



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501137-MH-26

Development

Permission to complete amendments to office structure in rear garden previously approved by P.A. Ref. 2460762/ABP-321402-24, comprising enlarged footprint, additional window on front and side elevations, revised fenestration on front elevation, revised positioning off rear and side boundaries, and ancillary site works.

Location

39 Clonkeen, Ratoath, Co. Meath, A85
T927

Planning Authority

Meath County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2660114

Applicant(s)

Mary Comerford

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant subject to conditions

Type of Appeal

Third Party v Grant

Appellant(s)

Loretta Fox
Rafal Stachura

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

19 May 2026

Inspector

Cáit Ryan

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The subject site is a detached dwelling house within Clonkeen, a mature residential estate in Ratoath, Co. Meath. The site is approx. 16km north of the M50. Existing surrounding dwellings comprise two-storey and dormer bungalow style dwellings.

1.2. The 0.0641ha site is rectangular in shape. The dwelling house faces east. It is bounded by detached two-storey houses -

- To north by No. 40 Clonkeen, which also faces east
- To west by No. 38 Clonkeen, which faces south towards a cul-de-sac

The rear garden boundaries of No.s 39 and 40 back onto the eastern (side) boundary of No. 38.

1.3. The dwelling at No. 39 has been previously extended, to include a large single-storey extension to the side (south) containing a family flat.

1.4. On site visit I noted that there was a partially constructed single-storey detached structure in the north western corner of the site. Other demolition and site clearance works had been carried out in the rear garden, and initial construction works had commenced on a new rear extension. A breach in the southern roadside boundary wall had been boarded up.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Permission is sought to complete amendments to previously approved permission P.A. Ref. 2460762 and ABP-321402-24, comprising the following amendments to the detached single storey flat roof office structure in the rear garden:

- Enlarged footprint (approx. 6.0sqm)
- An additional window on the front (southern) and side (eastern) elevations,
- Revised fenestration on the front (southern) elevation
- Revised positioning off the rear (western) and side (northern) boundaries
- All ancillary site works, landscaping and drainage.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority made a decision to grant subject to 8no. conditions.

3.1.1. Conditions of note are –

Condition 1: Development shall be completed in accordance with plans and particulars lodged on 30 January 2026 except where conditions specify otherwise

Condition 3: Save for amendments permitted on foot of this permission, the development shall be carried out in accordance with ABP-321402-24 except where conditions specify otherwise.

Condition 4: This permission shall expire as per date in ABP-321402-24

Condition 5: There shall not be separate entrance to proposed structure from roadway. Structure shall be accessed from existing dwelling and side access

Condition 6: Structure shall not be used for human habitation or industrial use and shall be used solely for the enjoyment of the residential dwelling

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

Basis for planning authority's decision:

Assistant Planner's report (26 March 2026) considers

- the application form and drawings have confusing information
- proposal to increase office floor area and additional windows are acceptable, with office element to be conditioned not to be for habitable use
- hole made in boundary wall shall be conditioned to be removed
- proposed development by itself or in combination with other plans and developments in the vicinity would not be likely to have significant effects on European sites, and Stage 2 AA is not required
- Mandatory EIA or sub-threshold EIS are not required

Recommends grant of permission subject to 8 no. conditions.

Report endorsed by Acting Senior Executive Planner.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

3.4. Observations to the Planning Authority

6no. observations were received by the planning authority, two of which are from an individual public representative. The issues raised are similar to those raised in the grounds of appeal.

Concerns relate to inaccurate statutory notices and drawings, site notice not visible as per Regulations, house is multi-unit structure, future residential use, adverse impact on residential amenities, overbearing and overlooking impacts, cramped and visually intrusive development out of character with estate, inconsistent with zoning, property devaluation, increased parking, surface water runoff, security and new entrance.

