



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501180-MH-26

Development

The demolition of existing garage - replaced with a side single storey extension. New rear detached garage and all associated site works.

Location

Bettystown Road, Donacarney Great, Mornington, Co. Meath

Planning Authority

Meath County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2660170

Applicants

John & Deborah Carolan

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission with Conditions

Type of Appeal

Third Party Planning Appeal

Appellant

Dorothy O'Brien

Observers

None

Date of Site Inspection

24th June 2026

Inspector

Margaret Commene

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development.....	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0	Planning History.....	6
5.0	Policy Context.....	7
6.0	The Appeal	10
7.0	Assessment	11
8.0	AA Screening.....	18
9.0	Water Framework Directive.....	18
10.0	Recommendation.....	19
11.0	Reasons and Considerations	19
12.0	Conditions.....	19
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	22

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is in Bettystown Road, Donacarney Great, Mornington, Co. Meath. More specially, it comprises of a 0.171Ha parcel located on the north-eastern side of the R150, c. 750 metres south of the settlement of Donacarney. The site currently features a detached bungalow with attached garage, setback c. 12 metres from the front boundary, and a large lawned garden to the rear. The site's front boundary features a new stone wall while the sites side and rear boundaries are delineated by a mix of block wall, timber fencing and hedging.
- 1.2. The area surrounding the subject site features a mix of residential and agricultural land uses. In terms of residential abutments, the subject site forms part of a row of 9 no. dwellings on the north-eastern side of the R150. The size, design and form of the dwellings in this row are varied and many of them have been previously extended. More specifically, the subject site's north-western boundary is flanked by a single storey dwelling constructed proximate to the common boundary and setback c. 29 metres from the R150. The subject site's south-eastern boundary is flanked by a dormer bungalow, known as San Antonio, which adopts a similar building line to the subject property.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the demolition of an existing single storey garage to the side/replacement with a side single storey extension/associated internal revisions; construction of a rear detached single storey garage and a soakaway; and all associated site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Meath County Council granted planning permission subject to 8 no. conditions. Of particular relevance is Condition No. 8, which reads as follows:

Condition No. 8 reads as follows:

8. The applicant shall comply with the following in relation to Flooding requirements:

- a) All electrical items in the proposed extension, including sockets shall be sited at least 1 metre above finished Floor levels so as to be above possible Flood levels.*
- b) All foul manhole lids/access junction lids to be sealed so flood water cannot enter the system.*
- c) The development shall incorporate a flood resilient design for construction, details of which shall be submitted to the written agreement of Meath County Council.*

Reason: To assist in the design of any new developments located within relevant flood risk zones so as to mitigate against flooding.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- Given the 'RA' - Rural Area land use zoning objective applying to the site, the principle of the proposed extension and relocation of a domestic garage is considered acceptable subject to a full planning assessment.
- Regarding design, the proposal is considered acceptable in the context of Objective DM OBJ 50 of the Meath County Development Plan, materials are consistent with the existing house, and the proposal will not unduly impact the visual or residential amenities of the vicinity.
- With regard to impact on neighbouring properties, given the existing satisfactory separation distance between neighbouring properties/the proposed development and the proposed development being single storey, it is not considered the proposed development would have any harmful impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of any overbearing, overlooking, overshadowing, loss of outlook or loss of natural light or loss of privacy. Furthermore, any potential issue regarding subsidence would be a civil matter between the third party and the applicant.

- The application site is located in a flood risk area, more specifically it falls within Flood Zone A in the OPW PFRA Mapping/Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for County Meath carried out for the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027. The following referral comments, pertaining to previous planning application Reg. Ref. 2460530, were noted: - *'the development can be classified as a minor development as per Revised section 5.28 of the aforementioned guidelines and as such the Justification test does not apply. However, a commensurate assessment of the risks of flooding still needs to be undertaken in order to demonstrate that it would not have adverse impacts, including to the environment, or impede access to a watercourse, floodplain or flood protection and management facilities. These proposals should follow best practice in the management of health & safety for users and residents of the proposal.'* It was considered that this assessment can be secured by way of a planning condition in any final grant of permission.
- The proposed development (entire project), by itself or in combination with other plans and developments in the vicinity, would not be likely to have a significant effect on European Site(s). In light of this, it is considered that a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment (Natura Impact Statement) is not required in this instance.
- A single dwelling or extension to the same are not listed in Schedule 5; therefore, a mandatory EIA is not required. The Planning Authority is satisfied that a sub-threshold EIA is not required.

