



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501279-MH-26

Development

The construction of 85 no. dwellings and all other site works. An NIS was submitted to the planning authority with the application. Significant Further Information/Revised Plans submitted on this application.

Location

At a site of c. 2.65 hectares bounded by 'The Belfry' to the north the rear of dwellings on the Kildalkey Road to the south Talbot Court/Butterstream Gardens to the east and agricultural lands to the west at Athboy Road, Trim, Co. Meath.

Planning Authority

Meath County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2560882

Applicant(s)

Greenwalk Homes Limited

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant with Conditions

Type of Appeal

Third Party v Grant

Appellant(s)	Padraig & Ann-Marie Farrell & Ann Gilsenan Karl Cleary
Observer(s)	Siobhan Byrne Sami Ensaf
Date of Site Inspection	01 September 2026
Inspector	Cáit Ryan

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	8
4.0 Planning History.....	14
5.0 Policy Context.....	15
6.0 EIA Screening	19
7.0 The Appeal	21
8.0 Assessment	38
9.0 AA Screening	64
10.0 Water Framework Directive	65
11.0 Planning Authority Conditions.....	65
12.0 Recommendation	85
13.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	86
14.0 Conditions	86

Appendix 1(a): Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Appendix 1(b): Form 3 – EIA Screening Determination

Appendix 2: Appropriate Assessment

Appendix 3: Water Framework Directive

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site is located off the Athboy Road (R154), Trim, Co. Meath, approx. 35km from the M50. The site is at an edge of town location, approx. 1.5km walking distance north east of the town centre (at High Street), within the 50km/hr speed limit, and located at Crowpark and Corporationland townlands.
- 1.2. It is an irregular-shaped 2.65ha greenfield site, roughly C-shape in configuration. The area is characterised by residential development to the south and east of Athboy Road, primarily comprising established housing estates. There is an industrial estate on the opposite (northern) side of this regional road. Other commercial development in the vicinity comprises a supermarket, approx. 1km walking distance from the site, further east on Athboy Road (southern side).
- 1.3. The subject site is bounded
 - To north by The Belfry, an established 2-storey housing estate on Athboy Road, through which the subject site is accessed
 - To west by agricultural lands, some of which were in use for livestock grazing on date of site visit
 - To east by Talbot Court housing estate and by separate large private landscaped grounds, indicated to 2no. large water features
 - To the south by the rear gardens of individual houses fronting Kildalkey Road
- 1.4. Whitehall Stream flows through the northern part of the site, from the north western corner in a south easterly direction. This stream continues along the part of the south easterly boundary.
- 1.5. The site is generally level. A hedgerow/ditch runs diagonally through the site which separates the northern and southern parts of the site. This ditch contains a relatively steep drop. No water was evident on date of site visit. This is also part of the townland boundary between the Crowpark and Corporationland townlands.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for a residential scheme
 - comprising 85no. residential dwellings, consisting of

- 73no. houses
 - 12no. apartments/duplexes
- Vehicular/pedestrian access from Athboy Road (R154) via 'The Belfry'
 - Temporary construction access from adjoining agricultural lands to west from the Athboy Road
 - Provision of foul and surface water drainage (attenuation areas), bin stores, public lighting and all associated landscaping and boundary treatment works, site development and infrastructural works, ESB substations, and all ancillary works.

2.2. The 85no. residential dwellings comprise the following:

	Number of houses	Number of bedrooms
	0	1-bed
	6no.	2-bed
	64no.	3-bed
	3no.	4-bed
Total	73no.	
	Number of apartments/duplexes	Number of bedrooms
	6no.	1-bed
	6no.	3-bed
Total	12no.	

2.3. The following additional details are outlined below:

Building Heights	All houses: 2-storey Apartments/duplexes: All within a single 3-storey building
------------------	--

Open Space	Provision of c. 0.491ha of public open space centrally within the site. Public open space is to integrate with existing open space to north (to include associated works) within The Belfry, and provision of an outdoor play area and landscaped planting
Car parking spaces	161 no. resident car parking spaces (including visitor/EV)
Cycle spaces	114no. comprising: Apartments: 24no. in 2no. single storey structures Terraced houses: 90no. in shelters to front curtilage

2.4. Documentation lodged with the application includes –

- Planning Report
- Natura Impact Statement (NIS)
- EIA Screening Report (EIASR)
- Ecological Impact Assessment
- Arboricultural Assessment
- Building Lifecycle Report
- Climate Action and Energy Statement
- Housing Quality Assessment
- Resource Waste Management Plan (RWMP)
- Confirmation of Feasibility
- Mobility Management Plan
- Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP)
- Architecture and Urban Design Statement

- Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment
- Traffic and Transport Assessment (TTA)
- Archaeological Impact Assessment
- Geophysical Survey Report
- Outdoor Lighting Report
- Stage 1 2 Road Safety Audit Response
- Landscape Strategy
- Engineering Services Report
- Universal Design Statement
- Meath County Council Letter of Consent

2.5. Following a request for Further Information (FI), Significant Further Information (SFI) was received. The key changes to the proposed development in the SFI response are:

- Total number of proposed units is reduced from 85no. to 82no. as follows:

Houses	6no. 2-beds
	64no. 3-beds
	2no. 4-beds
Total houses	72no.
Apartments	6no. 1-beds
	4no. 2-beds
Total apartments	10no.

- The apartment/duplex block is reduced in scale to from 3-storey to 2-storey. The overall design of this building is amended. First floor balconies are reorientated to the front of the building. 651sqm communal open space to the rear is provided. For clarity, while this 2-storey block is described as a duplex,

all 10no. residential units have 'own-door' access. 8no. entrance doors are positioned on the west (front) facing elevation, and there is an entrance door on both north and south (side) elevations.

- Childcare facility is proposed in the north west part of the site. It replaces a detached house (No. 17)

2.6. Documentation submitted with the SFI response includes:

- NIS [Updated]
- Ecological Impact Assessment [Updated]
- Architectural Response Report (to which Schedule of Accommodation at Further Information Response Stage is appended; Appendix A refers)

2.7. In terms of detail –

- The proposed development includes the removal of the existing wall at the southern end of the public open space within The Belfry, so as to adjoin the open space proposed with the subject site; SFI Proposed Site Layout refers.
- The hedgerow/ditch which forms the townland boundary within the subject site is described as a dry field ditch in Engineering Services Report lodged with the application; Fig. 3 refers.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. Following a request for Further Information, the planning authority granted permission subject to 29no. conditions. Conditions of note are as follows:

Condition 1: Development shall be carried out in accordance with plans and particulars lodged with the application on 21 August 2025, FI received on 04 January 2026 and revised notices received on 12 February 2026.

Condition 2: Development shall contain 82no. residential units. Each shall be occupied as a single unit for residential purposes.

Condition 3: All mitigation measures shall be implemented as outlined in Natura

Impact Statement (NIS) and other particulars received on 04/01/2026

Condition 4: Development to be carried out in accordance with accompanying phasing plan. Completion of childcare facility shall form part of Phase 1.

Condition 10: Development shall be completed at least to construction standards in Planning Authority's Taking in Charge Policy. Development shall be maintained by developer until taken in charge.

Condition 15: (a) Applicant shall carry out pre-construction survey to ensure no changes in baseline if more than 6 months between grant and site clearance, or if site clearance is within bird nesting season

Condition 16: (a) Update and submit CEMP (b) Update and submit RWMP

Condition 19: (a) Incorporate agreed recommendations of Stage 1/2 Road Safety Audit into design. Applicant shall carry out detailed Stage 3 RSA for proposed development and surrounding area. Submit copy of Stage 3 RSA to P.A. and complete all remedial measures prior to occupancy.

(g) Submit and agree Construction Stage Traffic Management Plan

Condition 20: (a) Implement actions in revised FI SSFRA (b) ensure 10m riparian strip along OPW for future maintenance (c) agree with OPW and PA details of required maintenance and access for potential maintenance

Condition 25: €291,284.00 financial contribution: roads and public transport infrastructure

Condition 26: €211,246.00 financial contribution: social infrastructure provision

Condition 27: €26 ,408.00 financial contribution: surface water drainage

Condition 28: Cash deposit: €296,000.00

Condition 29: Pay €200,000 per residential unit (€16,400) contribution towards expenditure to be incurred by P.A. in monitoring construction phases

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

Basis for planning authority decision:

Executive Planner's Reports (14 October 2025 and 08 April 2026)

First Report: Main issues raised are -

- Proposed density of 32.4uph is in accordance with Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines 2024.
- Considers a daylight/sunlight analysis, visual impact assessment (VIA) relating to 3-storey elements and a childcare facility are required.
- Notes internal reports and TII report.
- Notes NIS and states a planning condition will ensure all mitigation measures identified in NIS, CEMP and RWMP are implemented.
- States PA is satisfied that EIAR is not required.
- Notes 51no. submissions received

Recommendation to request FI on 15no. items (including information relating to revised public notices) reflects Planner's Report.

Report is endorsed by Senior Executive Planner.

Second Report: Main issues raised are -

- Notes 11no. further submissions received
- Notes height of duplex is reduced and location of balconies is revised.
- Consider phasing plan is acceptable and that creche be provided in Phase 1
- Notes content of internal reports to SFI responses relating to traffic/parking and surface water/flooding
- Refers to internal report from Environment Waste Section

Recommendation to grant permission subject to 29no. conditions reflects Planner's Report.

Report is endorsed by Senior Executive Planner.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Environment Flooding – Surface Water Section (08 October 2025; 19 March 2026): First Report recommends FI. Second Report recommends conditions.

Environment Waste Section (31 March 2026): Report recommends conditions.

Transportation Department (08 October 2025, 23 March 2026): First Report recommends FI. Second Report states no objection subject to conditions.

Ecologist Planning Referral Report (18 March 2026): Recommends conditions.

Architectural Conservation Officer (24 September 2025, 06 March 2025): First Report recommends FI. Second Report states no objection to revised proposals.

Public Lighting (undated x 2): Email recommends FI. Second email refers to FI and recommends condition.

Broadband Officer (15 September 2025): Recommends condition

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Development Applications Unit, Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage (DAU, DHLGH) in a letter dated 24 September 2025 states it has examined the submitted Archaeological Impact Assessment Report. On the basis of the information in the report, the results of previous test excavations and the proposed archaeological mitigation (Archaeological Impact Assessment Report, Section 6, page 31) it is their recommendation that a planning condition pertaining to Archaeological Excavation and Monitoring of ground disturbance at construction stages within the development site be included in any grant of planning permission that may issue. The recommended condition is outlined in the report. It includes (at 2) that the archaeologist will assist in the integration of the archaeological mitigation into the Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).

Uisce Éireann (UÉ) in a letter dated 18 September 2025 states that a Confirmation of Feasibility (COF) has been issued to the applicant advising that water & wastewater connections are feasible subject to upgrades.

Water: The COF states a connection is feasible without infrastructure upgrade by Uisce Éireann. This CoF does not extend to developments fire flow requirements.

Wastewater: The COF states a connection is feasible subject to upgrades. There are constraints in the Uisce Éireann wastewater network. The applicant should identify areas in conjunction with the Local Authority, where stormwater separation /infiltration removal works to the wastewater network can be identified and carry out works to remove these flows, diverting them to surface water bodies or dedicated storm sewers which are not connected to any Uisce Éireann wastewater / combined sewers. Uisce Éireann will consider a new connection offset by storm separation works to remove storm runoff with a peak flow the equivalent of a 1 in 1 year storm event equalling no less than 3 times the peak dry weather flow for the new development for wastewater discharge.

The proposal indicates that Uisce Éireann assets are present on site. The Developer must demonstrate that proposed structures and works will not inhibit access for maintenance or endanger structural or functional integrity of the assets during and after the works. Drawings (showing clearance distances, changing to ground levels) and Method Statements should be included in the Detailed Design of the Development. A wayleave in favour of Uisce Éireann will be required over the assets that are not located within the Public Space.

Uisce Éireann requests any grant of permission be conditioned as follows:

The applicant shall enter into a Connection Agreement(s) with Uisce Éireann to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network and adhere to standards and conditions set out in that agreement.

The letter set out an UÉ standard condition.

Transportation Infrastructure Ireland (TII) in a letter dated 16 September 2025 requests that the planning authority has regard to provisions of official policy for development proposals as follows: proposals impacting national roads, to the DoECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities and relevant TII Publications and proposals impacting the existing light rail network, to TII's "Code of engineering practice for works on, near, or adjacent the Luas light rail system".

TII in a subsequent letter of 17 February 2026 states, with reference to FI submitted, that their position remains as set out in their letter of 16 September 2025.

Health Service Executive, National Environmental Health Service in a letter dated 23 September 2025 states this report refers only to those sections of the planning documents which are relevant to the HSE and have an Environmental Health impact. This application is assessed

- in the context of any potential significant public health effect from noise, dust, odour or potential of pollution of any surface or groundwater resource
- under the remit of Healthy Ireland and Irelands Climate Action Plan and exploring opportunities for the incorporation of initiatives regarding health gain or climate and sustainability

The letter describes the proposal with regard to access, services, universal design, climate & sustainability, lighting, construction and social infrastructure. It recommends:

- construction measures, as outlined in section 4 of the CEMP are included as a condition to protect the environment and in turn, protect public health
- proposed bin stores are provided with drainage and a means of hosing down.
- With regard to sustainable travel, that all safe walking and cycling routes should be identified within a radius of at least 5km around the development site along with information measures intended to promote the use of public transport such as the location of stops, routes, timetables, walking times to main public transport facilities and the promotion of travel tickets and passes

3.4. Observations to the Planning Authority

The Planner's Reports note that 51no. observations were received, and a further 11no. were received following receipt of Significant Further Information.

The main issues raised relate to traffic, road capacity and inadequate width of emergency and service vehicles, car parking, alternative access from Athboy Road, The Belfry roads taken in charge but not its open space, pressures on water and wastewater systems, drainage, impacts on The Belfry's green area, overdevelopment, overshadowing, overlooking, density, loss of amenity and impacts on residential amenities, height, out of character, flooding, impacts on ecology, noise, vibration and general disturbance, pressure on local services, lack of childcare and

community facilities, potential crime, property devaluation, impacts on archaeology, and conflicts with County Development Plan.

Issues raised in observations from 2no. elected members are summarised as follows:

Cllr. Ronan Moore:

Concerns relating to vehicular access through The Belfry, traffic hazard, conflict with A1 zoning objective, parking, lack of childcare provision, lack of details for long-term management of SuDS features, wastewater constraints, hazards remain despite RSA findings, revised swept path analysis for larger service and emergency vehicles required, and contrary to County Development Plan.

Cllr. Noel French:

Concerns relate to The Belfry was designed as a low-traffic residential cul-de-sac, traffic, parking, queries if necessary water, wastewater and community services infrastructure is in place, 3-storey duplex is out of scale and results in overlooking.

4.0 Planning History

Subject site:

The Planner's Report indicates that no planning history has been recorded on the application site.

Sites in the vicinity:

P.A. Ref. TA/20006: Permission granted for housing estate in 2002 on lands to west of Talbot Court. This estate relates to The Belfry.

Condition 34 states:

Vehicular and pedestrian connection through the estate to surrounding land to the south and west of the subject site, shall be made available at reasonable cost.

Reason: In the interest of orderly development.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027, as varied

The subject site and adjoining lands to the north, east and south are zoned A1 Existing Residential, 'to protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities'.

Lands directly to the west are outside the Trim settlement boundary, and are zoned RA Rural Area: 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.

Approx. 570m east of The Belfry there are two separate land parcels zoned C1 Mixed Use, located on the southern side of Athboy Road (R154). There is a supermarket on part of the more easterly of these 2 blocks.

Vol. 1 – Written Statement

Chapter 2: Core Strategy

Trim is a self-sustaining growth town in the Core Strategy.

Chapter 3: Settlement and Housing Strategy

Policy SH POL 7: Support creation of attractive residential developments with a range of housing options and appropriate provision of functional public and private open space that is consistent with standards and principles in Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines (2024), the associated Urban Design Manual and any subsequent Guidelines.

Vol. 2 – Written Statement and Maps for Settlements

Trim:

Section 6 Settlement and Housing: Limited access to national transport infrastructure including rail and motorway will constrain overall residential growth, promoting consolidation of Trim's compact, high amenity urban form. The growth of the settlement will be based around principles of compact, sustainable neighbourhoods that include a suitable mix of housing to meet the needs of people of all ages in locations within walking distance of services and facilities.

Section 9.0 Water Services Infrastructure Water:

The Trim Water Treatment Plant treats water abstracted from the Boyne and also serves Summerhill and Rathmolyon. There is currently spare capacity but this is limited. The Council in conjunction with Irish Water is currently progressing proposals for a Capital upgrade. It is anticipated that this will be realised within the period of this plan. There are also some network constraints.

Wastewater: Trim Wastewater Treatment Plant currently has spare capacity available but this is limited. Preliminary proposals for a Capital expansion have been prepared and can be progressed when additional capacity is required.

OBJECTIVE RT 2: Local distributor road link connecting Athboy Road to the local distributor road west of the Town Centre Expansion area, including a new bridge over the Boyne (long term objective) subject to AA and consultation (with) National Parks and Wildlife Services and Inland Fisheries Ireland.

Vol. 4: includes Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

The SFRA shows a limited area within the northern part of the subject site is Flood Zone A, and to a much lesser extent, Flood Zone B. These 2no. Flood Zones follow the route of Whitehall Stream. The remainder of the site is within Flood Zone C.

5.2 Meath County Council Climate Action Plan 2024-2029

This Climate Action Plan 2024-2029 has been prepared to create a low carbon and climate resilient County, by delivering and promoting best practice in climate action, at the local level. It is aligned to the Government's overall National Climate Objective, which seeks to pursue and achieve, by no later than end of 2050, the transition to a climate resilient, biodiversity rich, environmentally sustainable and climate neutral economy. The Climate Action and Low Carbon Development (Amendment) Act 2021 frames Ireland's legally binding climate ambition to deliver a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions of 51% by 2030. As part of this Climate Action Plan, Meath County Council has undertaken a Climate Change Risk Assessment and prepared a Baseline Emissions Inventory for the County and each of the nine Decarbonising Zones (DZs), one of which is Trim. It includes at Table 36 (The register of opportunities for Trim DZ) pathways for 51% emission reduction

A reduction target of -7 ktCO₂eq by 2030 (50%) and projected reduction of -8 ktCO₂eq (56%) is stated as based on achieving a target of 50% EVs (2,000 approx.) and a 10% decrease in carbon emissions due to increased Active Travel.