4.0 Planning History

P.A. Ref. 2460762 and ABP-321402-24: Permission was granted in 2025 to

- retain amendment to previously approved permission P.A. Ref. DA60141, comprising a single storey shed
- proposed demolition of existing conservatory
- construction of
 - 2-storey rear extension
 - Single storey rear extension
 - Detached single storey office structure in rear garden

- Internal refurbishment and alterations to existing dwelling

On site visit I noted that the conservatory had been demolished. The permitted extensions to the dwelling house have not been constructed, although some initial construction works have commenced. The detached single storey office structure subject of this appeal is partially constructed, as outlined at Section 1.0 of this report.

P.A. Ref. DA60141: Permission granted in 2006 for first floor side extension over existing ground floor side extension and single-storey 1-bedroom granny flat to side of existing dwelling.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027

The Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 as varied is the operative development plan.

The site is zoned A1 Existing Residential, whereby it is an objective to protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities.

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

Permitted uses include Residential.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The site is not located within or adjacent to any European sites, Natural Heritage Areas (NHAs) or Proposed Natural Areas.

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development

Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. 2no. third party appeals have been received, from

- Loretta Fox, relating to adjoining property to the north
- Rafal Stachura, relating to adjoining property to the west

7.2. Grounds of Appeal

Grounds of appeal from Loretta Fox may be summarised as follows:

- 39 Clonkeen has an extensive planning history.
 - P.A. Ref DA601414 granted permission for first floor side extension and single storey granny flat
 - detached single storey flat roof office structure granted by P.A. Ref. 2460762 was subject to third party appeal ABP-321402-24
 - Applicant did not build in accordance with plans. Structure has approx. 6sqm enlarged footprint, additional windows and been repositioned relative to rear and side boundaries.
- Planning system depends on public confidence that unauthorised development will not be rewarded. The fact that applicant was stopped is evidence that council recognised development was unauthorised
- Inaccuracy of statutory notices: Notices describe permission 'to complete amendments previously approved permission'. Significant elements have already been carried out and should have been described as retention permission. Statutory notices are misleading. Council should have rejected this application. 'Permission' is sought, not a 'Retention Permission'.
- Planner's report does not appear to assess increased impact of enlarged and repositioned structure on residential amenities of No. 40. It is overbearing. Additional window on eastern elevation will create overlooking of rear windows

and patio, injuring privacy and residential amenities

- Intensity of use and residential character: No. 39 has been extensively extended and remodelled over years. Cumulative effect of main dwelling, granny flat, various extensions and now enlarged detached structure is that property is no longer operating as single family dwelling unit. Intensity of use is exceptionally high evidenced by number of vehicles regularly parked in and around the property. Level of activity is not consistent with A1 Existing Residential zoning objective. Condition restricting occupation to office use does not adequately address fundamental concerns.
- Enlarged footprint and additional fenestration raise concerns about its potential for future residential use. Services installed appear to indicate future use could extend beyond office use incidental to dwelling.
- Depreciation of property value: Property (No. 40) currently on the market has not received single bid. Considers level of activity and enlarged structure's overbearing nature are contributing to this.

Grounds of appeal from Rafal Stachura may be summarised as follows:

- Inaccurate information submitted: Drawings are inaccurate and fail to reflect true site levels. No. 39 and 38 Clonkeen are not on same level. Revised drawings omit any reference to overall height of so-called office building. Drawings indicate structure is substantially taller than approved under previous permission which will lead to loss of privacy and overbearing
- Loss of privacy and overbearing:
 - Height of 'office' building is materially greater than original permission by min. 40cm, notwithstanding that roof is not installed, an unauthorised deviation. Window positioned above boundary wall directly overlooks front of property. Revised drawings indicate building reaches a height comparable to first floor window, causing significant overshadowing during morning hours and materially impact on residential amenity.
 - Planner's report assessment was made in relation to structure as originally proposed in P.A. Ref. 2460762

- Property functions as multi-unit development, has detrimental effect on residential amenities of adjacent properties, and level of activity is wholly inconsistent with zoning objective. Increased parking demand undermines residential amenity and places additional pressure on surrounding streets
- Traffic, parking and safety: Existing property already experiences high levels of vehicle activity. New potential residential unit will lead to more cars impacting traffic and compromising safety on very busy road in proximity of school
- Drainage and environmental impact: Increase in permeable surface area raises concerns regarding surface water runoff and flood risk, particularly to front of third party's property. Infill development of this nature reduces natural drainage capacity and can adversely affect adjoining properties.
- Depreciation of property value: Size of office building and in vicinity of third party's property resulting in overbearing has an impact on property value.
- Requests Commission to refuse permission.