3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

Environment Flooding – Surface Water Section (01/04/2026): No objection, subject to conditions.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

None.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

1 no. third party observation was submitted to the Planning Authority. The main issues raised therein are as follows:

- The extensions proximity to the boundary.

- Subsidence resulting from the proposed buildings.
- The height of the proposed garage and its impacts on light/privacy of the neighbouring property.
- Flooding.
- Resulting damage to trees.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Subject Site

4.1.1. The following previous applications pertaining to the subject site are of relevance:

PA Reg. Ref. 2460530 (ABP Ref. ABP-321778-25)

Permission was sought for construction of a single-storey extension, to the side and front of the dwelling, and a shed within the rear garden. Permission was refused by Meath County Council in January 2025. The Planning Authority's decision was appealed to An Bord Pleanála by the applicants (ABP Ref. ABP-321778-25). The development was refused permission by the Board, in May 2025, for the following reason:

It is considered that, by reason of its design, form, roof profile and prominence, the proposed development would fail to respect, harmonise and integrate with the existing dwelling on site and would be contrary to Objective DM OBJ 50 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027. The proposed development would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

PA Reg. Ref. LB170783

Planning permission was granted by the Planning Authority in 2017 for a single storey extension and alterations to the front, side and rear of existing dwelling and detached shed in rear garden and all associated site works. This permission was not implemented and has since lapsed.

4.2. **Adjacent Sites**

There have been no recent applications on the sites immediately adjacent to the subject site that are pertinent to the current proposal.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (including variations No. 1-5)**

5.1.1. **Land Use Zoning**

The site is zoned 'RA' - Rural Area in the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied) with a stated objective to *'protect and promote in a balanced way, the development of agriculture, forestry and rural-related enterprise, biodiversity, the rural landscape, and the built and cultural heritage'*. The Development Plan details the following primary objective in relation to this zoning objective: - *'to protect and promote the value and future sustainability of rural areas. Agriculture, forestry, tourism and rural related resource enterprises will be employed for the benefit of the local and wider population. A balanced approach involving the protection and promotion of rural biodiversity, promotion of the integrity of the landscape, and enhancement of the built and cultural heritage will be adopted.'*

Residential is a 'permitted use' subject to compliance with the Rural Settlement Strategy.

5.1.2. **Other Relevant Sections/Policies**

The following sections/policies are considered relevant to the consideration of the subject proposal:

Chapter 6 – Infrastructure Strategy

The following objectives and policies are considered to be of relevance:

- INF POL 20 - *To require that a Flood Risk Assessment is carried out for any development proposal, where flood risk may be an issue in accordance with the "Planning System and Flood Risk Management – Guidelines for Planning Authorities" (DoECLG/OPW, 2009). This assessment shall be appropriate to the scale and nature of risk to and from the potential development and shall consider the impact of climate change.*

- INF OBJ 20 - *To implement the Planning System and Flood Risk Management-Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoEHLG/OPW 2009) or any updated guidelines. A site-specific Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted where appropriate.*
- INF OBJ 25 - *To require the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) to minimise and limit the extent of hard surfacing and paving and require the use of sustainable drainage techniques where appropriate, for new development or for extensions to existing developments, in order to reduce the potential impact of existing and predicted flooding risks.*

Chapter 9 – Rural Development Strategy

Section 9.2 encourages the consolidation of rural development within existing villages and settlements as per national and regional policy guidance. Section 9.14.1 outlines Development Assessment Criteria regarding applications for refurbishment and/or replacement of existing housing stock in rural areas. These state that in the case of refurbishment and extension proposals, *‘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’*.