5.3 Project Ireland 2040 National Planning Framework (NPF)

Project Ireland 2040 National Planning Framework (NPF) 2018 is a high level strategic plan to shape the future growth and development of the country to 2040. It is focused on delivering 10 National Strategic Outcomes (NSOs). Relevant National Policy Objectives (NPOs) include:

NPO 4 Ensure the creation of attractive, liveable, well designed, high quality urban places that are home to diverse and integrated communities that enjoy a high quality of life and well-being.

NPO 33 Prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location.

The subsequent NPF First Revision, 2025 (see below) includes NPO 12 (reiterates NPO 4) and NPO 43 (reiterates NPO 33).

The NPF First Revision (2025) states, with regard to the Mid-East region of which Meath forms a part, that managing the challenges of future growth is critical to this regional area. A more balanced and sustainable pattern of development, with a greater focus on addressing employment creation, local infrastructure needs, including in particular social and community infrastructure in areas such as education and amenity, and addressing the legacy of rapid growth, must be prioritised. This means that housing development should be infrastructure led and primarily based on employment growth, accessibility by sustainable transport modes and quality of life, rather than unsustainable commuting patterns.

The NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements (July 2025) are Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines. The purpose of these Guidelines is that further to approval of the Revised NPF in April 2025, there is a need for development plans to update the NPF requirements in respect of housing. Appendix 1 outlines that Meath County Council's Development Plan has an annual housing requirement (housing

supply target) of 2,826. Its new annual housing growth requirement to 2034 is 2,942 and from 2035-2040 is 1,362.

5.4 Delivering Homes, Building Communities (2025)

This document aims to further accelerate the delivery of new homes, to deliver 300,000 by the end of 2030, which will be achieved through the individual and collective effort of the key delivery partners. Local authorities, together with Approved Housing Bodies, the Land Development Agency, and the construction sector, will be critical to delivering and enabling the delivery of the quantum of homes needed over the lifetime of the plan. This is a wide-ranging strategy, encompassing two pillars: Activating Supply and Supporting People.

5.5 Eastern and Midland Regional Assembly Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) 2019-2031

The Eastern and Midland Regional Assembly's Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) 2019-2031 supports the implementation of Project Ireland 2040 and the economic and climate policies of the Government, by providing a long-term strategic planning and economic framework for the region.

Trim is a Level 3 'Town And/Or District Centres & Sub-County Town Centres (Key Service Centres)' in the RSES; Table 6.1 Retail Hierarchy for the Region refers.

5.6 Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines and Other Relevant Guidance

Relevant Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines include:

- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines – 2024
- Design Standards for Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2025
- Childcare Facilities Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2001
- Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2007
- Regulation of Commercial Institutional Investment in Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2021

Other Relevant Guidance includes:

- Circular Letter PL 3/2016: Childcare facilities operating under the Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) Scheme, Department of Environment, Community and Local Government (2016)
- Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS), Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport and Department of Housing, Planning and Local Government, 2019 (updated)

5.7 Natural Heritage Designations

The site is not located within or adjacent to any European sites. The nearest European site are:

- River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC approx. 370m to south
- River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA approx. 450m to south

The nearest pNHA is Trim (001357), approx. 4km to east on the River Boyne (straight line distance).

6.0 EIA Screening

6.1. The application includes an EIA Screening Report. It confirms (at Section 3.1) that this Screening is drafted based on the requirements of EU Directive 2014/52/EU, and with reference to Schedules 5, 7 and 7A of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. It outlines (at Section 4.1.1) that the development would not fall within any classes of development listed in Part 1 of Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended), and (at Section 4.1.2) thresholds that are applicable under Part 2 are Class 10 Infrastructure Projects are as follows:

- (b) (i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units.
- (iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere.

6.2. The submitted Screening Report concludes that the proposed development does not trigger any thresholds for mandatory EIA/EIAR, and EIA Screening Assessment has determined that the characteristics of the proposed development are not considered significant, having regard to -

- Nature and scale of the proposal on a greenfield site located in the vicinity of a well-developed town, and no demolition works proposed
- Lands are zoned A1; Existing Residential
- Characteristics and sensitivities of the receiving environment are low – moderate
- SSFRA concluded the proposed development is suitable
- Proposal is not considered to cause direct or visual effects on archaeological monuments or architectural features in the vicinity
- Proposal is c.360m from nearest Natura 2000 site (River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC/SPA)
- NIS and EclA conclude that following mitigation measures, the proposed development will not adversely affect the integrity of any European site, valued habitats, designated sites, individual or groups of species either alone or in combination with other plans or projects
- It considers that given the scale and nature of the proposed development the overall risk posed to the environment is low with no significant effects anticipated.
- It considers an EIAR would not be required to be completed for this project

6.3. I have assessed the proposed development with regard to EIA screening at Appendix 1(a): Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening and Appendix 1(b): Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Determination.

6.4. Appendix 1(b) sets out (at Section D: Main Reasons and Considerations) the matters to which regard has been had in this assessment. The recommended conclusion of this assessment is that by reason of the nature, scale and location of the project, the development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment and that an EIA and the preparation of an EIAR would not, therefore, be required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1. 2no. third party appeals have been received from

- Padraig and Ann-Marie Farrell and Ann Gilsenan
- Karl Cleary

all of whom have indicated that they live at various locations within The Belfry housing estate to the north of the subject site. These appeals are discussed separately below.

7.1.2. ***Appeal from Padraig and Ann-Marie Farrell and Ann Gilsenan.***

The grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

- Provision of housing is a critical requirement. Request that additional conditions be added to permission

Misleading traffic increase impact on and significant increase in road safety hazards in The Belfry

- Applicant's traffic count in March 2025 forecasts that 7.9% traffic increase at junction with R154. However, traffic through The Belfry estate increases from 54% to 85%. That cannot facilitate safe access and egress to and from the proposed development. Information underestimates impact on The Belfry.
- Pedestrians, particularly young children accessing green area, will face greatly increased traffic safety risk. No measures in grant of permission to mitigate against these

The Belfry estates roads do not have capacity for increased traffic volume

- The Belfry roads are not wide enough for increased through flow traffic and its existing road junctions do not allow for adequate turning space of emergency and refuse vehicles
- Roads in existing The Belfry do not meet min. requirements of DMURS (2019)

Environmental impacts of proposed development on The Belfry

- Increased traffic will result in significant increase in noise levels
- Location of refuse bin places hazard of vermin adjacent to The Belfry. Any risk associated with waste will adversely impact residents of The Belfry

Negative community impact on The Belfry

- Traffic through-flow will physically dissect the community. Residents feel their community is being coerced to allow trespass under guise of providing housing. Efforts of residents and committee to encourage local involvement, enhance environmental quality and improve neighbourhood will be curtailed

Proposed solution

- Proposed development should be accessed from R154 and conditioned to ensure sufficient capacity for safe access and egress. This should have been considered by Council where Development Plan provided landlocked zoned land for residential development. Zoning has been ill-considered.
- Alternatively, a condition can be added to provide contributions in a proportionate cost, for a distributor road connecting R154 Athboy Road and the Kildalkey Road. In this proposal Council need to commit to the Applicant and the public, a deadline for the delivery of the distributor road.
- Request that ACP consider this appeal, allowing for proposed development but with alternative access from R154 and negating impact on The Belfry.

7.1.3. Appeal from Karl Cleary

The grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

- No access to some files/submissions during procedure
- No analysis of:
 - effects of loss of privacy, light and sunlight at No. 55 The Belfry
 - effects of shading at 55, 54 and 53 The Belfry
 - effects of potential structural damage to a timber frame house at No. 55 The Belfry, aged 22 years
 - removal and possible damage to 2 trees in and outside No. 55, regarding flooding of gardens and road as no drainage shore located
 - protected species habitats on both sides of boundary wall and no

reptilian habitat done.

- No allowance made for removal of parking spaces by opening up road
- No allowance made in traffic management plan for extra creche traffic. Claim that the 109a services local bus stop 27 times is not true. Bus service is poor
- Not enough trees to negate extra surface water caused by development. Science.com recommend 2-5 fully mature trees per house.
- A screenshot of a injured lizard is attached, and third party states he has since seen a breeding pair.

7.2. Applicant Response

The applicant's response to the grounds of appeal includes –

- Daylight Sunlight Analysis
- Response Memorandum prepared by consulting engineers firm
- Response Letter by developer
- Response Letter by forestry consultant

Key issues raised in the applicant's main response to the grounds of appeal include:

- Traffic information provided was not misleading. It references entrance junction with R154 increase in traffic as comprising 7.9%. This is not in dispute.
- TTA submitted with application demonstrates there is ample capacity in The Belfry access road and R154 junction to accommodate the proposal
- TRICS survey data used to generate the traffic by the proposed development. The development will increase only by a max. of 44no. trips (arrival and departures) in either peak hour periods which result in increased traffic of no more than 7.9% in either peak hour period. PICADY operational assessment carried out on existing access of The Belfry shows that these additional trips will have a negligible impact on the surrounding road network.
- Cites content of Response Memorandum prepared by consulting engineer submitted with appeal –

- Belfry Estate Road forms part of existing 3-arm priority junction with R154. Operational assessment of junction was undertaken using PICADY software for the proposed development scenario for years 2028, 2033 and 2043 (15 year design year)
- Proposal does not materially increase traffic movements within The Belfry. Assessment shows junction currently operates well within its effective capacity on all approaches during AM and PM peak periods, with negligible vehicle queues and minimal delays on approaches.
- In each of the assessed years, the addition of vehicular traffic generated is shown to have negligible impact on junction performance, adding no more than 0.1 PCU to any mean approach queue, and no more than 1.1 seconds to the mean vehicle delay on any approach
- Proposed access through The Belfry was always seen as appropriate route for development of the subject lands under Condition 34 of the parent permission for The Belfry: 'Vehicular and pedestrian connection through the estate to surrounding land to the south and west of the site, shall be made available at reasonable cost.' The Belfry was constructed to cater for additional development to south, i.e., the subject site
- Council's Transportation Department did not highlight any concerns relating to traffic data and/or assumptions used for proposed development
- FI Drawing G1116-CSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0022 demonstrates appropriate visibility splays at the existing green space junction within The Belfry, with unobstructed sightlines of 23m achieved
- Refers to Proposed Traffic Calming Measures along Belfry Estate and Road Safety Audit (Drawing No. G1116-CSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0022) and Road Safety Audit (consulting engineers FI response)
- Traffic calming and upgrade works are proposed within The Belfry (FI response) to ensure safety within estate, including stops signs, pedestrian crossings over raised tables at key junctions, increasing speed limit signage and upgraded public lighting standards. These works have been subjected to Stage 1/2 Road Safety Audit. FI Upgrade works/traffic calming measures will

further improve traffic safety in The Belfry.

- RSA recommendations are accepted by the design team in full. Applicant would invite a condition from Commission to require submission of detailed drawings and sections to P.A., prior to construction.
- (Cited) drawings demonstrate that refuse collection vehicle and emergency vehicle can access and traverse the site without encountering impediments
- Minimal width of Belfry estate's internal roads is 6.0m. Where on-street parking occurs on one side of carriageway, sufficient residual width remains to allow opposing traffic to pass
- Access road and internal roads within proposed development have been designed in accordance with DMURS – min. 5.5m wide carriageway and 2m footpath along one or either side of road network.
- Proposal will not have negative impact on local traffic nor increase traffic hazards for pedestrians, as a result of proposed traffic calming measures
- P.A. did not raise any objection to providing access to subject development through The Belfry during planning application process
- Regarding appellants' (Padraig and Ann-Marie Farrell and Ann Gilsenan) alternative access proposal for a separate access /distributor road from R154 to Kildalkey Road to the south, (as per consulting engineers' Response Memorandum), lands adjoining western boundary are unzoned, do not provide a suitable or viable long-term access route to facilitate residential development of the subject lands and it is not considered appropriate to pursue alternative access arrangements via these lands to connect to R154.
- Applicant's land ownership extends only as far as existing private properties at Crowpark and Kildalkey Road to south. There is no interface between applicant's lands and Crowpark and/or Kildalkey Road in order to provide access. No direct access can be provided at Crowpark or Kildalkey Road as there are other constraints such as hedgerows, ditches, etc.
- Temporary construction access is proposed from western lands to ensure that construction impacts on The Belfry are mitigated insofar as possible

Removal of parking spaces

- Proposal does not remove any existing formal/permitted car parking spaces in The Belfry resulting from opening up the boundary wall, nor remove or impact existing turning heads currently located at proposed entrances to the scheme.
- Consulting engineers' Response Memorandum includes
 - Area opposite No. 55 forms part of existing turning head and has not been altered
 - The Belfry, granted in 2005, would have been subject to relevant car parking standards in County Development Plan at that time. P.A. Ref. 25/60882 did not include any reduction in car parking in The Belfry

Creche

- Regarding grounds of appeal that creche traffic not accounted for in traffic management plan, refer to consulting engineer's Response Memorandum
 - 6no. car spaces for creche staff and 2no. drop-off spaces proposed
 - In worst-case scenario, assuming all staff arrive and depart during AM and PM peak periods, this would generate additional 6 vehicular trips during each peak hour. This traffic increase results in increased traffic of no more than 1.1%, in addition to residential trips, in either peak hour period. Such a level of traffic generation is considered negligible and not anticipated to have any material impact on existing background traffic conditions within surrounding road network.

Noise pollution

- Noise pollution arising from construction and operational traffic shall be within allowable limits, as set out in Outline CEMP
- Section 4.2 of Outline CEMP includes all construction activities will be carried out in compliance with BS 5228, Noise Control on Construction and Open Sites Part 1 and Comply with BS 6187 Code of Practice for Demolition
- Condition 16 requires updated CEMP to be approved prior to construction
- Construction traffic will by-pass The Belfry estate and access the lands via

lands to the west, under ownership of the applicant, from R154.

- It is not considered that the proposal will contribute to major noise pollution and/or general community disturbance during construction phase and appellants' concerns are overstated

Waste pollution

- Development Plan DM POL 16 and Policy Objective DM OBJ 53 require provision for bin storage and collection at ground floor level adjacent to apartment units and separate from the apartment building, where appropriate
- 2no. external refuse stores are proposed for duplex block, as far as possible from The Belfry residents, and comprise blockwork construction and galvanised cage mesh door. Chosen materials were considered to be durable, secure and should prevent rodent and/or odour pollution
- Management Company will oversee cleaning and maintenance of stores

Lack of tree provision

- Consulting engineers' Response Memorandum outlines
 - Surface water infrastructure has been designed to retain stormwater volumes predicted during extreme rainfall events, defined as volume of storm water generated during 1-in-100 year event, increased by 20% for predicted effects of climate change, therefore ensuring no flood events would take place within and in vicinity of development site.
 - Storm water design will fully comply with Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works Volume 6
 - Proposal employs an appropriate and sustainable urban drainage strategy which ensures surface water and stormwater can be satisfactorily attenuated and discharged
 - Proposed level of tree provision does not significantly affect efficiency/ success of any proposed surface/storm water strategy/ system design
 - Proposal comprises sufficient provision of tree planting and other shrub vegetation regardless

Protected species/habitat analysis

- EclA assessed potential for impact on protected species and habitats. Majority of habitats to be removed comprise improved agricultural grassland of low ecological value. Habitats of value - hedgerows, drainage ditches and Whitehall Stream – are to be retained and enhanced with only minor sections proposed for removal
- EclA Section 3.4.1 relates to Flora and Fauna. Selected content is cited
 - Regarding amphibians, including common frog and smooth newt, drainage ditches were largely dry during site visits and heavily overgrown. This habitat is not unique to the site and insignificant in wider local context. Majority of drainage ditches are to be retained.
 - Majority of hedgerows are to be retained and enhanced. Only small section to be removed to facilitate internal access road crossing
- EclA Section 6 includes mitigation measures to avoid potential disturbance /impacts to protected species/habitats such as vegetation removal is outside main bird nesting season and that pollution control measures are adhered to
- NIS assessed potential for adverse effects on European sites and measures have been designed to avoid identified potential impacts. NIS concludes that proposal will not adversely affect integrity of any European site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects
- Regarding stated common lizard, it is applicant's ecologist's profession opinion that species shown is smooth newt. Consultant ecologist concludes –
 - Based on current conservation status of common lizard and smooth newt, listed as 'Least concern' in Irish Red Data Book, the habitats within the site and abundance of such habitats in wider landscape, no significant negative effects on either of these species is predicted
- EclA includes mitigation measures for in-stream works during construction phase which will ensure protection of potential newt habitats
- P.A.'s Ecologist Report (Appendix 4) concludes that project is not likely to have significant effect on QIs of any European sites in light of their

conservation objectives either alone or in combination with others plans or projects, and has no objection to the proposal subject to condition

Community Impacts

Social dissection:

- Proposal delivers 82no. residential units, and achieves a net density of 32.3uph which is within indicative range of 30-50uph for a large town (5,000+ population) in Compact Settlement Guidelines, 2024. It achieves appropriate density whilst remaining cognisant of existing residential development
- Delivery of 82no. residential units is significant in context of national housing crisis and strategic imperative to deliver housing under NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirement Guidelines (2025) and Government's Delivering Homes, Building Communities 2025-2030
- Benefits including contributing to existing green recreational spaces in the area by proposed c.0.492ha (c.19%of total site area) for public open space, of which c.0241ha adjoins the existing green space at The Belfry
- Removal of boundary wall is proposed to merge the green areas for a larger and high quality recreational asset. Only 4no. trees are to be removed (i.e., access). Proposal will contribute positively to recreational amenity of the area
- Creche is proposed in central western portion of the site, which is considered appropriate for safe and accessible set-down and drop-off via walking, cycling or by car and owing to its proximity to open space and public play spaces. Capacity for c.19 spaces is sufficient to cater for potential childcare demand from proposal, in line with Childcare Guidelines, 2001. Additional spaces may be realised when an operator comes on stream, which will contribute to local creche capacity in Trim.
- Proposed (at FI stage) traffic calming and upgrade works within The Belfry will further improve and enhance current traffic situation to The Belfry estate.
- The Belfry residents will benefit from significant planning gain in terms of provision of additional green open spaces, creche and enhanced traffic-calming measures. It is not accepted that the proposed development will contribute to any form of social dissection amongst local residents