7.3. Applicant Response

The applicant's response to the 2no. third party appeals states

- Third parties have made a number of inaccurate and unsubstantiated statements in appeals.
- No. 40 Clonkeen has been vacant for approx. 10 years and largely unmaintained
- Issues raised have already been examined and addressed during assessment of original application by Council and An Bord Pleanála (P.A. Ref. 2460762 and ABP-321401-24). Council considered same matters in reaching decision on current application (P.A. Ref. 2660114)
- Application before Board relates solely to minor modifications to previously permitted development, comprising increase in length by 1.2m (c.6sqm) to single-storey detached garden/office structure, and provision of 2no. additional windows. Overall height of structure remains unchanged from that permitted

under P.A. Ref. 2460762 and ABP-321402-24.

- Revised proposal repositions the structure further from both rear and side boundaries, increasing separation distances to adjoining properties.
- Having regard to extension's modest scale, unchanged height profile and increased setback from boundaries, it would not give rise to any significant or additional adverse impact on residential amenities of neighbouring properties beyond that already accepted under permitted scheme
- Concerns relating to potential impacts are not substantiated when assessed against planning history and nature and scale of revised development.

7.4. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority's response states that it considers that the matters raised in the appeal have been fully addressed in the Planning Officer's Report dated 26 March 2026 and respectfully requests that An Coimisiún Pleanála uphold its decision to grant permission.

7.5. Observations

None

8.0 Assessment

- 8.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having visited the site, and having regard to the relevant policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Legal and Procedural Issues
- Impacts on Residential Amenities
- Planning Authority's Condition 5
- Miscellaneous

8.2. Legal and Procedural Issues

Validation of planning application

- 8.2.1. In terms of procedural matters and the alleged irregularities in terms of the description of development as per the public notices, I refer to Article 26 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, which sets out the procedure on receipt of a planning application and indicates that the application must comply with *inter alia* Article 18. I note that all matters were considered acceptable by the planning authority.
- 8.2.2. Notwithstanding, I note that Article 18(1)(c) requires the newspaper notice to state whether the application is for permission, permission for retention, outline permission or permission consequent on the grant of outline permission.
- 8.2.3. I note that proposed development is for 'permission', as distinct from 'retention'.
- 8.2.4. While the public notices do not refer to 'retention', I consider that the development described as 'Permission' to 'complete amendments' to a previously approved permission, and which further details the amendments, adequately informs the public as to nature of the development subject of the application.

Lodged drawings

- 8.2.5. The plans and particulars on file indicate that the detached structure subject of this application is 'proposed office' or 'proposed office building'. A number of drawings clearly highlight the extent of the area to which the current application relates to comprise the general area of the office building.
- 8.2.6. Drawing titled 'Amended Drawings Site Plan – Proposed' (Drawing No. 101) states, *inter alia*, that the 'development will consist of Permission to complete amendments to previously approved permission (Reg. Ref. 2460762/ABP-321402-24)', and further describes the proposal as per the public notices.
- 8.2.7. With regard to the lodged planning drawings, I consider that some drawings on file appear confusing, for example,
- Drawing titled 'Planning Drawings Ground Floor Plan – Proposed' (Drawing No. 102) is shown to be 30sqm and to contain 1no. door and 1no. window only on the southern elevation.

- Drawing titled 'Planning Drawings Site Plan – Proposed' (Drawing No. 101) shows the proposed office to adjoin the northern and eastern site boundaries.