Chapter 11 - Development Management Standards and Land Use Zoning Objectives

Chapter 11 sets out the development management standards. More specifically, guidance regarding Extensions in Urban and Rural Areas is provided in Section 11.5.25. Objective DM OBJ 50 outlines the following criteria that all applications for residential extensions in urban and rural areas shall comply with:

- *High quality design which respects, harmonises and integrates with the existing dwelling in terms of height, scale, materials used, finishes, window proportions, etc.*
- *The quantity and quality of private open space that would remain to serve the house.*
- *Flat roof extensions, in a contemporary design context, will be considered on their individual merits.*

- *Impact on amenities of adjacent residents, in terms of light and privacy. Care should be taken to ensure that the extension does not overshadow windows, yards or gardens or have windows in the flank walls which would reduce a neighbour's privacy.*
- *Extensions which break the existing front building line will not normally be acceptable. A porch extension which does not significantly break the front building line will normally be permitted.*
- *Dormer extensions shall not obscure the main features of the existing roof, i.e. should not break the ridge or eaves lines of the roof.*
- *Proposed side extensions shall retain side access to the rear of the property, where required for utility access, refuse collection, etc.*
- *Ability to provide adequate car parking within the curtilage of the dwelling house.*
- *In all cases where diversion or construction over existing sewerage and/or water mains is required, the consent of Irish Water will be required as part of the application.*

5.2. **National & Regional Policy Documents/Section 28 - Ministerial Guidelines**

The following National Policy and Guidance Documents/Section 28 - Ministerial Guidelines are considered of relevance to the proposed development. Specific policies and objectives therein are referenced within the assessment where appropriate.

- Project Ireland 2040 – National Planning Framework (2025).
- Our Rural Future: Rural Development Policy 2021-2025.
- Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes and Sustaining Communities (DoHLGH, 2007).
- Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoHLGH, 2005).
- The Planning System and Flood Risk Management, including the associated Technical Appendices (2009).
- Eastern & Midland Regional Assembly Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy 2019-2031.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

5.3.1. The proposed development is not located within or immediately adjacent to any European site. The nearest European sites are the Boyne Coast and Estuary SAC (Site Code 001957) and the Boyne Estuary SPA (Site Code 004080), located c. 1.8km to the east/1.9km to the north and 1.9km to the north, respectively.

5.4. EIA Screening

5.4.1. 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 Act.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The site is in a Flood Zone Area and a full Flood Risk Assessment should be provided.
- Concerns exist regarding the areas high water results. It is feared construction will destabilise walls and hedging along the boundary.
- It is requested that the front extension be made smaller and setback 1.5 metres from the common boundary.
- The garage was wrongly advertised as a single storey building. It is in fact 2 storeys. If permission is granted for this aspect of the development, it is requested that it is moved 3-5 metres from the common boundary (due to flood risk, lack of privacy and sunshine) and reduced to a single storey structure.

6.2. Applicant Response

- None.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority has responded to the grounds of appeal. The response is summarised as follows:

- The Planning Authority considers that the matters raised in the appeal have been fully addressed in the Planning Officer's Report dated 24th March 2026. It is respectfully requested that An Coimisiún Pleanála uphold its decision to grant permission in this case.

6.4. Observations

- None.

7.0 Assessment

Having examined the application details/all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the Planning 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:

- Principle of Development.
- Design.
- Residential Amenity.
- Flooding.
- Other Matters.

7.1. Principle of Development

7.1.1. The proposed development involves the construction of a single storey extension to the side of an existing dwelling/construction of a garage to the rear on a site which is zoned objective 'RA' - Rural Area under the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied). Under this land use zoning objective, residential land use is permitted subject to compliance with the Rural Settlement Strategy. I am satisfied that the principle of the development has been established on the site and that the proposal is acceptable subject to compliance with the relevant policies and objectives of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied). Relevant Development Plan policies/objectives include Objective DM OBJ 50, featuring in Section 11.5.25 of the same. Compliance with this and other applicable policies and objectives will be addressed in the subsequent sections.

