain on-site after 17:00, and no patients remaining on-site after medical centre closes.
- 8.3.22. I accept the point in the Planner Report that there is a lack of clarity as to the specific nature of operations after public opening hours. I also note the point made by one Observer that even if evenings were limited to administration and cleaning, this would represent an inappropriate extension of activity in relation to parking, lighting, and noise. I see no hours of operation stated or restricted for the existing clinic. I have had regard to the residential nature of the area and the land use zoning objective. The latest the proposed clinic would be open to the public is 17:00, and between 17:00 and 21:00 non-medical staff (e.g. administrative, ancillary) only would be on-site. Whilst minimal information as to the number of staff or nature of activities is set out, I consider that the proposed hours of operation are acceptable.

Residential Amenity - Conclusion

- 8.3.23. Based on the available information, on balance I am satisfied the proposed development provides a reasonable degree of protection for neighbouring residential amenity and enhancement of the character of the area, in line with the land use zoning objective. I am satisfied the proposal is acceptable in relation to natural lighting, overbearance, hours of operation, overlooking, and privacy, subject to conditions as set out above. I also consider that the proposed development would remove the haphazard development to the rear of the site and enhance the character of the area with a contemporary building layout. Development Plan Section 11.14.2 indicates that proposed development should be considered on its individual merits and will only be permitted if they enhance, complement, are ancillary to, or

neutral to the zoning objective. Based on the foregoing, in relation to residential amenity and the land use zone, I am satisfied that the proposed development complements the zoning objective, subject to conditions.

8.4. Access

Access

- 8.4.1. I note the concerns raised by Observers in relation to the proposed access, including traffic safety, the absence of surveys, and overspill parking. I consider however that much of the concern raised related to the existing access. Having visited the site, I note that the simultaneous access and egress of vehicles through the existing site is restricted due to the access width. However the proposed development includes for the upgrading and widening of the access. I note the vehicular access to 'The Lodge' adjacent to the south.
- 8.4.2. The existing access measure approx. 3.7m in width and is set back from the public footpath. The proposed access is brought forward toward the footpath and increases in width to approx. 6m. I am satisfied that two vehicles could pass simultaneously through the proposed access.
- 8.4.3. The road outside the site is a 50kmh zone. There is a solid white line outside the site. I am satisfied there is and would be sufficient space for vehicles egressing the site and adjacent dwelling to the south to idle outside their respective accesses prior to crossing the public footpath and cycle lane. Proposed road markings and a 'stop' line are indicated on the proposed layout; I am satisfied that a reasonable degree of driver visibility would be available for vehicles entering and exiting the site. I am also satisfied the proposed wider access would improve driver, pedestrian, and cyclist intervisibility. Whilst I acknowledge the increased development proposed, overall I am satisfied the proposed access arrangements are acceptable.
- 8.4.4. Regarding the site layout, the Planner Report refers to a pinch-point within the site layout. The Transportation Department report raised no objection in relation to access or traffic impact. I have reviewed the submitted swept path analysis and I have no significant concerns in this regard, including in relation to driver and pedestrian safety. I note that access to the rear of the site would be available for

large cars but not refuse vehicles or delivery trucks. I am generally satisfied in this regard.

- 8.4.5. Regarding detailed design of the proposed access arrangements, I have reviewed the submission from the HSE and I am satisfied the matters raised in the course of the application have been addressed, including cycle parking and staff facilities. I am satisfied that outstanding issues (specifically, the marking out of pedestrian access arrangements) can be addressed by conditions for final circulation layout details.

Parking

- 8.4.6. I note the points made by Observers, the appellant, and Planning Authority internal reports. Development Plan Table 11.2 'Car Parking' indicates a standard of 2 no. car parking spaces per consulting room. Development Plan Section 11.9.1 states that non-residential car parking standards are set down as "maxima" standards. The submitted layout includes 13 no. consulting rooms. This would indicate a maximum standard of 26 no. car parking spaces. A total of 26 no. spaces are proposed. I note other rooms in the proposed layout associated with medical services including: 4 no. procedure rooms; 4 no. nurse rooms; 3 no. assessment rooms; 2 no. equipment & procedure room; and a dispensary.
- 8.4.7. The Planning Authority Transportation Department report stated no objection subject to conditions. The Planner Report stated that there was partial compliance with parking provision, and that the nature of some of the rooms and whether there will be staff parking has not been clarified. The appeal states that 4 no. car parking spaces are to be allocated to staff, however it also states that this number will increase subject to grant of permission.
- 8.4.8. The site is accessed from Dublin Road. There are dedicated cycle lanes and footpaths on both sides of the road. A number of bus services operate along Dublin Road. I note in particular Observers' concerns regarding the potential for overspill parking within the adjacent Wafre Lodge housing estate, and potential impact on residential amenity. I see little evidence of same on the file or during my site visit, and given the distance to and layout of that estate, I consider the potential for such overspill parking is limited.
- 8.4.9. I consider that there is some merit in the Planner Report and Observer points as to the lack of clarity regarding staff parking; the extent and nature of supporting rooms;

