



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501026-MH-26

Development

Demolition of the existing cottage & outbuildings and the construction of a new two-storey detached replacement dwelling.

Location

Cannistown, Navan, Co. Meath

Planning Authority

Meath County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2561128

Applicant(s)

Sylvester O'Byrne and Mary English

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse Permission

Type of Appeal

First Party Normal Planning Appeal

Appellant(s)

Sylvester O'Byrne and Mary English

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

26th June 2026

Inspector

Aisling MacNamara

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located in the rural area of Cannistown, Navan in County Meath and is located c 2km south of Navan on the L8034 local secondary road. The site contains an existing cottage and outbuilding with vehicular entrance and garden located near the road and also contains part of the agricultural field located behind the cottage curtilage. The eastern roadside boundary is treated with existing low boundary wall and natural hedgerow. There is a row of existing single dwellings located along the eastern side of the public road. The adjoining land to the north is in use for agricultural buildings and farmland. The Mullaghmore / Allerstown River is located c 50m to the south of the site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the following;

- the demolition of the existing cottage and outbuildings
- construction of a new two storey detached replacement dwelling and a detached garage
- associated landscaping and site works including a new wastewater treatment system and new site entrance to the public road.

The area of the site is 0.935ha. The existing buildings to be demolished are 204sqm. The proposed works are 221sqm.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By order dated 25th February 2026, the planning authority decided to refuse permission for the following two reasons:

1. *It is the policy RD POL 9 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027, “To require all applications for rural houses to comply with the ‘Meath Rural House Design Guide’”. Having regard to the layout of the proposed dwelling showing an excessive distance of 75 metres from the public road and the buildings to be replaced, it is considered that the proposed development would be unduly prominent and obtrusive in*

this rural area and if permitted would constitute the unacceptable and haphazard backland development which breaks the established building line. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the provisions set out in the Meath Rural House Design Guide and policy RD POL 9 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021 2027.

2. *It is the policy RD POL 30 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027, “To promote the viable re-use of vernacular dwellings without losing their character and to support applications for the sensitive restoration of disused vernacular or traditional dwellings” and RD POL 32, “To oppose the demolition and replacement of traditional or vernacular rural houses in order to protect the varied types of housing stock in rural areas of the County and to preserve the rural built heritage”.*

Having regard to the decision of An Coimisiún Pleanála under reference ABP-321846-25, wherein the existing dwelling on site was identified as a vernacular structure, the Planning Authority considers that the proposed demolition of the existing dwelling would result in the loss of a traditional vernacular building. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to RD POL 30 and RD POL 32 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021–2027, which seek to safeguard and promote the retention and sensitive restoration of vernacular dwellings. Accordingly, the proposed demolition would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The report of the Case Planner dated 10th December 2025 sets out a recommendation to request Further Information.
- Further Information was requested on 12th December 2025 in relation to two items:
(1) Policy RDPOL9 of the CDP requires rural houses to comply with Rural House Design Guide (a) the new dwelling is located 75m from existing dwelling and does not respect building line – this is backland rural development and is a repeat of PL2460069 with absence of satisfactory justification, submit revisions with relocated dwelling or justification, (b) design guide recommends two storey house ridge height should be 8.2m or lower – requested to lower ridge height to maximum 8.2m.

(2) If response is significant, will require new public notices.

- Response to Further Information request received 30th January 2026. No revised drawings are submitted. The applicant argues that the layout and design is acceptable, in accordance with the Meath Rural Design Guide and that ACP decision indicates that layout and design is acceptable.
- The report of the Case Planner dated 24th February 2026 recommends refusal of permission as per the decision.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Environment Flooding – Surface Water Section (09/12/2025):

Flooding – no objection from flood risk perspective.

Surface Water Treatment and disposal – recommended conditions for the disposal of surface water.

3.2.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

3.2.4. Third Party Observations

None

4.0 Planning History

PA 24/60965, ABP321846 – Sylvester O’Byrne & Mary English – Refused June 2025 – permission for development of a change of house type and revised site layout from that previously granted under reference number 24/60069 and the re-use of the existing dwelling as a farm outbuilding.