8.2.8. These 2no. drawings outlined above relate to the previous P.A. Ref. 2460762 and ABP-321402-24 planning application, although these drawings are not annotated to indicate this. I note that the separate cover letter lodged with the application refers to 6no. drawing titles which are 'Previously Approved....', for example, Previously Approved Site Layout Plan; Drawing No. 6553.01-PL-101.

8.2.9. While the content of the cover letter can be cross-referenced to these 6no. drawings, I consider that the absence to annotations relating to the previous planning permission on these drawings themselves does not lend itself to ease of reference. However, I am satisfied that there is sufficient information on file which indicates that these 6no. drawings relate to the recent planning permission.

Miscellaneous

8.2.10. The submitted planning application form states that the application site comprises 0.64ha. In contrast, the planning drawings indicate that the site area is 641sqm, which equates to 0.0641ha, rather than 0.64ha. While noting this discrepancy, I do not consider that it materially impacts on the assessment of this appeal.

8.3. Impact on Residential Amenities

General

8.3.1. I note the range of concerns raised by the third parties, including the use of the main dwelling as a multi-unit structure, and the potential for the office building subject of this appeal to be used for residential purposes. For clarity, the use of the main dwelling house and any extensions to same are not subject of this appeal, and as such do not come within the scope of this assessment.

Location and scale of office building

8.3.2. On site visit I noted that the office building permitted by P.A. Ref. 2460762 and ABP-321402-24 has been partially constructed, at a location similar to that permitted.

8.3.3. The permitted building (albeit described as 'Proposed Office Building' on drawing titled Planning Drawings Ground Floor Plan – Proposed; Drawing No. 102) is shown to adjoin the northern and western site boundaries. In contrast, the subject appeal

shows the building is 500mm and 903mm from the northern boundary and western boundaries respectively. The roof profile of both the permitted building and that subject of this appeal are of shallow monopitch design. The floor area of the extended office building at 36sqm is approx. 6sqm larger than permitted, and its height at 2.95m maximum is marginally lower. An overview of the contrasting floor areas and heights are outlined below.

Table 1: Comparison of Permitted Office Building and Current Appeal

	Permitted Building: P.A. Ref. 2460762 and ABP-321402-24	Current Appeal: P.A. Ref. 2660114 and ACP- 501137-26
Floor Area	30sqm	36sqm
Height	3.04m max. height	2.95m max. height

8.3.4. With regard to height, it is stated that the overall height is reduced from 3.042m to 2.959m total from previous planning application (drawing titled Amended Drawings Office Building – Elevations/Section – Proposed (shown on Drawing No. 108) refers). I consider that this very slight reduction in height while not easily discernible, would be acceptable. For clarity, I note that the applicant's response to the grounds of appeal states that the overall height of the structure remains unchanged from that previously permitted. However, as outlined above, a decrease in height is shown on the lodged drawings, albeit very marginal.

8.3.5. I consider that the increased floor area of the office building is acceptable. With regard to the position of the enlarged office building further offset from the shared boundaries with No. 40 to north and No. 38 to west, I consider that the position of the structure as it relates to these 2no. adjoining residential properties to be acceptable. This is discussed further below with regard to impacts of the subject structure on No.s 38 and 40.

Impacts on residential amenities of No. 38

8.3.6. With regard to the lodged drawings, I note that the drawing titled Amended Drawings Office Building – Elevations/Section – Proposed (shown on Drawing No. 108) shows

(at Proposed Front Elevation) the ground level at No. 38 Clonkeen (to west) to be very marginally above the ground level shown at the office building.