Provision of housing

- Applicant owns subject lands. Assertions that applicant is trespassing on lands is entirely refuted. Applicant is within their rights to seek planning permission for residential development on A1 zoned lands
- Applicant acknowledges residents' concerns in relation to issues including traffic/access, overlooking, daylight/sunlight provision. Applicant made significant changes at FI stage to include decreasing height of proposed duplex block. Applicant provided robust responses to all 55no. third party submissions as part of FI response. Applicant has engaged with residents' concerns and made appropriate amendments
- Increased housing output is required across Ireland. Owing to A1 zoning, development of these lands for residential is considered appropriate and a do-nothing scenario would constitute significant underutilisation of zoned lands

Daylight/sunlight and privacy impacts

- Sunlight/Daylight Impact Analysis submitted with appeal response demonstrates that proposal will not impact on existing sunlight/daylight amenity enjoyed by residents of No.s 53, 54 and 55 The Belfry
- Analysis demonstrates that rear gardens at No.s 53, 54 and 55 in receipt of 'at least two hours of sunlight on 21 March' will not reduce to less than 0.80 times of their former value, in line with BRE guidelines. These rear gardens will not experience any reduction in daylight or sunlight on 21 March (Spring equinox)
- Proposal complies with SPPR 1 of Compact Settlement Guidelines in providing minimum 16m separation distance between existing and proposed upper floor habitable rooms. Some mitigation measures such as obscure glazing and specific orientation of dwellings are employed to ensure existing privacy and amenity of local residents is maintained
- Refers to architect's document that
 - Eastern façade of proposed house no. 72 has small windows serving bedrooms 2 and 3. Its rear façade is 5.2m from the rear façade of No. 55 The Belfry. Overlooking of rear garden will be minimal

- No.s 53, 54 and 55 each have a single storey extension on their expose gable. Any views from No. 72's eastern façade into rear garden of 55 The Belfry are funnelled along a narrow diagonal, and would not impact on the more private zone that adjoins its rear facade
- Appeal response Daylight/Sunlight Analysis complements that submitted with FI response, which demonstrated that garden areas of 39 Talbot Court and 56 The Belfry would not be negatively impacted by 2-storey duplex block.
- Proposal will not result in daylight/sunlight and/or privacy impacts to adjoining residential dwellings and/or private areas

Procedural issues

- Applicant's agent monitored P.A.'s online case file (P.A. Ref. 25/60882) on a weekly basis during application process between August 2025 and April 2026, and at no point noted that access to any files/submissions were restricted
- P.A. made all documentation relating to case available for inspection by the public in a timely manner, insofar as practicable
- In preparing appeal response, agent examined P.A.'s online case in May 2026. It confirmed all relevant documents and appeal were publicly available

Structural analysis

- Refers to consulting engineers' Response Memorandum
 - As part of planning submission, there is no requirement to carry out structural analysis for the development and any other development. Analysis shall be carried out prior to construction to ensure there is no impact on adjacent structures. House No. 55 is approx. 6m from site boundary and will have no impact during construction.
 - Development shall be constructed as per standard methodology
 - Refers to Outline CEMP. Noise, vibration arising from construction and operational traffic shall be within allowable limits. Mitigation measures will be implemented where appropriate. It is not considered that proposal will contribute to major noise, vibration and/or general disturbance impacts.

- Condition 16 requires applicant to submit updated CEMP for written approval prior to construction, to include operational controls for vibration
- Appropriate vibration controls have been put in CEMP. It is not considered that proposal will impact structural integrity of existing development

Removal/damage to trees

- Refers to forestry consultant's response letter which includes
 - 4no. trees in The Belfry within footprint of proposed road are for removal: arboricultural impact drawing TATH005-A-DR-CMK-ARB-102
 - Tree in appellant's garden is a small specimen, separated from existing road by wall. No roots are likely to extend beneath wall foundations. Not considered likely that it will be negatively impacted by works
- Arboricultural Assessment and Impact Report recommends tree protection fencing be installed following tree removal and prior to mobilisation of site plant and infrastructure, and that a project arborist be employed to monitor tree protection and provide advice
- It is not considered that proposal will have significant negative impact on local environment in relation to tree protection
- Refers to consulting engineers' Response Memorandum
 - Removal of 2no. trees does not impact surface water infrastructure of permitted development. 74no. trees, 53no. feature shrubs and 1,240sqm of planting and 252m of native hedgerow are proposed. Project includes provision of 2no. attenuation features and 1150sqm recreation space.
 - Surface water information has been designed to retain stormwater volumes predicted during extreme rainfall events
 - SSFRA and hydrological modelling assessment concluded that proposal will not give rise to flooding within or surrounding the site
- Environment Flooding – Surface Water Section's Planning Report (reproduced at Appendix 5) does not indicate any concerns

- Applicant has assessed trees in question and has had due regard to surface water management of the site and wider local area

7.3. Planning Authority Response

The P.A.'s response to the grounds of appeal briefly describes the proposed development and states

- Trim is a self-sustaining growth town in Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027. The site is zoned A1 Existing Residential: to protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities. It is not located within a Flood Zone, ACA and does not feature any protected structures. There are no National Monuments identified within the subject site. The site is located in the Boyne Valley Landscape Character Area (LCA 5) which has exceptional value and high sensitivity.
- The P.A. has reviewed the issues raised in the appeal submission and is satisfied that these issues have been substantively addressed in the planning reports dated 14 October 2025 and 08 April 2026. An Coimisiún is requested to uphold the P.A.'s decision to grant permission.

7.4. Observations

7.4.1. 2no. observations have been received from Siobhan Byrne and Sami Ensaf.

7.4.2. The observation from Siobhan Byrne, of The Belfry housing estate, includes a letter from a separate resident of The Belfry. The main issues raised in the observation may be summarised as follows:

Premature due to inadequate water infrastructure.

- Trim experienced in excess of 100 water outages within past year. Completed residential estate in town remains unconnected to water services. Complaint findings confirm network pressure failures, pipe rupture and emergency tanker deployment. Contrary to Section 34(2) of Planning and Development Act 2000 and Development Plan – infrastructure and servicing policies
- ABP Ref. PL27.246077 refused due to insufficient wastewater capacity. ABP Ref. PL065.305275 refused where infrastructure delivery was uncertain

Traffic hazard

- Proposal to route traffic from 85 dwellings through existing estate contravenes DMURS (2013) principles, conflicts with A1 zoning objective and creates significant risk to pedestrians, children and emergency services. Documented inability of ambulances to access properties
- Applicant controls adjoining lands with frontage to Athboy Road (R154) but no direct access provided.
- ABP Ref. PL29N.307983 refused where access arrangements created traffic hazard. ABP Ref. PL06D.304305 refused due to substandard access design

Material contravention: Site is zoned A1 Existing Residential: to protect and enhance residential amenity. It introduces through traffic into quiet estate, alters fundamental character of the area and reduces safety and quality of life. Represents material contravention of Development Plan

Scale and Height

- 3-storey structure is out of character and incompatible with 2-storey homes. Sets precedent for further intensification and overdevelopment
- ABP Ref. PL06F. 248821 refused due to excessive height and visual impact
ABP Ref. PL29S. 301798: Overdevelopment and precedent considered valid refusal grounds

Loss of daylight, overshadowing and residential amenity: Proposal will cause loss of sunlight, impact solar panel performance and increase reliance on artificial lighting. Contrary to Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines (2009)

Flood risk and unsuitable ground conditions: Evidence indicates site is low-lying, prone to waterlogging and functionally part of a flood-prone area. Contrary to Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines. ABP Ref. PL 26S.248197 refused where flood risk not adequately addressed

Failure to provide social infrastructure: Failure to demonstrate capacity for schools, healthcare and childcare. Any creche will generate intense peak-hour traffic. Contrary to Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines (2009) and Childcare Facilities Guidelines (2001)

Environmental and Ecological Impacts: Site contains protected species and established ecological habitats. No site-specific ecological assessment provided. Contrary to Wildlife Acts 1976-2023 and EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC). Relevant case law is Sweetman v An Bord Pleanála (CIEU, C-258/11) – Strict protection of habitats

Pollution, construction impacts and quality of life: Proposal inadequately addresses dust and air pollution, noise and vibration, light pollution and water contamination risks. Contrary to EU Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC) and EPA guidance.

Infrastructure deficiencies: No confirmed capacity for electricity supply, drainage systems and long-term SuDS maintenance. Represents unsustainable and piecemeal development

Cumulative impact and failure: Development fails to account for existing infrastructure collapse and cumulative strain on Trim. Contrary to NPF (Project Ireland 2040) and core principle of proper planning

Relief sought: Request that P.A.'s decision is set aside and refuse permission for proposal in its current form

This is not opposition to housing

Submission attaches information regarding cul de sac status in original plans for The Belfry. Condition 5 states cul-de-sacs shall be provided with rectangular turning bays adequate to cater for refuse and service vehicles to comply with R.T. 181.

Letter from separate The Belfry resident included in observation outlines similar issues to the above, and includes

- Large vehicles have to reverse down cul-de-sac due to nowhere to turn
- Archaeology Report: a number of small test trenches uncovered finds in the field and more in-depth archaeological analysis is needed

7.4.3. The main issues raised in the observation from Sami Ensaf, of The Belfry housing estate, are summarised as follows –

- Refers to documents submitted in support of objection

Traffic and environmental considerations

- Requests that potential impact of material increase in vehicular movements, approx. 600-1000 additional vehicle trips, on local road network be considered
- Road traffic incident resulting in tree in The Belfry being knocked over was reportedly recorded in October 2025, and appears knocked down again on 02 June 2026
- There may be constraints affecting access for emergency services. Road width limitations and parked vehicles could restrict access
- Slower moving traffic may increase local vehicle emissions

Overshadowing, daylight and sunlight impacts: Proposal may give rise to overshadowing and reduction in daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties and amenity spaces. Clarification sought as to whether detailed assessment carried out, methodology used and how any impacts were mitigated

Water quality: Clarification requested as to whether water supply meets expected domestic standards with supplementary consumer-level treatment and if any costs implications for residents have been considered

Scale, height and visual character: Not evident how variation in scale, height and massing assessed in terms of visual impact, streetscape integration and compatibility with established character of the area

Creche: Not evident how creche provision aligns with current permission and not clear whether TTA accounts for this use

One-way system: Proposal appears to include management company and one-way traffic system. Further clarity warranted as to how one-way system will operate

Site boundary: Not evident whether boundary demarcations, ownership responsibilities and future management arrangements have been clearly defined

Land title: Council appears to have assumed responsibility for the estate roads. Steps may be underway to regularise or transfer title.

Cumulative development: Not evident whether permitted demolition of a residential property in wider area has been considered

Emergency access: It may be appropriate for relevant authorities including An Garda Síochána and local fire/emergency services to confirm if current and proposed site

layout and access remain suitable from safety and emergency response perspective

Structural considerations: Proposal appears to involve brick or masonry elements at ground level. There may be a question as to whether existing ground conditions and supporting infrastructure are suitable for increased structural loading

Flood risk: Parts of the area have medium to high flood risk. Alterations in surface levels, drainage patterns or permeability may affect water movement, flow direction or ground saturation on neighbouring properties

Public safety: Unfenced stream may create potential fall and safety risk to the public

Public health: Increased moisture levels with unmanaged boundary vegetation may contribute to conditions favourable to ticks and similar pests

Archaeology and flood risk: Archaeological Assessment appears to identify features which may be relevant to historical and tourism value. Clarification sought on reference to flood plains, extent of flood risk, compliance with flood risk management and planning guidance and implications for future insurability of properties.

7.5. Further Responses

7.5.1. A further submission was received from Mr. Karl Clearly (third party) on 02 June 2026. The main issues raised in the submission may be summarised as follows:

- The third party makes some observations on the other appeal submitted.
- PICADY model used in commissioned traffic submission can be flawed if not used correctly. It appears data was inputted with no on street parking used which invalidates the traffic model
- Proposal will cause traffic congestion, leading to serious safety issues, and result in increased pressure to join R154, increasing likelihood of an accident
- Failure to acknowledge increased traffic through estate from creche and service deliveries. Council took over creche at estate entrance and converted it into 3 housing units. It was obviously not viable
- Opening up cul de sacs and proposed pedestrian access will reduce parking by 6-12 ad hoc spaces, further complicating traffic movements
- Proposed development is stated as flood plains in archaeologist's findings.

This can impact house insurance and chances of getting a mortgage.

Underlying issues will present in the future with increasing rainfall

- Increased traffic and removal of boundary wall giving access to stream and ditches than can become a raging torrent is totally unacceptable.
- Stream flows into River Boyne, a SAC and SPA, deemed At Risk by EPA. Fear that Inland Fisheries' efforts protecting and respawning salmon in Boyne will be in vain. Mitigation efforts will not be sufficient. Tarmacadam and cement are toxic with high pH value.
- Not enough of wildlife, reptilian, mollusc and flora surveys conducted. Adjoining Butterstream Gardens is a haven for all sorts of species and overspill has migrated to surrounding areas.

8.0 **Assessment**

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

- Legal and Procedural
- Traffic and Transportation
- Surface Water Infrastructure and Flood Risk
- Impacts on Residential and Visual Amenities
- Ecology
- Material Contravention
- Other Issues –
 - Planning Decisions Cited in Observation
 - Planning Authority's Condition No. 29
 - Planning Authority's Condition No.s 4 and 6.

8.2. Legal and Procedural

Availability of File

- 8.2.1. With regard to concerns raised in the grounds of appeal (Karl Cleary) that there was no access to some files/submissions during procedure, I note that no details regarding the stated lack of access are outlined.
- 8.2.2. Procedural matters during the planning application process, including the availability of files for viewing by the public, are a matter for the planning authority. The planning authority has not raised any concerns in this regard, and the planning authority's response to the grounds of appeal does not comment on this matter specifically.
- 8.2.3. The applicant's response to the grounds of appeal outlines that they monitored the online case file (P.A. Ref. 25/60882) on a weekly basis during application process between August 2025 and April 2026, at no point noted that access to any files/submissions was restricted, and all documentation was made available for inspection in a timely manner insofar as practicable. In preparing the appeal response in May 2026, they examined the online case, which confirmed all relevant documents and appeal were publicly available.
- 8.2.4. On the basis of the information on file, I consider that no specific breach relating to lack of access to information has been identified. Having regard to the applicant's response to the grounds of appeal, I am satisfied that it has been adequately demonstrated that online information relating to the planning application was available during the application process.

Title

- 8.2.5. The observation (Sami Ensaf) outlines that the Council appears to have assumed responsibility for the estate roads, and steps may be underway to transfer title. In this regard I note that a letter of consent from Meath County Council was lodged with the application.
- 8.2.6. The letter outlines that Meath County Council as the body having effective control over the lands at The Belfry, Athboy Road, consents to the architects making a planning application for 87no. residential units, and cites a folio number pertaining to an attached map. It states that if planning is granted, it would be subject to a road opening licence application. The relevant areas indicated on the attached mapping

are 2no. minor areas at each of the existing 2no. cul-de-sacs in The Belfry, at which it is proposed to create a vehicular entrance.

- 8.2.7. Internal Transportation Department reports do not appear to specify if The Belfry has been taken in charge. Notwithstanding this, planning authority has not raised any issues with regard to the principle of the proposed development being accessed through The Belfry housing estate to its north, nor with regard to the principle of proposed traffic calming measures being carried out within this existing adjoining housing estate (as detailed further in the following Section 8.3 Traffic and Transportation).
- 8.2.8. Separately, the planning application form also outlines that a letter of consent from an adjoining landowner to the east is included with the application.
- 8.2.9. In terms of legal interest, I am satisfied that the applicant has provided sufficient evidence of their legal intent to make an application. Any further dispute is considered a civil matter and are outside the scope of the planning appeal. In any case, I note that should the Commission be minded to grant, Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, would apply, which states that a person shall not be entitled solely by reason of a permission under this section to carry out any development.

8.3. **Traffic and Transportation**

General

- 8.3.1. I note that the proposed development, as amended by SFI, would by reason of the provision of 82no. residential units, 1no. creche and the associated 161no. parking spaces, result in a considerable change to the current site context of The Belfry to its north, given that cul-de-sacs within the existing estate do not currently provide for any permeability to the undeveloped, zoned lands at the subject site to its south.
- 8.3.2. Following receipt of the SFI response, the Second Transportation Department report (23 March 2026) considered
- the proposed parking provision adequate,
 - Revised 'Swept Path Analysis Fire Tender and Refuse Truck' drawing demonstrates an emergency fire tender/response vehicle and refuse truck can access and traverse the site, including road nos. 01, 03 and 04, without

encountering impediments

- Revised 'Proposed Road Layout' drawing (no. G116-CSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0002) demonstrates ramps/raised tables in accordance with Section 6.13 of Traffic Management Guidelines. A number of traffic calming and upgrade works are proposed within The Belfry Estate as part of FI response, including provision of pedestrian crossings at some key junctions. The proposed traffic calming works have been subjected to a Stage1/2 Road Safety Audit with all recommendations as part of the audit incorporated within the final Belfry Estate traffic-calming proposals.

The report states no objection subject to 8no. conditions

- 8.3.3. In terms of detail, the decision to grant contains Advice Notes, including (iv) Applicant/Developer shall make all necessary arrangements to obtain Road Opening License(s) from Meath County Council in respect of all openings in public areas, shall pay Road Opening License fees and Road Restoration costs and shall abide by all conditions in said license(s).
- 8.3.4. With regard to traffic impacts arising from the proposed development, I consider that the main issues to be assessed are (a) capacity of the existing T-junction of The Belfry with R154 (Athboy Road), (b) impacts within The Belfry estate and (c) traffic and transportation within the proposed scheme

(a) Capacity of the existing The Belfry junction with R154 (Athboy Road)

- 8.3.5. The applicant's response to the grounds of appeal states that
- TRICS survey data shows the traffic generated will increase only by a max. of 44no. trips (arrival and departures) in either peak hour periods (AM and PM) which result in increased traffic of no more than 7.9% in either peak hour period. PICADY operational assessment carried out on The Belfry's Existing access shows that these additional trips will have a negligible impact on the surrounding road network.
 - this junction (i.e., junction of The Belfry to R154) currently operates well within its effective capacity on all approaches in the AM and PM peak period, and junction approaches are shown to continue operating within their effective capacities past 2043.