7.2. Design

- 7.2.1. The appellant has raised concerns about the proposed front extension. In terms of its design, they have requested that it be made smaller and setback 1.5 metres from the common boundary. As previously discussed in Section 5.1.2, Objective DM OBJ 50, included in Section 11.5.25 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied) outlines criteria for applications for residential extensions in urban and rural areas. The subject proposal is assessed against the relevant criteria in turn below.
- 7.2.2. The proposed development involves the demolition of the existing 19sqm attached garage and its replacement with a 48sqm single storey side/rear extension to the existing dwelling. The is considered modest in terms of scale and increase in floor area. The extension is setback 1.56 metres from the front façade of the existing house thus respecting the existing building line. The extension adopts a pitched roof similar to the existing dwelling, although the ridge height of the same sits a minimum of 0.61 metres lower than that of the existing dwelling. Due to the stepping back and the lower roof height adopted, the proposed extension reads as subservient to the existing dwelling. In terms of materials and finishes, the extension will feature black roof tiles, painted smooth plaster finish walls and uPVC windows, matching the materials of the existing dwelling. In terms of window proportions, the window serving the proposed new bedroom mirrors that currently featuring in the existing sitting room.
- 7.2.3. Having regard to the foregoing, I am satisfied that the proposed extension respects, harmonises and integrates with the existing dwelling featuring on site. In addition, I am also satisfied that the proposed extension is sympathetic to the character of the original structure and the surrounding area, consistent with the relevant criteria outlined in Section 9.14.1 of the current development plan.
- 7.2.4. As will be discussed in greater detail in the subsequent section, it is not considered that the proposed extension will have unreasonable amenity impacts on adjacent residents given its positioning relative to the neighbouring property and its scale/single storey height.
- 7.2.5. The proposed extension will occupy an area currently occupied by an attached garage/an external area used for storage. The existing large rear garden is maintained, be it a relatively small area (60sqm) of it is to accommodate the proposed garage. The proposed extension is located to the north of the existing dwelling. The existing side

access to the rear of the property featuring to the south of the existing dwelling is maintained. Similarly, the existing car parking area to the front of the subject dwelling is unaffected by the proposed development.

7.2.6. While each application is considered on its own individual merit, I think it is worth outlining the difference between the development now proposed and that previously refused by the Board under ABP Ref. ABP-321778-25, given both applications involve the construction of a single-storey extension to the existing dwelling. The previous proposal under PA Reg. Ref. 2460530/ABP Ref. ABP-321778-25, saw the existing garage replaced by a 118sqm flat roof extension which sat 2 metres forward of the existing dwelling's front façade. The subject proposal represents a marked reduction in terms of size/projection forward and a more sympathetic design from that for which permission was previously sought.

7.2.7. With regards to the proposed garage, I consider the design of this element of the proposal to be acceptable. It adopts a similar roof profile/materials and finishes to the existing dwelling featuring on site. In terms of siting, it is setback c. 55 metres from the properties front boundary and sits to the rear of the existing dwelling. Therefore, there will be limited views of the proposed garage within the streetscape. The appropriateness of the proposed garage in terms of the amenity impacts on adjacent residents is considered in the subsequent section of this report.

7.3. Residential Amenity

Appellants House

7.3.1. The appellant has raised concerns about the proposed development, and in particular the proposed garages', impact on their residential amenity. If permission is to be granted, it is requested that the garage be moved 3-5 metres from the common boundary and reduced to a single storey structure to reduce its impact. Prior to assessing potential overlooking, overbearing and overshadowing impacts, as well as potential impacts on daylight, I think it beneficial to discuss the subject site in the context of its interface with the appellants property. The appellants property sits to the north-west of the appeal site and comprises of a single storey dwelling constructed proximate to the common boundary and setback c. 29 metres from the R150. The driveway serving this property immediately abuts the detached garage proposed for

replacement as part of this application. The proposed garage is located proximate to the dwelling/garden area featuring on the appellants property.

- 7.3.2. The proposed garage is setback c. 25 metres from the rear façade of the existing dwelling on the appeal site and c. 1.4 metres from the common boundary. In the context of the neighbouring dwelling to the north-west, the building is offset c. 5 metres from the rear façade of the neighbouring dwelling. The building extends for a length of 10 metres along the common boundary and has a maximum wall height of c. 3.75 metres (ridge height of c. 6.4 metres). Upon review of the elevations accompanying the application, 1 no. north-east facing window features at mezzanine level which would provide oblique views of the neighbouring private open space area. As indicated on the plans accompanying the application, the proposed garage is to be used as office space ancillary to the house with the mezzanine level providing a storage area for the same. In light of this, I am satisfied that the proposed garage will not result in unreasonable overlooking of this neighbouring property.
- 7.3.3. Having regard to the overall scale, siting and proximity of the proposed garage relative to the neighbouring dwelling to the north-east and having considered the existing site context, in particular the depth of the adjacent garden and existing boundary treatments featuring along the common boundary, it is my opinion that the proposed garage is neither out of scale nor excessive and will not unduly compromise the residential amenity of the property to the north-east by way of overbearing or overshadowing. In terms of potential impacts on daylight to windows, I am satisfied that daylight and sunlight considerations have informed the proposed layout and design. The proposed garage has been setback from the common boundary by c. 1.4 metres and its positioning ensures it is offset from any south-facing windows associated with the neighbouring dwelling.
- 7.3.4. Having regard to the foregoing, I do not consider a reduction in height and/or an increase in the setback adopted from the common boundary, as requested by the appellant, is merited in this instance.
- 7.3.5. The proposed extension to the existing dwelling is single storey and sits forward of the appellants dwelling, immediately abutting the appellants driveway. Therefore, unreasonable overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing impacts, as well as negative