- 8.3.7. However, as viewed on site, the ground levels within the appeal site would appear to be slightly higher than at No. 38.
- 8.3.8. I note concerns raised by the third party relating to the overlooking of the front of No. 38. While I note that there is a mature hedgerow along part of No. 38's roadside boundary, I do not consider that the front garden/parking area of this property comprises private open space. Having regard to the single-storey nature of the office building, I do not consider that it would adversely impact on the residential amenities of No. 38 in terms of overlooking,
- 8.3.9. I note that the front building line of No. 38 has a staggered building line. While the office structure would be slightly forward the eastern, recessed part of No. 38's front building line, it would not be forward of its longer, principal building line. Any overshadowing would be limited in extent, and would not impact on any private amenity space of the adjoining property. I am satisfied that the proposed development would not adversely impact on No. 38 in terms of overshadowing or visual overbearance.
- 8.3.10. Issues raised relating to security concerns are civil matters, which fall outside the Commission's remit in deciding this application.

Impacts on residential amenities of No. 40

- 8.3.11. The office building subject of this appeal is closer to the rear elevation of No. 40 than that previously permitted. Based on annotated dimensions on drawing titled Amended Drawings First Floor Plan – Proposed (Drawing No. 103), I estimate that the eastern elevation of the enlarged office building is approx. 11.9m west of the rear building line of No. 40. As measured from plan, the separation distance from the approximate centre of the office's rear elevation and No. 40's actual rear building line is estimated to be very slightly longer at approx. 12.6m
- 8.3.12. While noting that a window is shown on the eastern elevation of the office building, given its single storey scale and its distance from the dwelling house at No. 40, I do not consider that the provision of this window as shown would adversely impact on the residential amenities of No. 40 in terms of overlooking. In addition, I do not

consider that the overall scale of the office building would adversely impact on the residential amenities of this adjoining property in terms of overshadowing or visual overbearance.

Use of office building

- 8.3.13. With regard to concerns raised relating to the potential residential use of the office building, as outlined previously I note that the overall floor area of the structure is 36sqm. The floor plan does not show any internal room layout. The planning authority's Condition 6 requires that the structure shall not be used for human habitation or industrial use and shall be solely used for the enjoyment of the residential dwelling.
- 8.3.14. The applicant's response to the grounds of appeal does not refer to the use of the office building.
- 8.3.15. Separately, I note that the applicant's response to the grounds of appeal on ABP-321402-24 (P.A. Ref. 2460762) states that the structure is proposed as a home office/study area for occupants of the dwelling, is not intended to be used as a commercial proposal but an ancillary use to that of the primary residential property. Condition 3 of the Board decision in that case states that the shed and office building shall not be used for human habitation, commercial use, industrial use or for any other purpose other than a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling.
- 8.3.16. With regard to the additional windows on the southern and eastern elevations shown in the subject application, I note that these would provide additional daylight to the extended office over that previously permitted, and that the increase in floor area is relatively limited at 6sqm. As outlined previously, I consider that the provision of additional windows and increased floor area would be acceptable.
- 8.3.17. In this regard, I consider that the attachment of a condition similar to Condition 3 of ABP-321402-24 (P.A. Ref. 2460762) would adequately address concerns relating to potential residential use of the office building, should the Commission be minded to grant permission.
- 8.3.18. For completeness, with regard to concerns raised relating to potential additional traffic generated by the subject structure, in tandem with the overall occupancy of the site, I consider that the approx. 6sqm increase in floor area to an office building which

is required (pursuant to Condition 3 of ABP-321402-24 (P.A. Ref. 2460762)) to be restricted to purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling, would not give rise to additional parking or traffic safety concerns.

Depreciation of properties

8.3.19. I note the concerns raised in the grounds of appeal in respect of the devaluation of neighbouring properties. However, having regard to the assessment and conclusion set out above, I am satisfied that 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.

8.4. Planning Authority's Condition 5

8.4.1. The planning authority's Condition 5 states that there shall not be a separate entrance to the structure from the roadway, and that the structure shall be accessed from the existing dwelling and existing side access.

8.4.2. On site visit I noted that a gap had been created in the site's southern roadside boundary wall facing No. 34 Clonkeen. This gap has been boarded up, although views into the site are partially visible.

8.4.3. The matter of this breach in the boundary wall is not raised in the third parties' grounds of appeal, although I note that it was raised in an observation received by the planning authority.