- In each of the years assessed (2028, 2035 and 2043), the addition of vehicular traffic generated is shown to have a negligible impact on junction performance, adding no more than 0.1 PCU (passenger car equivalent) to any mean approach queue, and no more than 1.1 seconds to the mean vehicle delay on any approach.
- While the proposal will slightly increase traffic, the existing road network within The Belfry and the Athboy Road junction have ample capacity to cater for the proposed development
- Proposed access through The Belfry was always seen as the appropriate route for the development of the subject lands under Condition 34 of the parent permission

8.3.6. I note that the applicant's response to the grounds of appeal does not appear to cite the relevant planning application reference number relating to Condition 34 for The Belfry. However, P.A. Ref. TA20006 (and associated Condition 34) is cited in the Planning Report lodged with the application as being the relevant planning permission pertaining to The Belfry. This is further outlined at Section 4.0 Planning History of this report. In addition, lodged Planning Report also refers to an amendment planning application, whereby Condition 20 reiterates Condition 34 of the original application.

8.3.7. In terms of detail, the Traffic and Transport Assessment (TTA) lodged with the application indicates that the peak hour traffic flows were found to be between 08:00 and 09:00 (AM peak hour) and between 16:15 and 17:15 (PM peak hour).

8.3.8. Having regard to the information outlined above, I note that the proposed development would result in an increase in traffic generated at this location, thereby increasing traffic movements at the junction of The Belfry and the R154. However, having regard to the information outlined above, I consider that it has been adequately demonstrated that the proposed development, in combination with existing The Belfry housing estate, would not adversely impact on the operation of the T-junction. I consider that the proposed development would be acceptable in this regard.

8.3.9. In terms of detail, I note that the SFI drawing titled Proposed Traffic Calming Measures along Belfry Estate and Road Safety Audit Response Drawing (Drawing

No. G116-CSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0022 (attached to consulting engineer's responses to traffic related observations) shows proposed tactile paving either side of the existing T-junction to R154, and a ramp is proposed within The Belfry, a short distance south of the T-junction with R154. I consider that this pedestrian improvement and the provision of the new traffic calming measures would be acceptable.

- 8.3.10. With regard to concerns raised in the ground of appeal that the claim that the 109a services local bus stop 27 times is not true, I note the content of the Mobility Management Plan (MMP) lodged with the application. The MMP outlines (at Section 3.2) that bus stops within a 15-minute walk of the site are served by a 5no. bus routes served by Bus Éireann and TFI Local link network. Table 1 outlines that that Bus Route 109A (operated by Bus Éireann) to DCU-Navan-Kells has 24no. weekday services.
- 8.3.11. I have viewed the Bus Éireann website (www.buseireann.ie, accessed 03 September 2026), and note that Route 109A runs from Dublin (Bus Áras) to Kells via Navan. No connection to Trim is indicated on Route 109A.
- 8.3.12. Separately, the following routes to/from Trim viewed on this website include -
- Route 109D: Trim to DCU: to take effect on 07 September 2026. There is one service only to operate to/from Trim per day (AM departure and PM return) (Monday to Friday only).
 - Route 109B: Dublin to Athboy via Trim and Dunshaughlin. It has 7no. Dublin outbound services per weekday, and 7no. from Trim.
- 8.3.13. On the basis of the information viewed on the Bus Éireann website outlined above with regard to Route 109A, this information would appear to be inconsistent with the reference in the MMP that Route 109A is within a 15minute walk of the site. In this regard I note that the MMP is dated 30 July 2025, and was lodged with the application on 21 August 2025.
- 8.3.14. Separate to the information lodged with the application, I have also viewed the NTA's PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level), (www.nationaltransport.ie, accessed 07 September 2026). I note that almost the entire subject site is indicated as Low Level of Service between 7am and 8am, with the northern part of The Belfry also indicated as such.

- 8.3.15. Accordingly, based on the information on file, and also as viewed on the NTA's website described above, I consider that it has not been adequately demonstrated that the subject site would be well served by public transport in the early morning timeframe. However, I note the location of the subject on zoned, serviced land, within walking distance to Trim town centre, and consider that the principle of a residential scheme at this edge of town location is acceptable in principle.
- 8.3.16. It is recommended that should the Commission be minded to grant, that a revised MMP be submitted, to include any relevant public transport services in the vicinity of the subject site. I consider that this matter can be adequately addressed by way of condition. For completeness, I draw to the Commission's attention that the submission from the HSE seeks information measures to be implemented to promote sustainable travel. The recommended inclusion of a condition requiring a revised MMP would address the principal issues raised in this regard.
- 8.3.17. With regard to the proposed alternative access from lands to the west suggested in the grounds of appeal (Padraig and Ann-Marie Farrell and Ann Gilsenan), I note that these lands are indicated to be within the ownership of the applicant. However, these adjoining greenfield lands are directly outside the Trim settlement boundary, and are indicted to be RA Rural Area in the Development Plan, whereby it is an objective to protect and promote in a balanced way, the development of agriculture, forestry and sustainable rural-related enterprise, community facilities, biodiversity, the rural landscape, and the built and cultural heritage.
- 8.3.18. I note that 'Residential (Subject to compliance with the Rural Settlement Strategy)' is a Permitted Use on this land use zoning. However, the nature of the proposed development does not relate to the Rural Settlement Strategy outlined elsewhere in the Development Plan, and the provision of a vehicular access to serve the proposed residential development to south of The Belfry would not be in compliance with the objective to protect and promote the development of agriculture, rural-related enterprise and other related matters. I note that 2no. 5.5m wide vehicular routes within the proposed scheme are shown to terminate at the western site boundary, namely Roads 01 and 04. Notwithstanding that these 2no. roads adjoin the western site boundary and that lands to the west are shown to be in the ownership of the applicant, it remains that as RA zoned lands to the west are outside the Trim settlement boundary, I do not consider that the provision of a vehicular entrance on

RA zoned lands to the west of the site would be appropriate in this instance.

- 8.3.19. For completeness, I note that a temporary construction access is proposed through these lands. Given the temporary, short-term nature of the construction phase, I consider that vehicular access through these adjoining lands would be acceptable for this purpose.

(b) Impacts within The Belfry estate

- 8.3.20. The grounds of appeal (Padraig and Ann-Marie Farrell and Ann Gilsenan) include that roads in The Belfry do not meet minimum requirements of DMURS and (Karl Cleary) that no allowance (is) made for removal of parking spaces by opening up the road.
- 8.3.21. On site visit I noted that there is a 30km/hr speed limit sign located just within (south of) the entrance to The Belfry from Athboy Road. A second speed limit sign stating 15km/hr is in place a short distance further south on the main internal access road leading towards the central open space area. A third speed limit sign (15km/hr) is located at the northern end of the open space area. A small number of cars were parked along the northern edge of the open space, and some on-street parking was noted elsewhere in the estate.
- 8.3.22. SFI Drawing No. G116-CSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0022 (referenced above) shows a range of proposed traffic calming measures within The Belfry. These largely comprise 3no. ramps, 4no. stops signs, 1no. cul-de-sac sign, tactile paving on footpaths at pedestrian crossing points and new road marking. Raised entry is indicated within the red line boundary of the application site, at the 2no. points of vehicular entry to the subject site from The Belfry. No new traffic signage is proposed at the entrance to scheme.
- 8.3.23. The applicant's response to the grounds of appeal outlines that the measures include upgraded public lighting standards, as set out in Existing Public Lighting Upgrade Works (Drawing No. 3316-ENX-XXXX-XX-DR-E01-006001) and Outdoor Lighting Report submitted as FI, and have been subjected to Stage 1 RSA. It states that as the minimum width of the internal road network within The Belfry is 6m, where on-street parking occurs along one side of the carriageway, sufficient residual width remains to allow opposing traffic to pass safely through sections where cars are parked on-street.

- 8.3.24. Drawing No. G116-CSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0022 shows annotated dimensions for roads widths within The Belfry. These include 7.5m width along the main internal access route near the site entrance, and 6m width in the existing cul-de-sacs either side (east and west) of the main open space within The Belfry. There is a footpath along the roadside frontage of the existing houses. No car parking spaces are delineated along either of these cul-de-sacs or their associated turning areas.
- 8.3.25. With regard to concerns raised relating to loss of car parking spaces, given that no formalised car parking spaces are shown on the 2no. existing cul-de-sacs in The Belfry, through which the proposed development would be accessed, I do not consider that it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would result in the removal of any permitted parking spaces.
- 8.3.26. I note the content of DMURS at Section 4.4.1 Carriageway Widths and Fig. 4.55 Carriageway Widths. It includes that in new designs the standard lane width on Arterial and Link Streets should lie in the range of 2.75m to 3.5m, the preferred values are 3.0m and 3.25m, and the selected values will depend on a number of criteria. The standard carriageway width on Local streets should be between 5m-5.5m.
- 8.3.27. I note that The Belfry pre-dates DMURS (2013, revised 2019). However, notwithstanding this, I note the range of traffic measures proposed (by way of SFI) in The Belfry.
- 8.3.28. I consider that the vehicular routes within The Belfry come within the meaning of Local Streets, described in DMURS as streets that provide access within communities and to Arterial and Link Streets. While road widths within The Belfry exceed the 5.5m cited in DMURS for Local Streets, given that the traffic calming measures with The Belfry include ramps and traffic signage, I consider that proposed development would not adversely impact on The Belfry in terms of traffic safety.
- 8.3.29. In terms of detail, I note that DMURS Table 4.2 shows that for a design speed of 30km/hr, the Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) is 23m. The applicant's response to the grounds of appeal states that unobstructed sightlines of 23m can be achieved at the existing green space junction within The Belfry. I note that this is indicated at the cul-de-sac route east of the open space, and consider that this is acceptable; Drawing No. G116-CSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0022 refers.

- 8.3.30. I consider that the proposed traffic calming measures within The Belfry to be acceptable, and would adequately address concerns raised in the grounds of appeal regarding traffic impacts within this existing estate.
- 8.3.31. For completeness, I note that a proposed 20km/hr speed limit sign is shown on SFI drawing titled Proposed Traffic Calming Measures (Drawing G116-CSC-XX-XX-SK-C-0007; attached to the consulting engineer's responses to traffic related observations, and referenced in the Safety Audit Feedback Form contained therein). This 20km/hr sign is discussed in the SFI Safety Audit Feedback Form as being a conflicting speed limit, whereby it is recommended that it be removed. I note that the 20km/hr sign is not included in the separate SFI Drawing No. G116-CSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0022. Accordingly, I consider that the provision of an additional 20km/hr sign is not required, and that this matter is adequately addressed in the SFI plans and particulars on file.
- 8.3.32. On the basis of the information on file, I am satisfied that the proposed traffic calming measures within The Belfry would be acceptable, that the proposed development would not result in removal of permitted parking spaces within this existing housing estate, and that the proposed would be acceptable in terms of traffic impacts on The Belfry.

(c) Traffic and transportation within the proposed scheme

Emergency and Refuse Vehicles

- 8.3.33. With regard to concerns raised in the grounds of appeal relating to lack of adequate turning space for emergency and refuse vehicles, the applicant's response to the grounds of appeal refers to the SFI revised Swept Path Analysis Fire Tender and Refuse Truck drawing, which demonstrate that refuse collection and emergency vehicles can access and traverse the site without encountering impediments.
- 8.3.34. I note the detail shown on Drawing No. G116-CSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0021 (attached to SFI response document by consulting engineer This drawing shows a 9.01m long (2.45m wide) Medium Refuse Vehicle and a 8.6m long (2.55m wide) pumping appliance, and shows forward and reversing manoeuvres for these vehicles. The vehicular manoeuvres are shown in the content of no on-street parking.
- 8.3.35. I consider that the information provided in respect of vehicular access for emergency

vehicles and refuse collection are acceptable.

Creche Traffic

- 8.3.36. With regard to concerns raised in grounds of appeal (Karl Cleary) that no allowance was made in the traffic management plan for extra creche traffic, the applicant's response to the grounds of appeals outlines that in a worst-case scenario, an additional 6 vehicular trips would be generated each peak hour, resulting in increased traffic of no more than 1.1%, in addition to residential trips.
- 8.3.37. I note that 6no. car parking spaces for creche staff and 2no. drop-off spaces are proposed in the SFI response, described as being within the creche complex. The 'creche complex' would have an open character to the east, given that it is accessed via a 5.5m wide vehicular access and a total of 8no. spaces are proposed on the approach to same. The proposed creche comprises 125sqm. It is outlined that the proposed creche will cater for c.19no. children, and the type of services offered, number of staff and hours of operation will become realised when an operator for the facility comes on stream; Planning consultant's SFI response report; Section 4.0 refers. It further outlines that the proposed creche parking provision is considered to comply with the car parking standards of Development Plan Table 11.2.
- 8.3.38. The Planner's Report did not raise concerns regarding the proposed parking provision for the creche, and that it considered the details of the childcare facility to be in line with Childcare Facilities Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2001).
- 8.3.39. I note that Development Parking standard for creches (at Table 11.2 Car Parking) is '1 per employee & dedicated set down area and 1 per 4 children plus dedicated set down area' (emphasis added). Guidance Notes includes that non-residential car parking standards are set down as 'maxima' standards. I note that the detailing of the childcare services to be provided and associated staffing numbers have not been ascertained by the applicant to date.
- 8.3.40. Based on the information on file and Development Plan car parking standards, I estimate that based on a childcare capacity of 19no. children alone, 4.75no. spaces (or approx. 5no. spaces) would be required. While the expected number of employees in the facility has not been quantified, I consider it reasonable to assume that in excess of 1no. staff member would be employed in the facility. In this context I consider that the total 6no. car parking spaces (excluding the 2no. drop off spaces)

to serve the proposed creche would be below Development Plan standards. However, having regard to the site's edge of town location, which is within walking distance of the town centre, and given that non-residential car parking standards are maximum standards, I consider that the provision of 6no. car parking spaces and 2no. drop off spaces would be acceptable in this instance.

- 8.3.41. However, I note that no cycle parking spaces associated with the creche are proposed. Development Plan Table 11.4 Cycle Parking Standards requires 'Other developments' to be served by '1 bike space per car space, or 10% of employee numbers in general'. Given the configuration of the proposed 'creche complex', there is limited space within this area to provide cycle spaces. However, I consider that the provision of cycle spaces to serve this non-residential use would be required, to comply with Development Plan standards.
- 8.3.42. The P.A.'s Condition 19(f) requires visitor cycle parking for the creche at a standard of 1 per 10 children and shall be able to facilitate cargo bike or bike with trailers.
- 8.3.43. Should the Commission be minded to grant permission, it is recommended that a condition is attached which requires the provision of cycle parking in accordance with Development Plan standards, and that such a parking area should be covered. I consider that should compliance with such a condition require the omission of a car parking space, that the reduction in car parking would be acceptable.
- 8.3.44. For completeness, I note that the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines (2024) do not include specific car or cycle parking standards for childcare facilities.
- 8.3.45. Accordingly, while I note that the provision of the proposed 6no. car parking spaces, which may be reduced subject to detailed design of the recommended provision of cycle parking spaces, should the Commission be minded to grant, I consider that the additional vehicular traffic generated by the proposed creche, in addition to the residential traffic generated, would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety.

Noise levels

- 8.3.46. The grounds of appeal (Padraig and Ann-Marie Farrell and Ann Gilsenan) that the additional traffic generated by the proposed development would result in a significant increase in noise levels.

- 8.3.47. I consider that the proposed development when completed would result in some increase in noise levels, given that 82no. residential units, a creche and associated car parking spaces are proposed. However, given the site's edge of town location on zoned, serviced lands, I consider that the development of a residential scheme on this site is acceptable in principle, and that the increase in traffic generated by the proposed development and associated traffic noise levels would not seriously impact on the residential amenities of the area.
- 8.3.48. With regard to construction phase noise impacts, I note that the EIA Screening Report states that the proposed development will be obliged to comply with BS 5228 "Noise Control on Construction and open sites Part 1", and measures to eliminate or reduce noise levels are outlined. In addition, I note that a temporary construction access to the west of the site would significantly mitigate construction traffic impacts. An Outline CEMP has been submitted with the application, and should the Commission be minded to grant, it is recommended that a final CEMP be agreed prior to commencement.
- 8.3.49. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not give rise significant noise impacts at construction or operational phases.

8.4. Surface Water Infrastructure and Flood Risk

(a) Surface Water Infrastructure and Tree Provision

- 8.4.1. Concerns are raised in the grounds of appeal (Karl Cleary) that (there are) not enough trees to negate extra surface water caused by the development.
- 8.4.2. The FI Item 11(a) response includes that the revised 'Proposed Storm Water Layout' drawing (no. G116-CSC-XX-XX-DR-C-0004) details the revised surface water system is SuDS compliant and in accordance with the Council's requirements.
- 8.4.3. The FI Item 11(d) response (outlined in consulting engineer's letter) states that the revised surface water strategy incorporates 1:4 side slopes for both the northern and central attenuation basins, that the design has been amended to ensure that that the maximum stored water depth within each basin does not exceed 300mm, and that these revisions have resulted in an increased footprint of the attenuation areas, with the northern basin increasing from 450m³ to 744m³ and the central basin increasing from 800m³ to 880m³.

- 8.4.4. With regard to FI Item 11(e), whereby the applicant was requested to provide confirmation that the functionality of the proposed green space will not be impacted by the proposed attenuation storage basins, the response includes that the full open space area will have an arrangement to filter drains (below soil level) connected to the outfall, so the open space can drain in a normal rain fall event. Only under 1-in-100 year event will the area see water with the maximum water depth within this area limited to 300mm.
- 8.4.5. The Second Environment Flooding – Surface Water Section report (31 March 2026) states, with regard to surface water, that should planning be granted, 5no. issues shall be addressed prior to commencement. These include (1) the applicant shall redesign the surface water system, notes the proposed surface water system is acceptable in principle, and applicant shall agree the design of all SuDS features and the proposed two attenuation systems to ensure functionality of any green open space is not impacted. These 5no. 'conditions' are contained in the P.A.'s Condition 18.
- 8.4.6. While the P.A.'s Condition 18 requires surface water management proposals to be submitted and agreed, I note that no concerns are raised by P.A. with regard to the surface water management proposals in principle. On the basis of the information on file, I am satisfied that the detailing of the SuDS features and the 2no. attenuation systems can be addressed by way of condition. Should the Commission be minded to grant permission, it is recommended that a similar condition is attached.
- 8.4.7. The applicant's response to the grounds of appeal includes that the proposal employs an appropriate and sustainable urban drainage strategy which ensures surface water and storm water can be satisfactorily attenuated and discharged, and that the proposed level of tree provision does not significantly affect efficiency/success of any proposed surface/storm water strategy or system design.
- 8.4.8. While I consider that surface water infrastructure would be adequately addressed in the proposed development, given that the grounds of appeal raise concerns specifically with regard to a lack of trees to negate extra surface water, I discuss the matter of trees further in the following section.
- 8.4.9. A revised proposed landscape masterplan was submitted as FI. This drawing shows existing trees and hedgerow to be removed or retained, and locations of proposed

additional trees and hedgerow. I note that existing hedgerows are proposed to be retained to the rear and side of new houses along the western site boundary. 2no. different boundary types are indicated to west of the house plots (Type 1 Brick Wall and Type 2 Verti-Crete Walling Systems (TBC)), slightly offset from the hedgerow.