Refusal reason:

1. *Having regard to the Rural Area (strong urban influence) zoning for the site, the planning history of the site with an extant permission for a two-storey replacement dwelling under Planning Register Reference Number 2460069, and policy RD POL 31, which seeks to encourage and facilitate the appropriate refurbishment of existing housing stock in rural areas and in certain limited cases the replacement of existing dwellings of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027/ it is considered that, the*

proposed change of house type and revised layout which includes the retention of the existing dwelling for agricultural use undermines the replacement nature of the proposed new dwelling, to the extent that it could no longer be deemed to qualify as a replacement dwelling under policy RD POL 31. The Board is not satisfied, on the basis of the documentation provided, that a rural housing need has been demonstrated by the applicants in accordance with policy RD POL 1, which seeks to ensure that individual house developments in rural areas satisfy the housing requirements of persons who are an intrinsic part of the rural community in which they are proposed.

The following is attached to the Board order:

The Board did not concur with the Inspector's or the planning authorities' reason for refusal that the proposed dwelling is contrary to the provisions set out in the Meath Rural House Design Guide as required by RD POL 9 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021 to 2027. The Board considered that the proposed dwelling design and siting accords with the provisions of inter alia Section 3.1 (site layout) 3.3 (entrances and driveways) 4.1 (building form) 4.2 (height) and 6.4 (2 storey houses) of the Meath Rural House Design Guide. The Board also considers RD POL 30 which promotes the viable re-use of vernacular dwellings without losing their character and to support applications for the sensitive restoration of disused vernacular or traditional dwellings to be reasonable.

PA24/60069 - Sylvester O'Byrne & Mary English – Grant July 2024 – permission for the construction of a new two-storey detached replacement dwelling and detached garage including the demolition of the existing cottage and outbuildings, proposed new entrance, associated landscaping and site works including a new waste water treatment system. Significant further information/revised plans submitted on this application

PA22/1018 - Sylvester O'Byrne & Mary English – Refused – permission for the construction of a new two storey detached replacement dwelling, the re-use of the existing dwelling as a farm outbuilding, a new garage, new waste water treatment unit and percolation area, a replacement vehicular entrance area from the road, new driveway and all associated landscaping and site works. Three refusal reasons relating to (i) visual impact and design (sweeping driveway, set back, scale / design), (ii) flooding – lack of

information submitted to show not at flood risk, (iii) proximity of development to tributary of River Boyen / Blackwater SAC/SPA - fails to consider appropriate assessment.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (including variations 1,2, 3, 4 and 5)

Note:

Variation no .4 (adopted Maynooth joint LAP 2025-2031) was adopted 7th July 2025.

Variation no.5 was adopted 8th June 2026 (NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirement Guidelines for planning authorities – revised housing growth targets and settlement plan boundaries / zonings)

- Rural types are identified on Map 9.1. The site is located within ‘Area 1 Rural Areas under Strong Urban Influence’.
- Map 8.6 identifies Views & Prospects. View no. 40 is from ‘on road to south of Cannistown Church and M3’ in the direction of ‘south east and south’.
- Site is in West Navan Lowlands landscape character area which is of ‘moderate sensitivity’ (Appendix 5 Landscape Character Assessment)

Volume 1 Written Statement

Chapter 8 Cultural and Natural Heritage Strategy

8.17 Landscape

HER POL 52 To protect and enhance the quality, character, and distinctiveness of the landscapes of the County in accordance with national policy and guidelines and the recommendations of the Meath Landscape Character Assessment (2007) in Appendix 5, to ensure that new development meets high standards of siting and design.

HER POL 53 To discourage proposals necessitating the removal of extensive amount of trees, hedgerows and historic walls or other distinctive boundary treatments.

8.18 Views and Prospects

HER OBJ 56 To preserve the views and prospects listed in Appendix 10, in Volume 2 and on Map 8.6 and to protect these views from inappropriate development which would interfere unduly with the character and visual amenity of the landscape.

Chapter 9 Rural Development Strategy

9.2 Rural Area Types

RD POL 1 To ensure that individual house developments in rural areas satisfy the housing requirements of persons who are an intrinsic part of the rural community in which they are proposed, subject to compliance with normal planning criteria.

RD POL 2 To facilitate the housing requirements of the rural community as identified while directing urban generated housing to areas zoned for new housing development in towns and villages in the area of the development plan.

RD POL 3 To protect areas falling within the environs of urban centres in this Area Type from urban generated and unsightly ribbon development and to maintain the identity of these urban centres.

9.5 All Areas

9.5.1 Development Assessment Criteria

9.5.2 Ribbon Development

9.5.3 Occupancy Conditions

9.6 Rural Residential Development: Design and Siting Considerations

RD POL 9 To require all applications for rural houses to comply with the 'Meath Rural House Design Guide'.