8.4.4. Given that a new entrance at this location does not form part of this application, I do not consider it necessary for a specific condition to be attached requiring the wall to be reinstated.

8.4.5. Separately, I note that Condition 5 of ABP-321402-24 (P.A. Ref. 2460762) requires a Construction Management Plan to be submitted and agreed by the planning authority prior to commencement. Should the Commission be minded to grant, it is recommended that a condition is attached requiring that all relevant conditions of ABP-321402-24 (P.A. Ref. 2460762) be complied with in the subject case.

8.5. Miscellaneous

Private Open Space

8.5.1. Private open space is indicated to comprise 180sqm, in the context of the subject

application and also in the context of the development previously permitted relating to extensions to the main dwelling house. This is a reduction from 189sqm shown on the lodged drawings on the subject file relating to P.A. Ref. 2460762 and ABP-321402-24. I consider this slight reduction to 180sqm of open space is acceptable.

Drainage

- 8.5.2. I note the concerns raised relating to surface water runoff and flood risk. I consider that this matter can be adequately addressed by way of standard condition relating to surface water drainage.

Development Contributions

- 8.5.3. The Planner's Report on file states that development contributions are calculated using the Meath County Development Contribution Scheme 2024-2029, that domestic extensions less than 100sqm (cumulative) are exempt, and notes that the floor area (of extension) is 36sqm. No condition requiring payment of a financial contribution is contained in the planning authority's decision.
- 8.5.4. I note that the Meath Development Contribution Scheme 2024-2029, viewed on www.meath.ie (accessed on 27 May 2025) states that extensions less than 100sqm are exempt. No contribution requirement or exemption is specified relating to detached structures such as offices ancillary to the main dwelling house.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the subject proposal comprising permission to complete amendments to office structure in rear garden previously approved by P.A. Ref. 2460762/ABP-321402-24, comprising enlarged footprint, additional window on front and side elevations, revised fenestration on front elevation, revised positioning off rear and side boundaries, and ancillary site works in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.2. The subject site is located at 39 Clonkeen, within a mature residential estate in Ratoath, Co. Meath. The site is approx. 16km north of the M50.
- 9.3. The nearest European sites are:
- River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (004232): 17km to north west
 - River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299): 17km to north west

- Rye Water Valley/Carlton SAC (001398): 14.3km to south west
- Malahide Estuary SPA (004025): 18km to south east
- Rogerstown Estuary SPA (004015): 18km to east

9.4. The development comprises completion of the following amendments to the detached single storey office structure in the rear garden previously approved by P.A. Ref. 2460762 and ABP-321402-24:

- Enlarged footprint (approx. 6.0sqm)
- An additional window on the front (southern) and side (eastern) elevations,
- Revised fenestration on the front (southern) elevation
- Revised positioning off the rear (western) and side (northern) boundaries
- All ancillary site works, landscaping and drainage.

9.5. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

9.6. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale and domestic nature of the development
- The site location in a serviced urban area, distance from nearest European sites, urban nature of intervening habitats, and lack of connections

9.7. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

9.8. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) 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.

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.

In addition, the proposed development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the protection, maintenance, and improvement of water body status, as required under the Directive.

- 10.3. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

11.0 Planning Authority Conditions

The following is an overview of the planning authority's conditions (8no.) Outlined is commentary relating to recommended inclusion or otherwise of conditions, should the Commission be minded to grant permission.