- 8.4.10. This landscape plan also identifies areas for bioretention and swale planting mix, and the northern attenuation area mix for seeding. While some trees and hedgerow are shown to be removed, I consider that the extent of additional planting to be provided, in the context of the overall design of attenuation and open/recreation spaces, and associated hard and soft landscaping, would be acceptable. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not result in a lack of trees to address the impacts of surface water generated.

(b) Flood Risk and Tree Damage

- 8.4.11. The grounds of appeal (Karl Cleary) includes that there is no analysis of removal and possible damage to 2no. trees in and outside No. 55 The Belfry, regarding flooding of gardens and road.
- 8.4.12. With regard to the SFI revised SSFRA, the conclusion (Section 8) includes that the modelling results confirm that the vast majority of the site, including all developable areas, lies within Flood Zone C and is therefore at low risk of flooding, and the proposed development will not be at risk of flooding during the design flood events, will not increase flood risk elsewhere and instead provides a net reduction in local flood risk.
- 8.4.13. The internal Second Environment Flooding – Surface Water Section Planning Report (31 March 2026) outlines that the proposed development is a ‘vulnerable development’ and the site is partially located in Flood Zones A and B. It notes the revised Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment (SSFRA), and that the applicant has determined the catchment areas, calculated acceptable flow rates and carried out hydraulic modelling of nearby watercourses, determined that the 1% AEP and 0.1% AEP critical flood events are all contained within channel, has carried out blockage scenarios on existing & proposed culverts and has applied the Justification Test. The internal report has no issues with the proposed development subject to conditions. The recommended conditions are contained in the P.A.’s Condition 20.

- 8.4.14. The applicant's response to the grounds of appeal includes that 4no. trees in The Belfry within the footprint of the proposed road are for removal: arboricultural impact drawing TATH005-A-DR-CMK-ARB-102 refers. It outlines that the tree within the appellant's garden is a small specimen, is separated from the existing road by a wall, and no roots are likely to extend beneath the wall foundations. The Arboricultural Assessment and Impact Report recommends tree protection fencing be installed following tree removal and prior to mobilisation of site plant and infrastructure. The separate consulting engineer's Response Memorandum is referred to, which includes that the removal of 2no. trees does not impact on the surface water infrastructure of the permitted development, and the submitted SSFRA and hydrological modelling assessment concluded that the proposal will not give rise to flooding within or surrounding the site.
- 8.4.15. I note that No.55 The Belfry is located east of the proposed more easterly vehicular access to the subject site, and directly north of the main residential part of the subject site. A narrow part of the subject site outlined in red extends along the roadside frontage of No. 55. The SFI Proposed Site Plan shows that an existing tree within the front garden of No. 55 is to be retained. Separately, 2no. existing trees (and a lamp standard) in this cul-de-sac are proposed to be removed to facilitate vehicular access to the subject site.
- 8.4.16. I note the content of the Arboricultural Assessment & Impact Report lodged with the application, which references TATH005-A-DR-CMK-ARB-102 (Arboricultural Impact & Tree Protection drawing), and is cited as Appendix iii. This drawing shows a tree in the front garden of No. 55, and indicates that it is to be retained. While noting the proximity of the existing tree at No. 55 to its roadside boundary, having regard to all information on file, including the Arboricultural Assessment & Impact Report and the SFI revised SSFRA, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not adversely impact on the existing tree at this adjoining property, and would not result in flood risk to this property.

(c) Flood Risk – Issues raised by observers

- 8.4.17. With regard to concerns raised in the observations relating to flood risk, I consider the basis for stating that the proposed development is contrary to the Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines has not been detailed.

- 8.4.18. I have noted previously in this report that the Development Plan SFRA shows a limited area within the northern part of the subject site is Flood Zone A, and to a much lesser extent, Flood Zone B, both of which generally follow the route of Whitehall Stream. The remainder of the subject site is within Flood Zone C.
- 8.4.19. In addition to the information contained in the 2021-2027 Development Plan, the SFI SSFRA (at Section 7.2: Justification Test: Part 2) states the vast majority of the site is located within Flood Zone C, with Flood Zones A and B limited to the Whitehall Stream corridor. The site-specific hydraulic model confirms that the proposed development will not increase flood risk elsewhere. The access route from Athboy Road (R154) via internal roads within The Belfry is in Flood Zone C and at low risk of flooding. The development will incorporate a stormwater management system designed to retain surface water on site and discharge flows at the agreed greenfield runoff rate. The FFL for residential properties has been set so that sufficient freeboard has been provided over the modelled flood levels, including climate change and culvert blockages which will mitigate current and future flood risk. The conclusion of the SFI SSFRA (Section 8) has been outlined previously above (at Flood Risk and Tree Damage).
- 8.4.20. On the basis of the information on file, including in particular the SFI SSFRA, and having regard to the overall site layout whereby proposed buildings are set back from the route of the Whitehall Stream, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not give rise to flood risk of the proposed dwelling houses or childcare facility, nor would it result in flooding to surrounding areas, and I consider that the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of flood risk.
- 8.4.21. With regard to concerns relating to Archaeological Assessment and flood risk, it is outlined that clarification is sought within the assessment with reference to flood plains and the extent of any flood risk affecting the site. No specific details relating to the location of flood plains or the archaeology in question is outlined in the observations.
- 8.4.22. I note that the Archaeological Impact Assessment lodged with the application includes (at Table 5 List of Recorded Monuments within the environs of the site) Recorded Monument ME036-050 Ritual Site – holy well, located at Crowpark 1st Division, Trim. This Recorded Monument is shown on Fig. 2 to be located a short distance north of River Boyne.

8.4.23. I estimate that this Recorded Monument is approx. 400m south of the subject site, as viewed on www.archaeology.ie (accessed 02 September 2026).

8.4.24. While the entry at Table 5 for ME036-050 states that it is located on the floodplain of a southwest-northeast section of the River Boyne c. 120 metres to the southeast, and c. 700 metres west of the town, having regard to distance of this Recorded Monument to the subject site, I do not consider that the reference to ‘flood plains’ is relevant to the proposed development and I also do not consider that the proposed development would have any impact on this Recorded Monument.

8.5. Impacts on Residential and Visual Amenities

Overshadowing:

8.5.1. Regarding concerns raised in the grounds of appeal relating to overshadowing impacts at No. 55 The Belfry, I note the SFI Proposed Site Layout shows

- the side (south) elevation of No. 55 is 5.4m from its southern site boundary.
- the rear (north) elevation of proposed House No. 72 is set back 1.2m from the boundary with No. 55, and its front elevation is forward of same. The rear building line of No. 72 does not extend to that of No. 55.

8.5.2. The applicant’s response to the grounds of appeal (architect’s response) shows the existing baseline context at No. 55, whereby structures are shown to south of the principal house on site.

8.5.3. Having regard to the position of No. 72 south of No. 55 The Belfry, I note that the proposed house would result in some overshadowing of the property to the north. However, this overshadowing would be of the structures to the side of the principal house and of the front garden area, to varying degrees over the course of the day and of the year. Given that overshadowing impacts would be largely of the front garden area, as distinct from the rear private amenity space, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not be seriously injurious to the residential amenities of No. 55 in terms of overshadowing impacts.

8.5.4. With regard to concerns raised in the grounds of appeal relating to overshadowing impacts on No. 54 The Belfry (which adjoins No. 55) and No. 53 located to north of No. 54, I note that both of these properties are further north of No. 55. The

applicant's response to the grounds of appeal states that the rear garden of these properties will not experience any reduction in daylight or sunlight on 21 March by virtue of the proposed development. I note that this is further demonstrated in applicant's response to the grounds of appeal in the separate architect's response document; Fig. 1 refers. On the basis of the information on file, and having regard to proposed House No. 72's position further distant from Nos 54 and 53, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not result in overshadowing those 2no. properties.

- 8.5.5. Concerns are raised in both of the observations received relating to overshadowing and loss of daylight.
- 8.5.6. I note that the SFI response amended the proposed apartment/duplex block from 3-storey to 2-storey.
- 8.5.7. The SFI Proposed Site Layout shows that this building would be in the range of 10.7m to 15.6m from its eastern boundary with No. 39 Talbot Court to the east. The apartment block would be 16m from the western (side) elevation of this adjoining single-storey property. The SFI Architectural Response Report included a Sunlight/Daylight Analysis. With regard to No. 39 Talbot Court, it includes a Note that as there is a significant mature woodland immediately south of 39 Talbot Court, this woodland has been included in the daylight analysis because it is the predominant feature limiting daylight/sunlight to the existing rear garden. The shadow cast analysis is presented for 10:00, 12:00 and 14:00 (GMT) on March 21st (the equinox), as per FI request. I note that the FI Item 5 requested that the shadow analysis should detail the sun path on March 21, at 10am, 12noon, and 2pm. While the SFI response emphasises a c. 15m separation distance from the proposed apartment block to the boundary of No. 39 Talbot Court, I note as outlined previously the separation distance is also annotated as 10.7m. While noting the specific times requested by the P.A. as the basis for the analysis, I consider that having regard to the apartment block's position to west of No. 39 Talbot Court, assessment of the impact of potential overshadowing in the later afternoon on 21 March would also be reasonable, in this particular site context.
- 8.5.8. Having regard to the position of the 2-storey block minimum 10.7m from the rear garden boundary of the adjoining property to the east, I consider that the proposed

development would result in some overshadowing of rear garden of this property in the later afternoon timeframe. However, I note also the existing site context, whereby there is mature planting, albeit not structures, to the south, and consider that additional overshadowing resulting from the proposed development on No. 39 Talbot Court would not be seriously injurious to the residential amenities of this property.

8.5.9. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not adversely impact on the residential amenities of existing residential properties in the vicinity in terms of overshadowing.

8.5.10. Concerns are raised in the observation (Siobhan Byrne) that the proposal would impact on solar panel performance. I note that the observer's property is min. 40m from the subject site. Having regard to this minimum separation distance, I am satisfied that the proposed 2-storey scale of the scheme would not impact on solar panel performance at the observer's property.

Overlooking

8.5.11. With regard to concerns raised in the grounds of appeal relating to overlooking of No. 55 The Belfry, I note that SFI House Type K2 shows that 1no. window only at first floor level directly faces north towards No. 55. This window serving the landing area is shown to have obscure glazing. 2no. bedroom windows are proposed on the east elevation. The applicant's response to the grounds of appeal (architect's response) states that No.s 53, 54 and 55 The Belfry each have a single storey rear extension on their exposed gable, meaning that any views from the eastern façade of House No. 72 into the rear garden of No. 55 are funnelled along a narrow diagonal between its single storey extension and the I-shaped shed on its southern boundary, and these views would not impact on the more private zone that adjoins its rear façade. Having regard to the relationship of proposed No. 72 to No. 55 to its north, and the detailed design of No. 72, I consider that any overlooking arising from the first floor windows on its eastern elevation towards No. 55 would be oblique and would not result in serious overlooking of the adjoining property to the north. Accordingly, I am satisfied that proposed No. 72 would not adversely impact on the residential amenities of No. 55 in terms of overlooking impacts.

8.5.12. Separately, with regard to potential overlooking from the first floor level of the proposed 2-storey apartment block of the private amenity space of No. 39 Talbot

Court to the east, I note that a first floor bedroom in each of Apt DP-09 and Apt DP-10 (at the southern end of the block) would be approx. 10.7m from the shared boundary. However, the distance of the rear building line to the south western corner of 39 Talbot Court is annotated as 16m, and I consider that this 16m separation distance to the more private amenity space directly to the rear of the dwellinghouse to be acceptable. Accordingly, while the proposed development would introduce some overlooking of 39 Talbot Court, I do not consider that this would adversely impact on the residential amenities of this adjoining dwelling house to an undue degree.

8.5.13. With regard to potential overlooking of existing houses on Kildalkey Road, and while noting these existing properties have relatively long rear gardens, I note the rear garden depths of proposed houses which back onto these properties are very limited in number of cases.

8.5.14. For example, 5.2m is annotated at No. 62, which is located in the south eastern corner of the site, and min. 3.5m is annotated at No. 48. However, in terms of the detailed design (as per SFI response), I note that with regard to the following house types which are closest in terms of potential overlooking of houses on Kildalkey Road, namely

- Proposed House No. 62: House Type R5A:
- Proposed House No. 48: House Type R5:
- Proposed House No. 60: House Type R1
- Proposed House No. 61: House Type R2

that in all 4no. cases, the 3no. windows at first floor level of the rear elevations all comprise obscure glazing. These first floor south facing windows serve an en-suite shower room, a bathroom and a landing.

8.5.15. Accordingly, notwithstanding the proximity of these proposed houses to their rear (southern) site boundary, I am satisfied given the provision of obscure glazing to non-habitable rooms at first floor level, that these proposed houses would not adversely impact on the residential amenities of the existing properties to the south (Kildalkey Road) in terms of overlooking.

Scale

8.5.16. With regard to concerns raised in the observation (Siobhan Byrne) that the 3-storey

structure is out of character, I note that the 3-storey duplex block originally proposed was reduced to a 2-storey structure in the SFI response. The surrounding area comprises a mix of single, dormer and 2-storey houses. Properties to the north and east along the southern side of Athboy Road are primarily located within housing estates of 2-storey scale. The 2-storey scale of the proposed development would be consistent with the established scale in the vicinity.

8.5.17. External finishes were amended in the SFI response (Item 2), to comprise a mix of brick (a light buff brick) and half-brick, half-render in places; SFI Architectural Response Report; Fig. B refers This SFI Item 2 response also outlines that a modern style of elevation is more appropriate to this brick colour, and so public-facing facades have been revised to be more modern with flat lintels above openings and modern style windows, bay windows and doors. I consider that the proposed houses are of contemporary design and are acceptable in visual terms.

8.5.18. I consider that the proposed development would respect the character of the area and would be acceptable in terms of its impacts on the visual amenities of the area.

8.6. Ecology

8.6.1. A variety of matters relating to ecology are raised in the grounds of appeal and in the observations, and I note also the content of the Council's Ecologist Report with regard to bats. These matters are discussed below.

Protected Species

8.6.2. Concerns are raised in the grounds of appeal (Karl Cleary) that (there are) protected species habitats on both sides of the boundary, and that no reptilian survey was done. Issues raised in the observations include no site specific ecological assessment provided and proposal is contrary to Wildlife Acts and EU Habitats Directive.

8.6.3. An Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) was submitted with the application. It includes (at Section 3.4.1) habitat classification at the subject site, which is further outlined in the applicant's response to the grounds of appeal. I note that there are no designations relating to European sites or (p)NHAs on the subject site or in the immediate vicinity of the site. I am satisfied on the basis of the EclA that there is no 'protected habitat' on or adjoining the subject site.

Bats

- 8.6.4. The grounds of appeal and the observations do not raise concerns specifically in respect of bats. However, I note that the Council's Ecologist Report outlines the site is used by foraging bats, and that the appropriate period for felling trees to avoid impacts to bats is late August to late October/ early November, not April to September as stated in the EclA. It outlines that as this is a precautionary measure and no bat roosts have been identified, this can be addressed as a condition, and it notes that bat boxes are proposed to compensate for any loss of trees.
- 8.6.5. I consider that the inclusion of such a condition is reasonable. Should the Commission be minded to grant permission, it is recommended that a condition relating to bats similar to that included in the P.A.'s Condition 15 is attached. .

EU Habitats Directive

- 8.6.6. With regard to concerns raised in the observation (Siobhan Byrne) that the proposed development is contrary to the EU Habitats Directive, I refer the Commission to Section 9.0 Appropriate Assessment of this report, where I conclude that the proposed development will not affect the attainment of conservation objectives for River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299) and River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (004232).

Amphibians

- 8.6.7. The applicant's response to the grounds of appeal states, with regard to common frog and smooth newt, that the EclA noted that while not recorded during surveys, the existing drainage ditches on site offer some suitable habitat for these species, and that ditches were largely dry during site visits and were heavily overgrown.
- 8.6.8. The separate attached report from the applicant's ecological consultant refers to the stated common lizard in the grounds of appeal (Karl Cleary). The ecologist's opinion is that it is a smooth newt. It further outlines that based on current conservation status of common lizard and smooth newt, listed as 'Least concern' in Irish Red Data Book, the habitats within the site and the abundance of such habitats in wider landscape, no significant negative effects on either of these species is predicted as a result of proposed development. Having visited the site, and having regard to the overall site layout whereby the proposed buildings would be set back from Whitehall

Stream and the adjoining lands to the west are in agricultural use, and having regard also to the consultant ecologist's opinion outlined above, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not adversely impact on smooth newt or common lizard.

Public Health

- 8.6.9. Public health concerns are raised in the observation (Sami Ensaf) that increased moisture levels with unmanaged boundary vegetation may contribute to conditions favourable to ticks and similar pests. I note that existing boundary hedgerows are proposed to be retained to the rear or side of dwelling houses along the western site boundary, i.e., outside house plot boundaries. As outlined previously, 2no. different boundary types are indicated to west of the house plots (Type 1 Brick Wall and Type 2 Verti-Crete Walling Systems (TBC)), slightly offset from the hedgerow.
- 8.6.10. Neither the SFI Management Company drawing (Drawing No. 2430 P 306) nor the SFI Taking in Charge drawing (Drawing No. 2430 P 305) show that this 'backland' area would be managed either by a management company or by the Council. While noting that these areas are to the rear or side of house plots, they are within the red line boundary, and I consider the submission of proposals to manage or maintain same would be reasonable. Should the Commission be minded to grant, it is recommended that this matter be addressed by way of condition. I consider that the inclusion of such a condition would adequately address concerns raised regarding management/ maintenance of the hedgerows.

Ecology – Conclusion

- 8.6.11. Having regard to the information outlined above, I am satisfied that matters relating to ecology have been adequately addressed by the applicant in the lodged application or as amended by SFI, or can be adequately addressed by way of condition as recommended above, should the Commission be minded to grant.

8.7. Material Contravention

- 8.7.1. The grounds of appeal do not raise concerns specifically relating to material contravention of the Development Plan.
- 8.7.2. The planning authority's response to the grounds of appeal includes reference to the site being within the settlement of Trim, a self-sustaining growth town in the Meath

County Development Plan 2021-2027. It notes the A1 Existing Residential zoning, which has the objective 'to protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities', and it requests the Commission to uphold its decision to grant permission for this development.