9.14 Vernacular Rural Buildings and Replacement Dwellings

RD POL 30 To promote the viable re-use of vernacular dwellings without losing their character and to support applications for the sensitive restoration of disused vernacular or traditional dwellings.

RD POL 31 To encourage and facilitate the appropriate refurbishment of existing housing stock in rural areas and in certain limited cases the replacement of existing dwellings subject to development assessment criteria outlined below.

RD POL 32 To oppose the demolition and replacement of traditional or vernacular rural houses in order to protect the varied types of housing stock in rural areas of the County and to preserve the rural built heritage.

RD POL 34 To respect the sensitive restoration and conversion to residential use of disused vernacular or traditional dwellings or traditional farm buildings, including those which are Protected Structures, such proposals shall not be subject to the Rural Housing Policy (i.e. local need) that applies to new dwellings.

RD POL 35 To actively promote the retention and restoration of thatched dwellings as a key component of the built heritage of Co. Meath.

9.14.1 Development Assessment Criteria

The Planning Authority shall assess applications for refurbishment and/or replacement of existing housing stock in rural areas, having regard to the criteria outlined hereunder:

- That in the case of refurbishment and extension proposals, that the scale and architectural treatment of proposed works are sympathetic to the character of the original structure and the surrounding area including adjoining or nearby development;
- That in the case of replacement dwellings, to require that the original structure was last used as a dwelling and that its roof, internal and external walls are generally intact;
- That replacement dwellings are provided at locations where safe access and acceptable wastewater disposal arrangements can be put in place and where specific development objectives or other policies of the Planning Authority are not compromised, and;
- That the replacement dwelling shall be designed to be of a size and scale appropriate to the site, and;
- The design of replacement dwellings in rural areas shall comply with the 'Meath Rural Design Guide'.
- In the assessment of whether a house which it is proposed to replaced is habitable or not, the Planning Authority will rely on the definition contained in Section 2 (Interpretation) of the Planning & Development Act 2000 as amended.

A "Habitable House" means a house which:

- a. is used as a dwelling;
- b. is not in use but when last used was used, disregarding any unauthorised use, as a dwelling and is not derelict, or;
- c. was provided for use as a dwelling but has not been occupied.

9.18 Technical Requirements

9.18.1 One-Off Houses: Sight Distances and Stopping Sight Distances Policy

RD POL 43 To ensure that the required standards for sight distances and stopping sight distances are in compliance with current road geometry standards as outlined in the NRA document Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) specifically Section TD 41-42/09 when assessing individual planning applications for individual houses in the countryside.

Appendix 13 Rural Design Guide

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC - 1.2km to the northwest.

River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA - 1.2km to the northwest.

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. 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.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

This is a first party appeal against the decision of Meath County Council to refuse permission for the proposed development. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- Every effort has been made between the applicant, architect and planner involved in the design and layout of the proposed dwelling to ensure full compliance with the Meath Rural House Design Guide and to minimise any negative visual impact. The Board concurred with this in their Direction on previous application 2460069 (ABP321846). We respectfully ask that this previous recommendation be upheld and permission granted for the proposed development as it is in accordance with the Council's design guide.
- A precedent is already set for similar type development (2 storey dwellings set back off the road). Development designed to minimize visual impacts – is substantial landholding, plenty of space, does not contribute to more ribbon development in the area, makes use of existing hedges, set back from road to minimise impact, 8.8m height not excessive (there is no maximum height restriction, does not dominate the landscape). The proposed house is acceptable at this location in terms of design, setting, context, proportion, massing and composition of building form as set out in the guidelines. Proposal is in accordance with various provisions of the Design Guide.
- The refurbishment of the existing cottage is not a viable option. The architect raises the following: The cottage was altered and this diminishes its vernacular character. Extensive costly repairs would be required. Substantial alterations and works would be required to upgrade to modern living standards and building regulations and necessary alterations would erode much of remaining vernacular character. The cottage is very close to the road which impacts negatively on amenity, privacy and safety and this would be exacerbated by alterations required to the front boundary necessary to improve sightlines.
- The Council have been inconsistent in their decisions. Under 2460069 the Council requested demolition of the existing cottage. In contrast, permission now being refused for demolition. The previous appeal direction and decision was carefully considered and we put forward a solution which would be acceptable and in accordance with the Design Guide and the replacement dwelling policies.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority has responded to the grounds of appeal. The planning authority notes the contents of the first party appeal and is satisfied that the subject proposal was appropriately considered throughout the course of the assessment of the planning

application, as detailed in the planning officer's reports. The planning authority request ACP uphold the decision to refuse permission.