impacts to daylight levels currently received, will not occur in the context of this aspect of the subject proposal.

Other Adjacent House

- 7.3.6. The site is adjoined to the south-east by San Antonio which comprises a detached dormer bungalow. I do not consider the proposed development, would result in any significant impacts on or detract from the residential amenity of this adjoining property given the orientation of the subject site relative to this property, the generous separation distance provided between the proposed extension/garage and this property and the boundary treatment/established planting featuring along the common boundary.

Subject Dwelling

- 7.3.7. The dwelling resulting from the proposed extension and associated internal modifications will have a total floor area of c. 152sqm. Having reviewed the proposed floor plans, I am satisfied that the resulting house is suitably designed and adequately sized internally to provide an adequate level of residential amenity to future residents. As discussed in the previous section in the context of the Objective DM OBJ 50 criteria, a large rear garden is maintained to serve residents of the subject dwelling. Further to this, there are no changes proposed to the large car parking area serving the dwelling at the front of the site, which provides ample parking for a dwelling of this size.

7.4. Flooding

- 7.4.1. The third party appeal submission raises flooding as an issue, contending that a full Flood Risk Assessment should have been provided given the site is in a Flood Zone Area and arguing that the extension and garage should adopt greater setbacks from the common boundary.
- 7.4.2. The application is not accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment. The matter of flood risk is instead addressed a letter, prepared by Campbell & Carolan - a Building Surveying & Civil Engineering firm, accompanying the application. In this regard, I would note the discretion regarding site-specific Flood Risk Assessment submission provided in Objective INF OBJ 20 of the current Development Plan. The application material states that *"it is proposed that all surface water run-off from roofs, and hardstanding areas, be collected and disposed of within the site to the surface water*

soakaways. This property is well established, and the proposal is unlikely to increase flooding in this area."

- 7.4.3. The Planning Authority saw fit to address outstanding matters pertaining to flooding by way of condition, Condition No. 8 requiring a detailed flood resilient design for construction to be agreed with Meath County Council and specifying requirements regarding electrical items and foul manhole lids/access junction lids (see Section 3.1 for exact condition wording). It is worth noting that the Planners Report was informed by the referral comments, pertaining to previous planning application Reg. Ref. 2460530 as the report of the Environment Flooding – Surface Water Section was issued after the Planners Report publication. However, upon review I note the referral comments issued by the Environment Flooding – Surface Water Section in the context of the subject application mirrored those issued in the context of the previous application.
- 7.4.4. Part of the subject site is identified as being within Flood Zone A in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment prepared as part of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied). More specifically, Flood Zone A extends across the southernmost part of the site. In the context of the subject proposal, the existing garage/proposed extension falls within Flood Zone A and the proposed garage falls outside of the same. Residential dwellings are classified as 'highly vulnerable' development within the Flood Risk Management Guidelines and are not considered appropriate within Flood Zone A and B. The need for growth within urban settlements is however recognised in the Flood Risk Management Guidelines. With regards to applications for minor development, including small scale infill, Section 5.28 of the guidelines states that in the context of such development it is "*unlikely to raise significant flooding issues...the sequential approach cannot be used to locate them in lower-risk areas and the Justification Test will not apply.*" It states however that a commensurate assessment of the risks of flooding should accompany such applications to demonstrate that they would not have adverse impacts or impede access to a watercourse, floodplain or flood protection and management facilities. It states these proposals should follow best practice in the management of health and safety for users and residents of the proposal.