8.7.3. The observation (Siobhan Byrne) raises concern that the proposed development by introducing through traffic into a quiet estate alters the fundamental character of the area, reduces safety and quality of life. As the site is zoned A1, the proposed development represents a material contravention of the Development Plan.

8.7.4. I note the Development Plan Guidance for the A1 Existing Residential zoning objective states (Vol. 1; Section 11.14.6):

'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.'

8.7.5. 'Residential' is a Permitted Use and 'Childcare Facility' is Open for Consideration. With regard to the site context and land use zoning, I consider that the provision of a new residential scheme, located on these A1 zoned lands, to be acceptable in principle. I consider that both the proposed 'Residential' use and the 'Childcare Facility' would be acceptable in principle at this location.

8.7.6. With regard to whether the subject proposed development may be '.....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', I consider the proposed development to be acceptable in terms of -

- its impacts on the residential and visual amenities of the area, including that impacts on the amenities of surrounding properties at construction phase would be mitigated by measures set out in the outline/final CEMP,
- the proposed uses - residential and childcare facility - would be acceptable,
- the scale, character and design of the proposed development, which would respect the character of the area

In addition, I have outlined previously in this report an overview of the range of traffic calming measures proposed to be introduced in The Belfry housing estate, as part of the proposed development whereby vehicular access would be provided through this existing housing estate to the subject site. I have outlined that I am satisfied that the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety, and have recommended that should the Commission be minded to grant, that a condition requiring submission of a Stage 3 RSA is attached.

- 8.7.7. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not, if permitted, be a material contravention of the A1 Existing Residential land use zoning objective of the current County Development Plan.

8.8. Other Issues

Planning Decisions Cited in Observation

- 8.8.1. The observation received (Siobhan Byrne) includes 7no. planning decisions by An Bord Pleanála over an extended period of time. I have viewed all these cases on the Commission's website (www.pleanala.ie, accessed 10 September 2025). I note that the cases cited do not comprise any comparable development type to the subject case, nor relate to the County Meath area. Accordingly, I do not consider that the cases cited are relevant to the assessment of the subject case.
- 8.8.2. Furthermore, I consider that the proposed development, would in any event, be required to be assessed on its merits.

Planning Authority's Condition 29

- 8.8.3. The P.A.'s Condition 29 requires the developer to pay the sum of €200.00 per residential unit (€16,400.00) as a contribution towards expenditure to be incurred by the Planning Authority in the monitoring of the construction phases of the development.
- 8.8.4. I note that the Council's Development Contribution Scheme 2024-2029 (www.meath.ie, accessed 08 September 2026) outlines (at Section 11 Ring Fencing of Income) that money accruing to a Local Authority under this Scheme shall be accounted for in a separate account and shall be applied to the provision of public infrastructure, facilities and their enabling costs on a countywide basis. Given this

content of the DCS, I do not consider that it has been demonstrated that the DCS provides for monies to be accrued for the purposes of the planning authority's costs in monitoring of the construction phases of the proposed development. Accordingly, I do not consider that the attachment of Condition 29 is warranted. Should the Commission be minded to grant permission, it is recommended that Condition 29 is not attached.

- 8.8.5. For clarity, there is no reference in Condition 29 to the contribution being a special contribution.

Planning Authority's Conditions 6 and 4

- 8.8.6. Condition 4 requires the childcare facility to form Phase One of the development.
- 8.8.7. Condition 6 requires that prior to commencement of development, the developer shall submit details of the proposed management arrangements for the crèche for the written agreement of the P.A. The Reason is to ensure timely provision of community facilities for the benefit of occupants of the residential units.
- 8.8.8. I consider that Condition 4 is reasonable and should the Commission be minded to grant, a similar condition is recommended.
- 8.8.9. With regard to Condition 6, I consider that the matter of hours of operation can be addressed by way of condition, should the Commission be minded to grant. However, save for the matter of parking provision to be addressed, I consider that management arrangements for the creche are a matter for the future operator the facility, and the inclusion of this condition would not be required. Should the Commission be minded to grant, it may wish to consider the omission of this condition.

9.0 Appropriate Assessment

- 9.1. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that it is not possible to exclude that the proposed development alone will give rise to significant effects on River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299) and River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (004232) in view of the sites conservation objectives. Appropriate Assessment is required.

- 9.2. In screening the need for Appropriate Assessment, it was determined that the proposed development could result in significant effects on River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299) and River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (004232) in view of the conservation objectives of those sites and that Appropriate Assessment under the provisions of S177U/S177AE was required.
- 9.3. Following an examination, analysis and evaluation of the NIS all associated material submitted including the NIS [Updated] submitted as Significant Further Information (SFI), and taking into account the observation of Uisce Éireann, I consider that adverse effects on site integrity of the River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299) and River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (004232) can be excluded in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and that no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of such effects.

My conclusion is based on the following:

- Detailed assessment of construction and operational impacts
- NIS [Updated] (received by the planning authority as Significant Further Information)
- Effectiveness of mitigation measures proposed in SFI Natura Impact Statement [Updated] and Outline CEMP
- Application of planning conditions to ensure application of these measures

The proposed development will not affect the attainment of conservation objectives for River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299) and River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (004232).

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. I refer the Commission to Appendix 3 of this report.
- 10.2. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken in accordance with Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC), as transposed by the European Communities (Water Policy) Regulations 2003, as amended, and with regard to the Water Action Plan 2024: A River Basin Management Plan for Ireland.

- 10.3. The receiving water environment has been identified and assessed, see Appendix 3. Having regard to the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, and the mitigation measures incorporated into the design and as proposed in the Outline Construction and Demolition Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) submitted with the application, and in the Natura Impact Statement [Updated] submitted as SFI, it is concluded that the proposed development will not:
- Result in deterioration of the ecological, chemical, or quantitative status of any relevant surface water or groundwater body;
 - Increase pollutant loading or alter the hydrological regime of any receiving watercourse;
 - prevent or impede achievement of environmental objectives under the applicable River Basin Management Plan.
- 10.4. Any residual risks are capable of being addressed through the proposed mitigation measures and implementation of a final Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).
- 10.5. The proposed development is considered to be in compliance with the requirements of Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive.

11.0 Planning Authority Conditions

- 11.1.1. The following is an overview of the planning authority’s schedule of conditions (29no.). Outlined is commentary relating to the recommended inclusion or otherwise of the conditions, should the Commission be minded to grant.

1	The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application on 21/08/2025, further information received on 04/01/2026 and revised notices received on 12/02/2026 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: To ensure a satisfactory standard of development in accordance
---	--

	with the approved plans. <u>Comment:</u> Similar condition recommended.
2.	The development hereby permitted shall contain 82no. residential units. Each residential unit shall be used and occupied as a single unit for residential purposes and shall not be sub-divided or used for any commercial purpose (including short-term letting) without a separate planning permission. Reason: In the interest of clarity and to ensure the maintenance of a residential community. <u>Comment:</u> Similar condition recommended.
3.	All mitigation measures in respect of the development hereby permitted shall be implemented as outlined in the Natura Impact Statement (NIS) and other plans and particulars date received 04/01/2026 and in conjunction with the timelines set out therein, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the conditions hereunder. Reason: To avoid any potential adverse effects on the River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC and SPA resulting from water borne pollution originating from the development. <u>Comment:</u> Similar condition recommended.
4.	The development shall be carried out on a phased basis in accordance with the phasing plan which accompanies the application unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority. The completion of the childcare facility shall form part of Phase One of the development. Reason: To ensure the timely provision of services, for the benefit of the occupants of the proposed residential development/wider area. <u>Comment:</u> Similar condition recommended.

5.	(a) The architectural design and external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall comply with the details indicated in the further information documentation received by the Planning Authority on 04/01/2026. (b) No development of a class specified in column 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001-2025, shall be permitted within the curtilage of any residential unit hereby permitted. Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure the integrity of the design concept is retained. Comment: Similar condition recommended relating to Class 1 and Class 3.
6.	Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details of the proposed management arrangements for the Creche for the written agreement of the Planning Authority. Reason: To ensure the timely provision of community facilities for the benefit of the occupants of the residential units <u>Comment:</u> I consider that the matter of proposed management arrangements for the creche are a matter for the future operator of the childcare facility. It is recommended that this condition is not attached. An alternative condition stipulating days/hours within which the facility may operate is recommended.
7.	(a) The developer is required to employ a suitably qualified archaeologist to co-ordinate the geophysical survey proposed in the Archaeological Impact Assessment Report (Section 6) to include the excavation of the archaeological features identified to date (to be carried out in advance of any construction works) and archaeological monitoring under license of all groundworks in the designated area. (b) Should archaeological material be found during the course of monitoring, the archaeologist may have work on the site stopped, pending a decision as to how best to deal with the archaeology. The developer shall be prepared to be advised by the Department with regard to any necessary mitigating action

	(e.g. preservation in situ, or excavation) and should facilitate the archaeologist in recording any material found. (c) The Planning Authority and this Department shall be furnished with a report describing the results of the archaeological testing and subsequent monitoring. (d) The Applicant shall notify the Department in advance of the commencement of construction works. Where archaeological material/features are shown to be present, preservation in situ, preservation by record (excavation) or monitoring may be required. Reason: To ensure the continued preservation (either in situ or by record) of places, caves, sites, features or other objects of archaeological interest. Comment: This condition differs from recommended condition in DAU submission. The inclusion of a condition similar to that contained in DAU submission is recommended, which includes that the archaeologist assist in the integration of archaeological mitigation into the CEMP. With regard to applicant's AIA, which includes a recommendation that written and photographic evidence of townland boundary to be impacted be submitted, this is discussed at Appendix 1(b) of this report. Should the Commission be minded to grant permission, it is recommended that a similar condition be attached. The recommended condition relating to landscaping (Condition 10) includes this detailing relating to the townland boundary.
8.	(a) Prior to the occupation of any residential unit hereby permitted, the applicant shall provide the public open space and landscaping as indicated on the drawings received on 04/01/2026. The open spaces shall be developed for, and devoted to, public use and shall be maintained as public open space by the developer until taken in charge by the local authority or management company. (b) Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from the completion of the development, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of

	similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority. (c) All hard and soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the appropriate British Standard document or other recognised Code of Practice, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority. (d) Final details of all boundary treatments shall be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development. (e) Prior to commencement of development, details of a public art feature to be incorporated into the overall scheme or a financial contribution to facilitate the Council to provide a piece of public art in order to enhance the amenities of the local environment shall be submitted for the written agreement of the Planning Authority. Reason: To ensure that the public open space, planting provision, boundary treatment, public art is provided in a timely manner and retained for the benefit of the occupiers and to aid integration of the development into the local landscape as soon as possible. Comment: See also Condition 15. It is recommended that elements of Condition 8 are attached. However, it is recommended that some elements of Condition 15 could be added to a form a combined Condition 8 and 15.
9.	(a) The communal open spaces, including hard and soft landscaping, car parking areas and access ways, and all areas not intended to be taken in charge by the local authority, shall be maintained by a legally constituted management company. (b) Details of the management company contract, and drawings/particulars describing the parts of the for which the company would have responsibility, shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority before any of the affected residential units are made available for occupation. Reason: To provide for the satisfactory future maintenance in the interest of residential amenity.

	Comment: Similar condition recommended.
10.	The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and completed at least to the construction standards set out in the Planning Authority's Taking in Charge Policy. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall agree with the authority, in writing, the procedures for inspection and monitoring of the development by the authority to ensure compliance with these standards and shall thereafter comply with the agreed procedures during the construction of the overall development. Following completion, the development shall be maintained by the developer, in compliance with these standards, until taken in charge by the planning authority. Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out and completed to an acceptable construction standard. Comment: Similar condition recommended. However, as outlined in Section 8.0 of report, it is recommended that the condition addresses how the hedgerow along the western site boundary, to rear or side of proposed houses, would be maintained.
11.	The open spaces shall be developed in accordance with the phasing arrangement and shall devoted to public use and shall be kept free of any development. When the development is being taken in charge, the roads and all public areas including open spaces that have been designated for taking in charge shall be vested in the Planning Authority, at no cost to the Authority Reason: To provide for the satisfactory future maintenance in the interest of residential amenity. Comment: Inclusion of this condition is not recommended.
12.	(a) Prior to the commencement of the development as permitted, the applicant or any person with an interest in the land shall enter into an agreement with the planning authority (such agreement must specify the

	number and location of each residential unit), pursuant to Section 47 of the Planning and Development Acts 2000-2023, that restricts all residential units permitted, to first occupation by individual purchasers i.e. those not being a corporate entity, and/or by those eligible for the occupation of social and/or affordable housing, including cost rental housing. (b) An agreement pursuant to Section 47 shall be applicable for the period of duration of the planning permission, except where after not less than two years from the date of completion of each specified housing unit, it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the planning authority that it has not been possible to transact each specified house unit for use by individual purchasers and/or to those eligible for the occupation of social and/or affordable housing, including cost rental housing. (c) The determination of the planning authority as required in (b) shall be subject to receipt by the planning and housing authority of satisfactory documentary evidence from the applicant or any person with an interest in the land regarding the sales and marketing of the specified housing units, in which case the planning authority shall confirm in writing to the applicant or any person with an interest in the land that the Section 47 agreement has been terminated and that the requirement of this planning condition has been discharged in respect of each specified housing unit. Reason: To restrict new housing development to use by persons of a particular class or description in order to ensure an adequate choice and supply of housing, including affordable housing, in the common good. Comment: Inclusion of condition recommended.
13.	Prior to commencement of development hereby permitted, the applicant or other person with an interest in the land to which the application relates shall enter into an agreement in writing with the planning authority in relation to the provision of housing in accordance with the requirements of Section 94(4) and Section 96(2) and (3) (Part V) of the Planning and Development Acts 2000-2023, unless an exemption certificate shall have been applied for and been granted under Section 97 of said Act. Where such an agreement is not

	reached within eight weeks from the date of this order, the matter in dispute (other than a matter to which Section 96(7) applies) may be referred by the planning authority or any other prospective party to the agreement to An Bord Pleanála for determination. Reason: To comply with the requirements of Part V of the Planning & Development Acts 2000-2024 and of the housing strategy in the development plan for the area. Comment: Similar condition recommended.
14.	Proposals for names for the overall development, apartments, creche, home zones/streets inclusive of a numbering scheme and associated signage shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, all signage and unit numbers, shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme unless the planning authority agrees in writing to an alternative scheme. The proposed name(s) shall be based on local historical or topographical features, or other alternatives acceptable to the planning authority. No advertisements/marketing signage relating to the name(s) of the development shall be erected until the developer has obtained the planning authority's written agreement to the proposed name(s). Reason: In the interest of urban legibility and to ensure the use of locally appropriate place names for new residential areas. Comment: Similar condition recommended.
15.	(a) The applicant shall carry out a pre-construction survey to ensure no changes in baseline have occurred if more than 6 months have passed between the grant of planning and site clearance or if site clearance is within the nesting bird season. (b) The applicant shall install hedgehog gates between gardens. (c) The applicant shall install 10 no. swift bricks or specialist swift boxes on site. Siting should be in accordance with relevant guidelines i.e. at least 5 m

	from the ground, on a north facing wall with unobstructed access (no trees immediately opposite). (d) All trees with potential as bat roosts shall be felled outside the period of late August to early November, as per TII guidelines. (e) In the event that any protected species is encountered during the course of works the applicant shall carryout the following: i. All works in the immediate vicinity of the find shall cease immediately. ii. The area shall be secured to prevent further disturbance. iii. A suitably qualified ecologist shall be engaged to assess the situation. iv. The Planning Authority (Meath County Council Ecologist) shall be notified without delay. v. Works shall not recommence in the affected area until written agreement is obtained from the Planning Authority regarding appropriate avoidance, mitigation, or compensatory measures. vi. Where required, works shall not resume unless and until the necessary derogation licence has been obtained from the National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS). Reason: To ensure the protection of legally protected species and their habitats in accordance with national and European legislation, and to avoid adverse impacts on biodiversity. Comment: Inclusion of part of this condition is recommended (relating to hedgehog gates between gardens, swift bricks/boxes and timeframe for felling any trees with potential bat roost).
16.	a) Prior to commencement of construction the applicant shall update and submit the outlined Construction Environmental Monitoring Plan (CEMP) (Ref: CS Consulting Ref No G116,30th July 2025) for the written approval of the Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include but not be limited to operational controls for dust, noise and vibration, waste management, protection of soils and groundwaters, protection of flora and fauna, site housekeeping, emergency response planning, site environmental policy, environmental regulatory requirements and project roles and responsibilities.