7.3. **Observations**

None

8.0 **Assessment**

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

- principle of development
- design and visual amenity

8.2. **Principle of development**

- 8.2.1. The proposed development is for the demolition of an existing cottage and outbuilding and the construction of a new house on a rural site. The cottage is a traditional vernacular dwelling. The stone outbuilding to the rear of the cottage is also of traditional vernacular form and materials. Under recent decision ABP321846, the vernacular nature of the buildings was noted by the Board.
- 8.2.2. The planning authority have refused permission for reason no. 2 which states that the loss of the traditional vernacular building would be contrary to RDPOL30 and RDPOL32 of the Meath County Development Plan (CDP).
- 8.2.3. Section 9.14 sets out objectives in relation to replacement dwellings and vernacular rural buildings. Policy RD POL30 is to promote the re use of vernacular dwellings without losing their character and for the restoration of disused vernacular dwellings. Policy RDPOL31 allows for the replacement of existing dwellings in certain limited cases. Policy RDPOL32 is to oppose the demolition and replacement of traditional or vernacular rural houses in order to protect the varied types of housing stock in rural areas of the county and to preserve rural built heritage.
- 8.2.4. The planning authority under 24/60069 granted permission in July 2024 for the demolition of the cottage and outbuildings and the replacement of these with a new house. Under

24/60965 (ABP321846), the Board refused permission for a proposal to retain the cottage and outbuilding structures for agricultural use and to construct a new house on the basis that the proposal would lose its 'status' as a 'replacement dwelling' under RDPOL31 and would instead constitute a proposal for a new house requiring compliance with the rural housing requirements under RDPOL1. This subject application aims to address the issue raised in the ABP321846 refusal by now proposing the demolition of the existing dwelling and thereby the proposal constitutes a 'replacement' dwelling which can be considered under RDPOL31.

- 8.2.5. I am mindful that there is an extant permission under 2460069 which the applicant can execute, for the demolition of the existing cottage and its replacement with a new house on the site. Notwithstanding, the applicant has now submitted a new application for demolition of the cottage and replacement with a new house, which is now for the consideration of the Commission. Policy RDPOL32 opposes the demolition and replacement of vernacular rural houses and policy RDPOL31 encourages the restoration of vernacular houses. Whilst the buildings are in a state of disrepair, they are substantially in tact and contribute positively to the rural character and amenity of the area. Notwithstanding the 2460069 permission, I consider that the proposal to demolish the vernacular house and to replace it with a contemporary new dwelling is contrary to policy RD POL32 of the CDP. The proposal would be injurious to the visual amenity and character of the area. Refusal recommended.

8.3. Design and visual impact

- 8.3.1. In principle, and as per the above assessment, I consider that the proposal to demolish and replace the vernacular cottage is not acceptable. However, should the Commission consider that the proposal for the replacement dwelling is acceptable in principle, regard is to be paid to RD POL31 which allows for replacement of dwellings in limited cases and subject to the development assessment criteria outlined in Section 9.14.1 of the CDP. Section 9.14.1 states that the design of replacement dwellings in rural areas shall comply with the Meath Rural Design Guide. In addition, policy RD POL9 of the CDP requires applications for rural houses to comply with the Meath Rural House Design Guide.
- 8.3.2. The planning authority refused permission for reason no. 1 which states that the proposal is contrary to RD POL9 and the provisions of the Meath Rural House Design Guide having

regard to the siting of the house (excessive 75m from public road and buildings to be replaced) which would be prominent and obtrusive and constitute haphazard backland development breaking the building line.