and the scale and nature of proposed development, and that these factors have the potential to increase car parking demand at the site. In this regard I note the appellant points relating to the increase in staff parking numbers should permission be granted, and that nurse rooms would 'not necessarily' be used as consulting rooms. However, the Development Plan is clear as to the car parking standard, and does not specify requirements in relation to staff parking or supporting rooms. I acknowledge the reduction in car parking numbers on the site and the increased floorspace proposed, however I am satisfied the applicant appears to meet the stated parking requirements. Given the foregoing, I consider that a condition is required for the agreement of a car parking management plan and a mobility management plan for the premises should the Commission grant permission.

Service vehicles

8.4.10. I note the points made by Observers and the appellant in relation to deliveries. I also note the differences in commentary between the Transportation Section report and Planner report. I have reviewed the proposed circulation layout, including the swept path analyses. I note that the swept path drawings show both the existing and proposed accesses and indicate the potential conflict with the *existing* access width but not the proposed. I am satisfied the location of refuse collection toward the front of the site is reasonable, as is the routing of deliveries to the front of the site only. I am also satisfied there is space for delivery and service vehicles to enter the site, turn and exit in a forward motion (Drw. No. 252176-PUNCH-XX-XX-DR-C-0600, Plans 3 & 4).

8.5. Related matters raised in the course of the appeal

Waste

8.5.1. I note the proposed bin store, and revised details submitted to the Planning Authority at further information. I also note concerns raised by Observers in relation to potential impacts on residential amenity in terms of odour, health, and vermin. The bin store and bin collection areas would be adjacent the gate and located generally away from dwellings. The bin store layout was submitted at application stage, but was not updated as part of the further information response. Minimal details of finishes were provide. I am generally satisfied the proposed bin store and collection

layout is acceptable, subject to conditions for the agreement of design details. I have addressed related matters of access above.

Water & drainage

- 8.5.2. I note the proposed mains water and foul water connections, as well as surface water drainage arrangements. These include SUDS features comprising permeable paving, porous asphalt, flow control, and rainwater harvesters. I have reviewed the submitted Engineering Planning Report. No report from the Planning Authority Environmental Department is on the file. I note related points made in the Planner Report. The Planning Authority and Observers raised no concerns in this regard. The proposal incorporates SuDS features comprising discharge to ground which are reasonable for a brownfield site in an urban area. Overall I am satisfied the proposal is acceptable in this regard subject to standard conditions relating to agreement of details with the Planning Authority and in relation to Uisce Eireann.

Construction

- 8.5.3. No construction management plan or construction traffic management plan were submitted, nor was a construction & demolition waste management plan. There are residential dwellings to the north, east, and south. Dublin Road is to the west. I note the concerns raised by Observers in this regard, including in terms of traffic, noise, dust, and uncontrolled parking. I acknowledge the extent of works proposed and the proximity of neighbouring dwellings, however I am satisfied that the likely construction phase impacts arising including in terms of noise, dust suppression, construction traffic management, and parking can be satisfactorily controlled by a comprehensive construction management plan and a construction & demolition waste management plan to be agreed with the Planning Authority.

Condition 3

- 8.5.4. The application refers to Condition 3 of permission Ref: 23/60323 and states that demolition of the existing single storey structures is in accordance with that condition. Condition 3 relates to a restriction of the use of the buildings, as does Condition 4 of that permission. However Condition 5 of that permission states generally that the temporary building for medical use permitted shall be retained in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the Planning Authority and

shall be removed from the site no later than 3 years from the final grant of permission. I consider that Condition 5 is the relevant condition in this regard.

Property values

- 8.5.5. I note the Planner Report and Planning Authority decision in relation to property values. Having regard to the assessment and conclusion above, I am satisfied the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area to such an extent that would adversely affect the value of property in the vicinity.

Previous reasons for refusal

- 8.5.6. I note some Observer's made the point that the application did not resolve previous reasons for refusal, however the specific application was not referenced. I consider that application Reg. Ref. 211170 is relevant in this regard. It was refused on grounds that the development proposed in that case was a non-conforming use in the A1 zone and that the development would materially contravene the Ashbourne Local Area Plan 2009-2015 which forms part of the Meath County Development Plan 2013-2019. I have addressed land use above and I am satisfied that this matter has been satisfactorily addressed in the subject application.