	The CEMP shall also address extreme of weather (drought, wind, precipitation, temperature extremes) and the possible impacts on receptors and mitigation of same. The CEMP shall be treated as a live document. b) Prior to commencement of construction the applicant shall update and submit the prepared Resource Waste Management Plan (RWMP) (Ref: CS Consulting Ref No G116,30th July 2025) for the proposed development for the written approval of the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any site activity. The RWMP shall include but not be limited to project description, legislation requirements, demolition 2 waste, construction phase waste, categories of construction waste, anticipated hazardous waste, non-construction waste, segregation of waste streams, estimated waste generated, waste hierarchy and adherence to same, roles and responsibilities and communication of WMP, details of recovery and disposal sites, details of waste hauliers, record keeping and documentation, waste audit procedures. The WMP shall be prepared in accordance with “Best Practice Guidelines on the Preparation of Resource Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects” (2021) and “Guidelines for the Management of Waste from National Road Construction Road Projects” (Rev. 2017 as amended), the WMP shall also take cognisance of the National Waste Management Plan for a Circular Economy 2024-2030 (as may be revised or replaced from time to time) and the National Hazardous Waste Management Plan 2021-2027 (as may be revised or replaced from time to time) in particular the upper tiers of the Waste Hierarchy. All waste generated on site shall be recovered/ disposed of at an authorised facility and transported by an authorised collector. The RWMP shall be treated as a live document and communicated to all relevant personnel. c) Dust emissions during the construction phase shall not exceed 350mg/m²/day at the site boundaries. d) All refuelling shall take place in a designated refuelling area at least 30m from watercourses, details of same to be included in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). e) All hydrocarbons, chemicals, oils, etc. shall be stored in a dedicated bunded area at least 50m from watercourses and capable of storing 110% of
--	---

	the container/tank capacity. f) The applicant shall ensure adequate supply of spill kits and hydrocarbon absorbent pads are stocked on site. g) Burning of waste, including green waste, is prohibited on site. h) The construction works shall be carried out in accordance with the noise guidance set out by BS 5228-1:2009 Code of Practice for Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites and the NRA Guidelines for the treatment of Noise and Vibration in National Roads Schemes. i) During the construction phase noise levels at noise sensitive locations shall not exceed 70dB(A) between 0700 to 1900 hours Monday to Friday and 0800 to 1400 hours Saturday and 45dB(A) at any other time. Noise exceedance activities must be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to the activity taking place. j) The Applicant shall, during the construction stage, maintain a Complaints Register to record any complaints regarding but not limited to noise, odour, dust, traffic or any other environmental nuisance. The Complaint Register shall include details of the complaint and measures taken to address the complaint and prevent repetition of the complaint. k) In the event it is necessary to import/export soil and stone or topsoil for any element of the proposed development, the Applicant shall that a Certificate of Registration or 3 Waste Facility Permit as per the Waste Management (Facility and Registration) Regulations 2007, as amended is secured in advance of the works. l) Alternatively, soil and stone or topsoil may be imported/ exported from the site under a By Product Notification to the Environmental Protection Agency (Article 27). In accordance with Article 27 of the EC (Waste Directive) Regulations (2011). A log of all By-Product material movements will be recorded and maintained. m) All excavated material stored onsite shall be setback a minimum of 10 metres back from any drainage ditches/watercourses onsite. A silt fence shall also be installed at a minimum of 3 metres from any drainage ditches/watercourses onsite and shall be maintained until vegetation has been re-established.
--	---

	Reason: In the interests of public health and to provide for the protection of the environment. [ENVIRONMENT] <u>Comment:</u> Alternative condition recommended requiring final CEMP to be submitted. It is recommended that (m) is not attached. SFI NIS [Updated] states (Section 5.4.2.1) that silt fences will be installed along the length of both banks of Whitehall Stream and excavated material will be stored a minimum of 20m from the bank of any watercourse.
17.	(a) Prior to the commencement of the development the developer shall submit for the written agreement of Meath County Council an Operational Waste Management Plan. This plan must include details of the management of waste (and, in particular, recyclable materials and organic waste) within the development, including the provision of facilities for the storage, separation and collection of the waste and details of the ongoing operation of these facilities for each housing unit shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority not later than six months from the date of commencement of the development. Therefore, the waste shall be managed in accordance with the agreed plan. (b) This plan shall provide for screened communal bin stores, the location and design of which shall be included in the details to be submitted: i. A defined pedestrian route from apartment areas to the nearest waste storage area. ii. Waste storage areas should not present any safety risks to users i.e. installation of a non-slip, even surface within the waste storage area. iii. Adequate ventilation to avoid the creation of stagnant air or foul odours. iv. Appropriate sensor-controlled lighting. v. Suitable wastewater drainage points and water supply points should be installed in the bin storage area for cleaning and disinfecting. vi. Provision of appropriate graphical signage to inform residents of their obligation to reduce waste, segregate waste and in the correct bin. vii. Measures to control and monitor access to waste storage areas, ensuring safe and adequate upkeep. The communal bins shall include for the

	separation of recyclable materials, organic waste and residual waste). viii. The size and number of bins provided shall be determined by the estimated waste generated and the collection frequency required due to the nature of the waste e.g. organic waste. (c) Initial Waste Management - Provision of a full waste collection service from the date of first occupation of units with communal bin storage in the development. Provision of a guidance document to all occupants from the date of first occupation of units in the development. (d) The plan shall include provide for screen bin stores, which shall accommodate not less than three standard sized wheeled bins (namely recyclable materials, organic waste and residual waste) within the curtilage of each house plot. (e) Details of signage, waste management and hours of operation of non-residential units shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of the development. Please contact Helen Smith Executive Scientist Environment Waste Section, Meath County Council for queries in relation to this request. Reason: In the interests of public health and to provide for the protection of the environment. [ENVIRONMENT] <u>Comment:</u> Alternative condition recommended requiring submission and agreement of OWMP, to also include reference to proposed childcare facility.
18.	(a) Prior to the commencement of any of the proposed development, the applicant shall redesign the surface water system to the written agreement of the planning authority. To note the proposed surface water system is acceptable in principle. The applicant shall agree the design of all SuDS features and the proposed two attenuation systems to ensure the functionality of any green open space is not impacted. The applicant shall reduce the amount of concrete surround required where possible. (b) Prior to commencement of any of the proposed development, the applicant shall agree in writing the proposed attenuation system types with

	particular reference to future maintenance requirements. (c) Prior to commencement of any of the proposed development, the applicant shall submit a services coordination plan showing all proposed services and demonstrating acceptable separation distances can be achieved. The applicant shall include detail cross sections at locations where there are multiple services, most notably the proposed ø600mm culvert diversion. (d) All surface water design/work shall comply fully with the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study (GDSDS) Regional Drainage Policies Volume 2, for New Developments. (e) All surface water design/work shall comply fully with the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works Volume 6. Reason: To ensure orderly disposal of surface water and in the interests of road safety and environmental protection. Comment: Similar condition recommended.
19.	(a) The applicant shall include the provision of necessary infrastructure to be capable of accommodating future Electric Vehicle charging points, at a rate of 20% of total duplex car space numbers. (b) The applicant shall provide a 35mm layer of buff/beige coloured 10mm SMA 10 surf with colour matched aggregate in areas proposed as shared surfaces, unless otherwise agreed. (c) Pedestrian crossings, including tactile paving, shall comply with the "Traffic Management Guidelines". (d) All signs and road markings shall comply with the "Traffic Signs Manual". Placement of signs shall be in accordance with Chapter 1. Speed limit signage must accurately reflect the legal speed limit. (e) The applicant shall incorporate the agreed recommendations of the Stage 1/2 Road Safety Audit into the detailed development design. The applicant shall carry out a detailed Stage 3 Road Safety Audit (RSA) for the proposed development and surrounding area. The developer shall submit to the planning authority a copy of the RSA Stage 3 report and shall complete all of

	the remedial measures identified in the RSA Stage 3, prior to occupancy of the residential units, unless otherwise agreed. The applicant shall be liable for all costs associated with these works. (f) Visitor cycle parking for the duplex units shall also be provided at a standard of 1 space per 2 duplex residential units. Visitor cycle parking for the creche shall also be provided at a standard of 1 per 10 children and shall be able to facilitate cargo bike or bike with trailers. Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and orderly development. (g) The applicant shall submit a Construction Stage Traffic Management Plan for agreement with Meath County Council prior to commencement. Reason: In the interest of traffic management and pedestrian safety. Recommendation: Similar condition recommended. For clarity, no 'duplex' residential units are proposed. All units in the apartment block are 'apartments', located at either ground or first floor level.
20.	(a) The applicant shall implement all recommendations and actions stated in the revised SSFRA, that was submitted as part of the further information response. (b) The applicant shall ensure a 10m riparian strip is provided along the OPW channel for future maintenance purposes. (c) Prior to the commencement of any of the proposed development, the applicant shall agree in writing with the OPW and the planning authority, details of required maintenance and access for potential maintenance. Reason: In the interest of flood risk management Comment: Similar condition recommended. It is recommended that (c) requires agreement to be addressed with the P.A. There is no report on file from Office of Public Works (OPW). The documentation on file does not indicate that this file was referred by the P.A. to the OPW.

	For completeness, the P.A. invited the EPA to make comments. No response was received from the EPA.
21.	The lighting design shall be as per “Meath County Council’s: Public Lighting Technical Specification & Requirements” document. Reason: In the interest of visual and residential amenity [PUBLIC LIGHTING] Comment: Alternative condition recommended.
22.	No advertisement or advertisement structure (other than those shown on the drawings submitted with the application) shall be erected or displayed on any building (or within the curtilage of same) in such a manner as to be visible from outside the building, unless authorised by a further grant of planning permission. Reason: In the interest of visual amenity. Comment: Similar condition recommended. 1no. commercial unit only (creche) proposed in scheme.
23.	All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, communal television, telephone and public lighting cables) shall be run underground within the site. In this regard, ducting in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Authority shall be provided to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development the detail of which shall be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted. Reason: In the interest of orderly development and the visual amenities of the area. Comment: Similar condition recommended.
24.	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 development management and residential amenity Comment: Alternative condition recommended, which allows for working hours from 0700 to <u>1900</u> Mondays to Friday inclusive.
25.	The applicant shall pay the sum of €291,284.00 to the planning authority as a contribution towards expenditure that was and/or that is proposed to be incurred by the planning authority in the provision, refurbishment, upgrading, enlargement or replacement of public roads and public transport infrastructure by the Council benefiting development in the area of the Authority, as provided for in the Contribution Scheme of Meath County Council adopted in accordance with the provisions of Section 48 of the Planning & Development Acts 2000-2023. Payment of this sum shall be made prior to commencement of development unless the phasing of payments and the giving of security to ensure payment in full is agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The above sum shall apply until 31st December 2026 and shall be subject to review on that date and to annual review thereafter unless previously paid. The contribution rates shall be updated effective from January 1st each year during the lifetime of the Development Contribution Scheme in accordance with the Wholesale Price Indices - Building and Construction (Capital Goods) published by the Central Statistics Office. Reason: The provision of such roads and public transport infrastructure in the area by the Council will facilitate the proposed development. It is considered reasonable that the developer should contribute towards the cost of providing these services.

	Comment: Alternative 1no. single condition recommended for unspecified amount for development contribution. See also Conditions 26 and 27 – it is recommended that these 2no. conditions are ‘combined’ with Condition 25 into a single condition for development contributions.
26.	The applicant shall pay the sum of €211,246.00 to the planning authority as a contribution towards expenditure that was and/or that is proposed to be incurred by the planning authority in the provision and extension of social infrastructure (open spaces, recreational and community facilities, amenities and landscaping works) by the Council benefiting development in the area of the Authority, as provided for in the Contribution Scheme of Meath County Council adopted in accordance with the provisions of Section 48 of the Planning & Development Acts 2000-2023. Payment of this sum shall be made prior to commencement of development unless the phasing of payments and the giving of security to ensure payment in full is agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The above sum shall apply until 31st December 2026 and shall be subject to review on that date and to annual review thereafter unless previously paid. The contribution rates shall be updated effective from January 1st each year during the lifetime of the Development Contribution Scheme in accordance with the Wholesale Price Indices - Building and Construction (Capital Goods) published by the Central Statistics Office. Reason: The provision of such social infrastructure in the area by the Council will facilitate the proposed development. It is considered reasonable that the developer should contribute towards the cost of providing these services. Comment: See Condition 25
27.	The applicant shall pay the sum of €26,408.00 to the planning authority as a contribution towards expenditure that was and/or that is proposed to be incurred by the planning authority in the provision of surface water drainage

	infrastructure by the Council benefiting development in the area of the Authority, as provided for in the Contribution Scheme of Meath County Council adopted in accordance with the provisions of Section 48 of the Planning & Development Acts 2000-2023. Payment of this sum shall be made prior to commencement of development unless the phasing of payments and the giving of security to ensure payment in full is agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The above sum shall apply until 31st December 2026 and shall be subject to review on that date and to annual review thereafter unless previously paid. The contribution rates shall be updated effective from January 1st each year during the lifetime of the Development Contribution Scheme in accordance with the Wholesale Price Indices - Building and Construction (Capital Goods) published by the Central Statistics Office. Reason: The provision of such surface water drainage in the area by the Council will facilitate the proposed development. It is considered reasonable that the developer should contribute towards the cost of providing these services. <u>Comment:</u> See Condition 25
28.	The developer shall lodge with the Planning Authority a cash deposit of €296,000.00 as a security for the satisfactory completion and maintenance until taken in charge by the Council of roads, footpaths, surface water drains, public lighting, open space, landscaping and any other services required with the development. In the event of the non-completion or maintenance of the services the Planning Authority shall be empowered to apply the said funds or part thereof for the satisfactory completion of and maintenance as aforesaid of any part of the development Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out and completed to an acceptable construction standard. <u>Comment:</u> Similar condition recommended for unspecified amount.

29.	The developer shall pay the sum of €200.00 per residential unit (€16,400.00) as a contribution towards expenditure to be incurred by the Planning Authority in the monitoring of the construction phases of the development. Payment of this sum shall be made prior to the commencement of development. The above sum shall apply until 31st December 2026 and shall be subject to review on that date and to annual review thereafter unless previously paid. The contribution rates shall be updated effective from January 1st each year during the lifetime of the Development Contribution Scheme in accordance with the Wholesale Price Indices – Building and Construction (Capital Goods) published by the Central Statistics Office. Reason: It is considered reasonable that the developer should contribute towards the Planning Authority’s monitoring costs associated with the development <u>Comment:</u> It is recommended that this condition is omitted, as discussed in Section 8.0 (under ‘Other Issues’).
-----	--

12.0 Recommendation

12.1. Permission with condition is recommended.

13.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, the A1 Existing Residential zoning objective of the subject site and its location within the settlement boundary of Trim, a self-sustaining growth town in the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience and would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity. The proposed 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 and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 04 day of February 2026, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars. Reason: In the interest of clarity
2.	The development hereby permitted shall comprise • 82no. residential units, consisting of 72no. houses and 10no. apartments, and • 1no. childcare facility Reason: In the interest of clarity.
3.	The mitigation measures contained in the Natura Impact Statement (NIS), submitted as Significant Further Information on 04 February 2026, shall be implemented. Reason: To protect the integrity of European Sites.
4.	(a) The development shall be carried out on a phased basis, in accordance with a phasing scheme which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of any development. (b) The childcare facility shall be provided in phase one of the scheme. Reason: To ensure the timely provision of services, for the benefit

	of the occupants of the proposed dwellings.
5.	Development described in Classes 1 or 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, or any statutory provision modifying or replacing them, shall not be carried out within the curtilage of any of the proposed dwellinghouses without a prior grant of planning permission. Reason: In order to ensure that a reasonable amount of private open space is provided for the benefit of the occupants of the proposed dwellings.
6.	(a) The applicant shall engage the services of a suitably qualified archaeologist to coordinate the mitigation proposals contained in the Archaeological Impact Assessment Report to include the excavation of the remains of a burnt spread (previously identified in testing) and the Archaeological Monitoring (under licence) of ground disturbance at construction stages across the development site. (b) The archaeologist will assist in the integration of the archaeological mitigation into the final Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). (c) Should previously unidentified archaeological material be found during the course of monitoring, the archaeologist may have work on the site stopped, pending a decision as to how best to deal with the archaeology. The developer shall be prepared to be advised by the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage with regard to any necessary mitigating action (e.g. preservation in situ, or excavation) and should facilitate the archaeologist in recording any material found. (d) The Planning Authority and the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage shall be furnished with a report describing the results of the monitoring.

	Reason: To ensure the continued preservation (either in situ or by record) of places, caves, sites, features or other objects of archaeological interest.
7.	Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 10(4) of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, or any statutory provision modifying or replacing them, no room in the proposed houses shall be used for the purpose of providing overnight paying guest accommodation without a prior grant of planning permission. Reason: In order to prevent overdevelopment of the site in the interest of residential amenity.
8.	Prior to commencement of development, the applicant or other person with an interest in the land to which the application relates shall enter into an agreement in writing with the planning authority in relation to the provision of housing on lands in accordance with the requirements of section 94(4) and section 96(2) and 96(3) (b), (Part V) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, unless an exemption certificate has been granted under section 97 of the Act, as amended. Where such an agreement cannot be reached between the parties, the matter in dispute (other than a matter to which section 96(7) applies) shall be referred by the planning authority or any other prospective party to the agreement, to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination. Reason: To comply with the requirements of Part V of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and of the housing strategy in the development plan for the area.
9.	Prior to the occupation of the development, a Mobility Management Plan (MMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning

	authority. This shall provide for incentives to encourage the use of public transport, cycling and walking by residents/occupants/staff employed in the development. The MMP shall include public transport information, where relevant. Reason: In the interest of encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport.
10.	(a) Prior to commencement of development, a revised landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the planning authority. This landscape scheme shall indicate proposed access and maintenance proposals for the hedgerow along the western site boundary. (b) The landscaping scheme shall be carried out within the first planting season following substantial completion of external construction works. (c) All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from the completion of the development shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority. (d) Final details of all boundary treatments shall be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development. Boundary treatments to be agreed shall include any boundaries to (i) Whitehall Stream and to (ii) the townland boundary ditch which traverses the approximate centre of the site, running from north west to south east. (e) The plans and particulars to be submitted shall demonstrate how the hedgerow along the western site boundary is intended to be

	maintained, and shall clarify if this area is intended to be taken in charge or maintained by a management company. (f) Prior to commencement of development, a written and photographic record of the townland boundary to be impacted, shall be submitted for the written agreement of the planning authority. (g) Prior to commencement of development, details of a public art feature to be incorporated into the overall scheme or a financial contribution to facilitate the Council to provide a piece of public art in order to enhance the amenities of the local environment shall be submitted for the written agreement of the planning authority. Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.
11.	(a) Prior to the commencement of the development as permitted, the applicant or any person with an interest in the land shall enter into an agreement with the planning authority (such agreement must specify the number and location of each residential unit), pursuant to Section 47 of the Planning and Development Acts 2000-2023, that restricts all residential units permitted, to first occupation by individual purchasers i.e. those not being a corporate entity, and/or by those eligible for the occupation of social and/or affordable housing, including cost rental housing. (b) An agreement pursuant to Section 47 shall be applicable for the period of duration of the planning permission, except where after not less than two years from the date of completion of each specified housing unit, it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the planning authority that it has not been possible to transact each specified house unit for use by individual purchasers and/or to those eligible for the occupation of social and/or affordable housing, including cost rental housing. (c) The determination of the planning authority as required in (b) shall be subject to receipt by the planning and housing authority of satisfactory documentary evidence from the applicant or any person with an interest in

	the land regarding the sales and marketing of the specified housing units, in which case the planning authority shall confirm in writing to the applicant or any person with an interest in the land that the Section 47 agreement has been terminated and that the requirement of this planning condition has been discharged in respect of each specified housing unit. Reason: To restrict new housing development to use by persons of a particular class or description in order to ensure an adequate choice and supply of housing, including affordable housing, in the common good.
12.	Proposals for an estate/street name, house/apartment numbering scheme and associated signage shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, all estate and street signs, and house/apartment numbers, shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme. The proposed name(s) shall be based on local historical or topographical features, or other alternatives acceptable to the planning authority. No advertisements/marketing signage relating to the name(s) of the development shall be erected until the developer has obtained the planning authority's written agreement to the proposed name(s). Reason: In the interest of urban legibility and to ensure the use of locally appropriate placenames for new residential areas.
13.	The internal road network serving the proposed development including turning bays, junctions, parking areas, footpaths, and kerbs, shall comply with the detailed construction standards of the planning authority for such works and design standards outlined in Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS). Reason: In the interest of amenity and of traffic safety and amenity.