- 8.3.3. Under 24/60965 (ABP321846), the Board's decision order indicates that the design and siting of the proposed new dwelling accords with the provisions of Section 3.1 (site layout), 3.3 (entrances and driveways), 4.1 (building form), 4.2 (height) and 6.4 (2 storey houses) of the Design Guide.
- 8.3.4. In the current subject application, the design and layout for the proposed new house is as per that proposed under 2460965. As the Board indicated that the design and layout is in accordance with the Design Guide, the applicant contends that the current proposal is acceptable on design grounds.
- 8.3.5. Section 3.1 and 3.3 of the Design Guide address site layout and entrances and driveways. I have had regard to the site layout of 2460965 and that of the subject proposal. I agree with the applicant that the current proposed site layout is substantially similar to that considered acceptable by the Board. Having regard to the demolition of the existing buildings, I do not consider that the siting is 'backland'. The house is setback from the roadside boundary, however this can be accommodated having regard to the overall size of the site. The house and driveway is sited closer to the northern boundary taking advantage of the existing natural screening along the northern side and along the eastern part of the site. The existing vehicular entrance serving the cottage is to be closed off and a new vehicular entrance to serve the new house is to be constructed near the northern boundary of the site. The existing hedge and boundary wall along the roadside boundary is to be removed and replaced with a newly planted hedge set back 3m from the road edge behind the sightline. The new entrance is to be marked with 2m simple traditional block piers with capping and lime render and traditional gate. The proposed siting and entrance and driveway is in accordance with the provisions of section 3.1 and 3.3 of the Design Guide.
- 8.3.6. Section 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 of the Design Guide addresses building form, height, scale and proportion. It is proposed to construct a part single storey part two storey house with 8.8m max ground to ridge height and finished in natural slate and render including single storey garage store. The total floor area of works is 221sqm. The design of the proposed house and garage is the same as that proposed under 2460965. Under 2460965, the

Commission indicated that proposed building form and two storey height accords with the Design Guide.

- 8.3.7. Having regard to the size of the site and setbacks to the boundaries and natural screening including the location of the site within a moderately sensitive landscape area, it is considered that the two storey height and scale of development proposed can be integrated into the surrounding area without adversely impacting visual amenity. There is a protected view south of Cannistown Church and M3 in a south east and southerly direction. On site visit, I considered the potential impact of the development on this view. Considering the intervening topography and structures I do not consider that the development would adversely impact on the view.
- 8.3.8. In summary, having regard to the planning history of the site in particular the recent ABP decision under 24/60965 (ABP321846), it is considered that the design and layout of the proposed development is in accordance with the Meath Rural Design Guide and is in accordance with RD POL9 and would not seriously adversely impact on the visual amenities of the area.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.1.2. The subject site is c 1.2km from River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC and SPA.
- 9.1.3. It is proposed to demolish an existing house and replace it with a new house. There will be minimal impact on existing trees or hedgerows other than that required for sightlines. Foul effluent disposal is to ground via on site wastewater and disposal system designed to EPA standards. Surface water is to be disposed on site to ground via soak pits. There are no ecological or hydrological pathways between the development and the Natura 2000 site network.
- 9.1.4. I conclude that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect on any European site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
- 9.1.5. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive, together with relevant guidance published by the Environmental Protection Agency (Ireland), including applicable codes of practice for the protection of water quality.
- 10.2. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, it is concluded that the proposal will not result in any risk of deterioration in the status of any water body, including surface waters (rivers and lakes), groundwater, transitional waters, or coastal waters. This applies to both qualitative and quantitative status, and in respect of temporary and permanent effects.
- 10.3. The proposed development has been designed in accordance with EPA codes of practice and best practice guidance, ensuring that appropriate measures are incorporated to prevent pollution, control runoff, and protect both surface water and groundwater receptors.
- 10.4. Furthermore, the development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the maintenance or attainment of Good Ecological Status/Potential and Good Chemical Status, as required under the Directive.
- 10.5. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend permission be refused.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The proposed development to demolish a vernacular rural house and replace it with a new house is contrary to policy RD POL32 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 which is *“To oppose the demolition and replacement of traditional or vernacular rural houses in order to protect the varied types of housing stock in rural areas of the County and to preserve the rural built heritage.”*. The proposed development would adversely impact on

the built heritage of the area and would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area. 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

29th June 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	501026
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of the existing cottage & outbuildings and the construction of a new two-storey detached replacement dwelling.
Development Address	Cannistown, Navan, Co. Meath
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☐ No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
☒ 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?	
☐ 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.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
☒ 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 Schedule 5, Part 2, 14 works of demolition
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 ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	501026
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of the existing cottage & outbuildings and the construction of a new two-storey detached replacement dwelling.
Development Address	Cannistown, 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).	- Proposed residential use is compatible with other uses in area - Modest size and intensity of development - Localised impact on natural resources - 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).	- Rural area – agricultural land - Local ecology only on site - Local vernacular building (not protected structure) - No designated natural heritage sites at the site - Localised impacts on landscape (moderate sensitivity landscape)

Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	Having regard to the following: - nature and scale of the development, - lack of significant environmental sensitivities on the site, - absence of significant 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.

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)