- 7.4.5. I have assessed the proposed development with regards to the identified flood risk for the area, having regard to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment prepared as part of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied) and the Flood Risk Management Guidelines. Given the size and nature of the proposed extension (the proposed 48sqm extension replacing an existing building featuring on site), the provision of a soakway, and that the site is located at the edge of the area identified as being at risk of flooding, I do not consider the proposal would have a significant impact in relation to obstructing important flow paths, introducing a significant additional number of people into flood risk areas, or having adverse impacts or impeding access to a watercourse, floodplain or flood protection and management facilities. It is worth noting that the Board that flooding did not inform the refusal reasons in the context of the extension previously proposed under ABP Ref. ABP-321778-25.
- 7.4.6. The Planning Authority's Environment Flooding – Surface Water Section raised no objection to the proposed development subject to conditions in relation to detailed design. It is recommended that, if the Coimisiún are inclined to grant permission that these aforementioned conditions regarding detailed design of flood risk mitigation measures be attached to the Coimisiún's Order. Subject to the inclusion of such conditions, I am satisfied the proposal is acceptable in this regard.

7.5. Other Matters

- 7.5.1. *Destabilisation of walls and hedging along the boundary* - The appellant has raised a concern about potential destabilising of walls and hedging along the boundary arising from the proposed development. I note that no works are proposed to any of the boundaries as part of the current application, the plans accompanying the planning application showing a minimum 500mm separation distance being proposed between the proposed extension/garage and the common boundary. Given the separation distance adopted and the nature/scale of the proposed works adjacent to the common boundary, I do not consider there to be an undue/unreasonable threat in this regard. Notwithstanding, I consider that matters relating to potential impacts on the structural integrity of neighbouring properties are controlled under separate Building Regulations and are not a matter for the Coimisiún.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. I have considered the subject development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended). The area immediately abutting the subject site is residential in nature and the site is not located within or immediately adjoining any designated Natura 2000 sites. It is c. 1.8km to the west/c. 1.9km to the south of the Boyne Coast and Estuary SAC and c. 1.9km to the south of Boyne Estuary SPA. The proposed development comprises demolition of an existing garage, construction of an extension and a garage, and all associated site works. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 8.2. 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.
- 8.3. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The small scale and nature of the development;
 - The location of the site on serviced lands and distance from nearest European site and lack of connections; and
 - Taking into account the screening determination by the Planning Authority.
- 8.4. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the subject development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

9.0 Water Framework Directive

- 9.1. The subject site is in a serviced area and is to connect to the existing sewer network. There are no water courses in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site which is situated within an established residential area.
- 9.2. 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. 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.

- 9.3. 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. Accordingly, the subject development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive.

10.0 Recommendation

- 10.1. I recommend that the decision of the Planning Authority be upheld and that permission be granted for the proposed development.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 (as varied), the Planning System and Flood Risk Management, including the associated Technical Appendices (2009) and the nature, scale and design of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposed development would be acceptable within the context of the site and that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential amenities of property in the vicinity, the visual amenities of the area or give rise to an increased risk of flooding on the site or other properties in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, 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. All external finishes (including roof tiles/slates, render finish and windows) shall be as proposed in the drawings submitted to the Planning Authority, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

3. The extension and the existing dwelling combined shall be confined solely to residential use as a single private dwelling unit and shall not be sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

4. The garage shall be used for purposes ancillary to the enjoyment of the dwelling and shall not be used for habitation or for commercial purposes

Reason: In the interest of clarity and to regulate the use of the site.

5. The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

6. The applicant shall comply with the following in relation to Flooding requirements:
 - a) All electrical items in the proposed extension, including sockets shall be sited at least 1 metre above finished Floor levels so as to be above possible Flood levels.
 - b) All foul manhole lids/access junction lids to be sealed so flood water cannot enter the system.

- c) The development shall incorporate a flood resilient design for construction, details of which shall be submitted to the written agreement of Meath County Council.

Reason: To mitigate potential flood risk.

7. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall submit details of a Construction Management Plan for the written agreement of the planning authority. The plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the proposed development, including traffic management, working hours, noise and dust management, and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste. The proposed development shall be carried out in accordance with the written agreed details.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory standard of development, in the interest of residential amenity and public safety.

8. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

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.

Margaret Commane
Senior Planning Inspector
20th July 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501180-MH-26
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of existing garage, construction of a replacement side extension and rear detached garage, and all associated site works.
Development Address	Bettystown Road, Donacarney Great, Mornington, 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.	
☒ 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 ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____