Conditions

- 8.5.7. In addition to the foregoing, should the Commission be minded to grant permission, I also consider the following:
- Signage: That a condition relating to the management of signage is warranted on account of a lack of detail in the application;
 - Transportation: That the conditions recommended by the Transportation Department can be replaced by a single condition for a final parking layout;
 - Contributions: Standard Section 48.

9.0 Appropriate Assessment screening

- 9.1.1. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on any

European Sites including the Malahide Estuary SAC and Malahide Estuary SPA in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required. This determination is based on the nature of the proposed works and the location and distance from nearest European site and lack of connections

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1.1. The subject site is located approx. 143m south-west of the Broad Meadow River. The proposed development comprises alterations, demolitions and additions to a clinic. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal. I have assessed the project and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively, or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives. The reason for this conclusion is as follows: the nature of works e.g. small scale and nature of the development, and the location-distance from nearest Water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1.1. I recommend permission be **Granted**, for the reasons and consideration below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature, scale, and extent of the proposed development comprised of alterations, demolitions, and additions to The Maple Clinic; to the nature of the site and surrounding area; and to the existing pattern of development in the area; it is considered the proposed development generally accords with the Policies and Objectives of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027, including the 'A1 – Existing Residential' land use zoning objective for the area, and would not impact unduly on the amenities of the area, or road safety. It is considered therefore that the proposed development generally accords the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, subject to the conditions below.

13.0 Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the Planning Authority on the 26 th day of November 2025, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the Planning Authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars. Reason: In the interest of clarity.
2	The glazing to all first-floor windows shall be manufactured opaque or frosted glass and shall be permanently maintained. The application of film to the surface of clear glass is not acceptable. Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.
3	All external signage shall be in accordance with details which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to the provision of such signage. Where agreement cannot be reached between the applicant/developer and the local authority the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiun Pleanála for determination. The signage shall be lit by external illumination only. Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

4	<p>The applicant shall submit a Car Park Management Plan and details of car parking design, layout and management to the planning authority for agreement in writing prior to the commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of sustainable transport and safety.</p>
5	<p>Prior to the opening/occupation of the development, a Mobility Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority. This shall provide for incentives to encourage the use of public transport, cycling and walking by occupants/staff employed in the development. The mobility strategy shall be prepared and implemented by the management company for all units within the development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport.</p>
6	<p>A plan containing details for the management of waste (and, in particular, recyclable materials) within the development, including the provision of facilities for the storage, separation and collection of the waste and, in particular, recyclable materials shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, the agreed waste facilities shall be maintained and waste shall be managed in accordance with the agreed plan.</p> <p>Reason: To provide for the appropriate management of waste and, in particular recyclable materials, in the interest of protecting the environment and the amenities of properties in the vicinity.</p>
7	<p>Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management.</p>
8	<p>Prior to the commencement of development the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreement(s) with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.</p>
9	<p>Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with the planning authority, a Construction Management Plan, which shall</p>

	<p>be adhered to during construction. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust management measures, construction traffic management, parking, and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity.</p>
10	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.</p>

-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.-

Dan Aspell
 Planning Inspector
 8th June 2026

APPENDIX 1

Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500688-MH-26
Proposed Development Summary	The development will consist of alterations, demolitions and additions to The Maple Clinic
Development Address	The Maple Clinic, Dublin Road, Ashbourne Co Meath
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	Class 10(b)(iv) Urban development.
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:** __ 29th May 2026 __

Form 2: EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-500688-MH-26
Proposed Development Summary	The development will consist of alterations, demolitions and additions to The Maple Clinic
Development Address	The Maple Clinic, Dublin Road, Ashbourne 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	Proposed development comprises alterations to a clinic building in a town. The proposed development has a modest footprint, comes forward as a standalone project, requires modest demolition works, does not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to production of significant waste, significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, human health or is vulnerable to climate change.
Location of development	The development is located in a town on urban land. The receiving location is not particularly environmentally sensitive and is removed from sensitive natural habitats, designated sites and identified landscapes of significance in the County Development Plan. The site is not of historic or cultural significance, and is not near Protected Structures, Sites of archaeological interest, or in an Architectural Conservation Area. Given the scale and nature of development and mitigation proposed there will be no significant environmental effects arising.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts	Having regard to the characteristics and modest nature of the proposed development, the sensitivity of its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.

Inspector: _____ Date: 29th May 2026
 DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____