1.	The development shall be completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the Planning Authority on 30/01/2026 except where conditions hereunder specify otherwise. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars. Reason: In the interests of the proper planning and development of the area. Comment: Similar condition recommended.
2.	The external finish, height and materials of the development shall be as shown on the plans submitted on 30/01/2026 unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. Reason: In the interest of visual amenity. Comment: Inclusion of this condition is not recommended, as I consider that this matter of external finishes is adequately addressed in recommended

	Condition 1 (standard condition requiring development to be carried out in accordance with submitted plans and particulars).
3.	Save for the amendments permitted on foot of this permission, the development shall otherwise be carried out in strict accordance with the terms and conditions of planning application Reg. Ref. ABP-321402-24, except where conditions hereunder specify otherwise. Reason: In the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. Comment: Similar condition recommended.
4.	This permission shall expire as per the date outlined on the parent permission associated with this application, under Plan Ref No ABP-321402-24. Reason: In the interest of clarity. Comment: Same issue recommended to be included, in a standard condition.
5.	There shall not be a separate entrance to the proposed structure hereby permitted from the roadway. The structure shall be accessed from the existing dwelling and its existing side access laneway. Reason: In the interest of orderly development and traffic safety. Comment: It is recommended that this condition is not attached as outlined at Section 8 of this report.
6.	The proposed structure hereby permitted shall not be used for human habitation or industrial use and shall be used solely for the enjoyment of the residential dwelling. Reason: In the interest of orderly development. Comment: Similar condition recommended.
7.	Surface water from the site shall be disposed of within the boundaries of the site and shall not discharge into the public road or adjoining property. Permeable paving shall be incorporated to the proposed driveway. Existing surface water drainage for adjoining properties shall not be adversely affected by the development hereby permitted. All soakpits shall be designed to BRE

	Digest 365 standards. All works shall comply fully with the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study (GDSDS) Regional Drainage Policies Volume 2, for New Developments. Reason: To ensure orderly disposal of surface water and in the interest of road safety. Comment: Alternative drainage condition recommended.
8.	The developer shall comply in full with the following: (a) The hours of construction shall be restricted to between 7.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m., Monday to Friday, and 8.00 a.m. to 2.00 p.m. on Saturdays. (b) No activities shall take place on-site on Sundays, bank or public holidays (c) Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from Meath County Council. Such approval may be given subject to conditions pertaining to the particular circumstances being set by Meath County Council. Reason: In the interest of residential amenities of the area Comment: Alternative working hours condition recommended, in the interests of consistency with Condition 6 of ABP-321402-24 (P.A. Ref. 2460762). Condition 6 of that permission allows for working hours from 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, i.e., 1 hour beyond that stated in the planning authority's Condition 8 above. This matter is addressed in recommended Condition 2 in Section 14.0 of this report.

12.0 Recommendation

- 12.1. I recommend that permission be granted subject to conditions for the reasons and considerations set out below.

13.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 13.1. Having regard to the provisions of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027, as varied, the nature and scale of the development comprising completion of amendments to previously approved permission, it is considered that, subject to

compliance with the conditions set out below, the development would be appropriate in terms of scale, form and layout, would not adversely impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties by reasons of overlooking, overshadowing or visual overbearance, nor impact on the character or visual amenity of the area and would be acceptable in terms traffic safety. The development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

14.0 Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and particulars submitted with the planning application except as may be otherwise required by the following conditions. Reason: To clarify the plans and particulars for which permission is granted.
2.	Apart from any departures specifically authorised by this permission, the development shall comply with the conditions of the parent permission An Bord Pleanála Ref. ABP-321402-24 (P.A. Ref. 2460762) unless the conditions set out hereunder specify otherwise. This permission shall expire on the same date as the parent permission. Reason: In the interest of clarity and to ensure that the overall development is carried out in accordance with the previous permissions.
3.	The office building shall not be used for human habitation, commercial use, industrial use or for any other purpose other than a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling. Reason: in the interest of development management.
4.	Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management.

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.

Cáit Ryan

Senior Planning Inspector

29 May 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501137-MH-26
Proposed Development Summary	Permission to complete amendments to office structure in rear garden previously approved by P.A. Ref. 2460762/ABP-321402-24, comprising enlarged footprint, additional window on front and side elevations, revised fenestration on front elevation, revised positioning off rear and side boundaries, and ancillary site works.
Development Address	39 Clonkeen, Ratoath, Co. Meath, A85 T927
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.	
☒ 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)	

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 ☐	
No ☐	

Inspector: _____ Date: _____