14.	(a) Prior to the commencement of development the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreement (s) with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for service connection(s) to the public water supply and wastewater collection network. (b) Where the applicant proposes to build over or divert existing water or wastewater services the applicant shall have received written Confirmation of Feasibility (COF) of Diversion(s) from Uisce Éireann prior to any works commencing. Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.
15.	(a) Prior to the commencement of any of the proposed development, the applicant shall redesign the surface water system to the written agreement of the planning authority. The applicant shall agree the design of all SuDS features and the proposed two attenuation systems to ensure the functionality of any green open space is not impacted. (b) Prior to commencement of any of the proposed development, the applicant shall agree in writing the proposed attenuation system types with particular reference to future maintenance requirements. (c) Prior to commencement of any of the proposed development, the applicant shall submit a services coordination plan showing all proposed services and demonstrating acceptable separation distances can be achieved. The applicant shall include detail cross sections at locations where there are multiple services, most notably the proposed ø600mm culvert diversion. (d) All surface water design/work shall comply fully with the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study (GDSDS) Regional Drainage Policies Volume 2, for New Developments. (e) All surface water design/work shall comply fully with the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works Volume 6. Reason: In the interests of public health and surface water management.

16.	Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority. Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.
17.	Prior to the commencement of any works associated with the development hereby permitted, the developer shall submit a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) for the construction phase of the development for the written agreement of the planning authority. The TMP shall incorporate details of the road network to be used by construction traffic including oversized loads, detailed proposals for the protection of bridges, culverts and other structures to be traversed, as may be required. The agreed CTMP shall be implemented in full during the course of construction of the development. Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and convenience.
18.	The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a final Construction and Environmental Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including: (i) (a) Location of the site and materials compound(s) including area(s) identified for the storage of construction refuse; (b) Location of areas for construction site offices and staff facilities; (c) Details of site security fencing and hoardings; (d) Details of on-site car parking facilities for site workers during the course of construction;

	(e) Details of the timing and routing of construction traffic to and from the construction site and associated directional signage, to include proposals to facilitate the delivery of abnormal loads to the site; (f) Measures to obviate queuing of construction traffic on the adjoining road network; (g) Measures to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on the public road network; (h) Alternative arrangements to be put in place for pedestrians and vehicles in the case of the closure of any public road or footpath during the course of site development works; (i) Details of appropriate mitigation measures for noise, dust and vibration, and monitoring of such levels; (j) Containment of all construction-related fuel and oil within specially constructed bunds to ensure that fuel spillages are fully contained. Such bunds shall be roofed to exclude rainwater; (k) Off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste and details of how it is proposed to manage excavated soil; (l) Means to ensure that surface water run-off is controlled such that no silt or other pollutants enter local surface water sewers or drains. (m) A record of daily checks that the works are being undertaken in accordance with the Construction and Environmental Management Plan shall be available for inspection by the planning authority; (ii) The final CEMP to be submitted shall take account of any archaeological requirements of Condition 6 of this permission. (iii) The final CEMP shall be consistent with the Natura Impact Statement, submitted as Significant Further Information on 04 February 2026, which states that silt fences will be installed along the length of both banks of Whitehall Stream and excavated material will be stored a minimum of 20m from the bank of any watercourse. Reason: In the interest of amenities, public health and safety and environmental protection
--	--

19.	Prior to commencement of development, a Resource Waste Management Plan (RWMP) as set out in the EPA's Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects (2021) shall be prepared and submitted to the planning authority for written agreement. The RWMP shall include specific proposals as to how the RWMP will be measured and monitored for effectiveness. All records (including for waste and all resources) pursuant to the agreed RWMP shall be made available for inspection at the site office at all times. Reason: In the interest of reducing waste and encouraging recycling.
20.	(a) The communal open spaces, including hard and soft landscaping, car parking areas and access ways, communal refuse/bin storage and all areas not intended to be taken in charge by the local authority, shall be maintained by a legally constituted management company. (b) Details of the management company contract, and drawings/particulars describing the parts of the development for which the company would have responsibility, shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority before any of the residential units are made available for occupation. Reason: To provide for the satisfactory future maintenance of this development in the interest of residential amenity.
21.	The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and completed at least to the construction standards as set out in the planning authority's Taking In Charge Standards. Following completion, the development shall be maintained by the developer, in compliance with these standards, until taken in charge by the planning authority. Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out and completed to an acceptable standard of construction.

22.	The plans and particulars to be submitted shall clarify if the hedgerow along the western site boundary is intended to be maintained by a management company. Reason: In the interests of clarity and biodiversity.
23.	(a) Prior to commencement of development, revised plans and particulars shall be submitted to and agreed with the planning authority which shall show the location of (i) Hedgehog gates to be installed between gardens (ii) 10no. swift bricks or swift boxes on site (b) Any trees with potential as bat roosts to be felled shall be felled outside the period of 31 August to 01 November. Reason: To protect biodiversity.
24.	All the communal parking areas serving the residential units shall be provided with functional electric vehicle charging points, and all of the in-curtilage car parking spaces serving residential units shall be provided with electric connections to the exterior of the houses to allow for the provision of future electric vehicle charging points. Details of how it is proposed to comply with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Reason: In the interest of sustainable transportation.
25.	All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development. All

	existing over ground cables shall be re-located underground as part of the site development works. Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.
26.	(a) The applicant shall implement all recommendations and actions stated in the revised Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment, submitted as Significant Further Information on 04 February 2026 (b) The applicant shall ensure a 10m riparian strip is provided along Whitehall Stream (OPW channel) within the subject site for future maintenance purposes. (c) Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall agree in writing with the planning authority, details of required maintenance and access for potential maintenance. Reason: In the interest of flood risk management
27.	(a) A plan containing details for the management of waste (and, in particular, recyclable materials) within the development, including the provision of facilities for the storage, separation and collection of the waste and, in particular, recyclable materials shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, the waste shall be managed in accordance with the agreed plan. (b) This plan shall provide for screened communal bin stores, the locations and designs of which shall be included in the details to be submitted. (c) The Plan shall include both the residential development and the childcare facility hereby permitted. Reason: To provide for the appropriate management of waste and, in particular recyclable materials, in the interest of protecting the environment.

28.	Prior to commencement of development, the applicant shall submit a revised site layout plan, to an appropriate scale, which shall show the provision of cycle parking to serve the proposed creche, in accordance with the cycle parking standards set out in the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027. The cycle parking area to be provided shall be sheltered. Reason: In the interests of sustainable transportation.
29.	The proposed childcare facility shall not operate outside the period of 0700 to 1800 hours Monday to Friday inclusive and shall not operate on Saturdays, Sundays or public holidays. Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.
30.	Public lighting shall be provided in accordance with a scheme, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Such lighting shall be provided prior to the making available by the developer for occupation of any house. Reason: In the interests of amenity and public safety.
31.	No advertisement or advertisement structure (other than those shown on the drawings submitted with the application) shall be erected or displayed on the building (or within the curtilage of the site) in such a manner as to be visible from outside the building, unless authorised by a further grant of planning permission. Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.
32.	Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or other security to secure the provision and satisfactory completion and maintenance until taken in charge by the local authority of roads, footpaths, watermains, drains, public open space and other services required in connection with the development, coupled with an agreement

	empowering the local authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory completion or maintenance of any part of the development. The form and amount of the security shall be as agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination. Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion and maintenance of the development until taken in charge.
33.	The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme. Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

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

10 September 2026

Appendix 1(a): Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-501279-MH-26
Proposed Development Summary	85no. residential units comprising 73no. house and 12no. apartments/duplexes. SFI submitted amended the proposed development to 82no. residential units (72no. houses and 10no. apartments) and a creche. The description of the proposed development is further detailed at Section 2.0 of the main report.
Development Address	Site bounded to north by The Belfry, rear of dwellings on Kildalkey Road to south, Talbot Court/Butterstown Stream to east and agricultural lands to the west, on Athboy Road, Trim, 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	(a) the nature and scale of the project, which is below the threshold in Schedule 5, Part 2, - Class 10(b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units - Class 10(b)(iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area (non-business district area)

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:** _____

Appendix 1(b): EIA Screening Determination

A. CASE DETAILS		
An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	PL-501279-MH-26	
Development Summary	Permission is sought for construction of 85no. residential units, comprising 73no. houses and 12no. apartments. SFI submitted amended the proposed development to 82no. residential units (72no. houses and 10no. apartments) and a creche. The description of the proposed development is further detailed at Section 2.0 of the main report. Site location: Site is bounded to north by The Belfry, rear of dwellings on Kildalkey Road to south, Talbot Court/Butterstown Stream to east and agricultural lands to the west, on Athboy Road, Trim, Co. Meath	
	Yes / No / N/A	Comment (if relevant)
1. Was a Screening Determination carried out by the PA?	No	Planner's Report noted EIA Screening Report (EIASR) submitted and concluded no EIAR was required. No detailed assessment on file.
2. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?	Yes	

3. Has an AA screening report or NIS been submitted?	Yes	AA Screening and Stage 2 NIS lodged with application. (document titled Natura Impact Statement) Revised document submitted as SFI.
4. Is a IED/ IPC or Waste Licence (or review of licence) required from the EPA? If YES has the EPA commented on the need for an EIAR?	No	
5. Have any other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment which have a significant bearing on the project been carried out pursuant to other relevant Directives – for example SEA	Yes	The EIASR references – • Water Framework Directive • (with reference to noise limits) European Commission Directive 2000/14/EC Other assessments carried out include: • Appropriate Assessment Screening which considers the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) and Birds Directive (2009/147/EC) • Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan which considers the Waste Framework Directive (Directive 2008/98/EC) • Resource & Waste Management Plan which considers Waste Framework Directive 2008/98/EC • SFI Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment considers that the Meath County Development Plan has sought to proactively manage flood risk in the county in accordance with the EU Flood Directive 2007/60/EC. Separately, I note that SEA and AA were carried out for Meath

		County Development Plan <u>2021-2027</u> , as varied.	
B. EXAMINATION	Yes/ No/ Uncertain	Briefly describe the nature and extent and Mitigation Measures (where relevant) (having regard to the probability, magnitude (including population size affected), complexity, duration, frequency, intensity, and reversibility of impact) Mitigation measures –Where relevant specify features or measures proposed by the applicant to avoid or prevent a significant effect.	Is this likely to result in significant effects on the environment? Yes/ No/ Uncertain
This screening examination should be read with, and in light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith			
1. Characteristics of proposed development (including demolition, construction, operation, or decommissioning)			
1.1 Is the project significantly different in character or scale to the existing surrounding or environment?	No	The site is a greenfield site. There is an existing residential estate The Belfry to the north, through which the project would be accessed. There is a row of individual dwelling houses to the south of the site, accessed from Kildalkey Road.	No
1.2 Will construction, operation, decommissioning or demolition works cause physical changes to the locality (topography, land use, waterbodies)?	Yes	<u>SFI NIS [Updated]:</u> Whitehall Stream, an OPW channel, traverses the central section of the site. The site has been divided into 2 catchment areas for collection and disposal of stormwater runoff. Whitehall Stream is culverted where it traverses The Belfry (and other stretches of this stream).	No

		Section 3.2.2.1: Culverting of the existing ditch which crosses the centre of the site has been revised, and it is proposed to connect this ditch to the OPW channel (Whitehall Stream) <u>Comment:</u> The site is generally flat. No demolition works are proposed, save for the removal of an existing wall at the southern boundary of The Belfry, and which bounds the subject site. Whitehall Stream runs from the north west corner of the site in a south easterly direction, all in the northern part of the site. I note that a range of SuDS measures are proposed, and the attenuation areas have been enlarged in the SFI response over that originally proposed. Proposed excavation works will cause a change in site topography/ground levels. I note that these would be managed by a RWMP and CEMP. Outline CEMP was submitted with the application. Should the Commission be minded to grant it is recommended that a final version be submitted for approval by way of condition. The proposed development would be served by public sewer. At operation phase I consider that the proposed development by itself would not cause physical changes to the locality. I do not consider that the physical changes arising from the project are likely to result in significant	
--	--	--	--

		effects on the environment in terms of topography, land use and hydrology/hydrogeology.	
1.3 Will construction or operation of the project use natural resources such as land, soil, water, materials/minerals or energy, especially resources which are non-renewable or in short supply?	Yes	<u>EIASR:</u> The project does not include the extensive use of natural resources. Significant negative effects arising from the use of land or soil are not anticipated. <u>Comment:</u> I note that the project would use standard construction methods, materials and equipment. The process would be managed by the final CEMP and waste would be managed by RWMP. The project uses land which is a finite resource. However, the site is contiguous to the built-up area of Trim and is currently 'landlocked', insofar access to the site is via an existing housing estate. Given that the subject lands are zoned and can be serviced by connections to public water and waste water infrastructure, and the proposed development includes the provision of a childcare facility and open space, I consider the project to be an efficient use of land. Accordingly, I do not consider that the use of natural resources in the project likely to result in a significant effect on the environment of the area.	No
1.4 Will the project involve the use, storage, transport, handling or production of substance which would be harmful to human health or the environment?	Yes	<u>EIASR:</u> Section 3.1.2: Regarding surface water run-off, harmful materials such as fuels, oils, greases, paints and hydraulic fluids must be stored in bunded compounds well away from storm water drains and gullies, and refuelling of machinery should be carried out using drip trays.	No

		Table 5.3: Potential effects to human health are anticipated to be slight. Potential effects on sensitive receptors are unlikely to be significant, pending the implementation of best practice construction procedures and mitigation measures for environmental protection. <u>Comment:</u> Construction phase will require use of potentially harmful materials such as fuel and waste will be created. Use of such substances would be typical of a construction site. Noise and dust emissions during construction phase are likely. These would be managed through implementation of the outline/final CEMP. At operational phase the use, storage, transport, handling or production of substances which would be harmful to human health or the environment are not anticipated to arise. Condition 17 of P.A.'s decision requires submission of Operational Waste Management Plan (OWMP) prior to commencement. Should the Commission be minded to grant, it is recommended that a similar condition requiring OWMP is attached for both the residential units and the childcare facility. Accordingly, I do not consider that this aspect of the proposed development likely to result in significant effects on the environment in terms of human health or biodiversity.	
--	--	---	--

1.5 Will the project produce solid waste, release pollutants or any hazardous / toxic / noxious substances?	Yes	<u>EIASR:</u> Table 5.1: It is not anticipated that significant quantities of waste will be generated as a result of road use or excavation activities. <u>Comment:</u> No demolition of buildings is proposed in the project. It is proposed to remove the existing southern boundary wall at The Belfry bounding the subject site. Conventional waste will be produced from construction activity and will be managed through the final CEMP and the RWMP. The operational phase of the project comprising occupation of the dwelling units and the creche will not produce or release any pollutant or hazardous material. Conventional operational waste will be managed through an Operational Waste Management Plan (OWMP), as recommended at Item 1.4 above. Accordingly, I do not consider that the production of waste or generation of pollutants in the project likely to result in a significant effect on the environment of the area.	No
1.6 Will the project lead to risks of contamination of land or water from releases of pollutants onto the ground or into surface waters, groundwater, coastal waters or the sea?	Yes	<u>EIASR:</u> Table 5.2: The principle hydrological features in the vicinity of the site are Whitehall Stream which flows through the site from north to east and River Boyne which the stream adjoins ca. 750m downstream. Both the Whitehall Stream and the Boyne Main Channel demonstrate a WFD status of	No

		“Moderate” and are “At Risk” in accordance with the Water Framework Directive objectives. According to GSI groundwater maps, the site overlies a locally important aquifer, of bedrock which is generally moderately productive (Lm). Groundwater vulnerability index of the entire site is described as high. Pending implementation of best practice construction methodologies and mitigation measures throughout the construction stage, significant effects are not anticipated. Risks to receptors are anticipated to be negligible given the nature of the proposed development including implementation of best practice construction procedures and mitigation methods that will be applied to avoid effects. Table 5.3: There exists a direct hydrological pathway from the proposed project to two no. Natura 2000 sites, which include River Boyne & River Blackwater SAC (002299) located ca. 360m south and River Boyne & River Blackwater SPA (004232) located ca. 410m south. Whitehall Stream is hydrologically connected to these Natura 2000 sites, ca. 750m downstream. NIS concludes that there is no potential for the proposed development to result in adverse effects on the integrity of any European site. It is not anticipated the development will exacerbate the risk of flooding. Residual effects from an ecological perspective are not anticipated to be significant and effects to	
--	--	---	--

		biodiversity, flora and fauna is anticipated to be negligible, pending the implementation of best practice construction procedures and mitigation measures. Regarding land and soil, potential effects on underlying soils are negligible. <u>SFI NIS [Updated]:</u> Section 5.4.2 (Mitigation Measures) At In-stream works, it outlines that minor landscaping works are proposed along the Whitehall Stream. 3no. headwalls will be created for the overflow of surface waters from the on-site attenuation areas into the Whitehall Stream. A dry works area will be created, and isolated from the watercourse. No instream works will be undertaken outside the isolated works area. <u>Comment</u> The project involves site preparation, excavations, construction (structures and roads) and landscaping works. The construction phase activities are associated with contamination risks to land and/or water sources. Standard construction methods, materials and equipment are to be used and the construction process will be managed through implementation of the outline/final CEMP and RWMP. See also	
--	--	---	--

		- Item 2.1 regarding risk of contamination of protected water bodies/ecological designations - Item 2.5 regarding risk of contamination of water resources including surface waters, groundwaters, coastal waters and of flood risk. Accordingly, as risks of contamination to ground or water bodies are not predicted and/or can be mitigated for, I do not consider this aspect of the proposed development likely to result in a significant effect on the environment.	
1.7 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes	<u>EIASR:</u> Section 3.1.11 Noise: A preliminary risk assessment was carried out for the proposed site locations in accordance with Air Quality Monitoring and Noise Control Unit's Good Practice Guide for Construction and Demolition (London Authorities Noise Action Forum, July 2016). This assessment considered factors relating to the proximity of the sites to sensitive receptors and rated the level of nuisance anticipated with scheduled work practices; Appendix A refers. The proposed development was determined to be a moderate risk site based on scale and nature of the project. Noise emanating from the project during construction phase has potential to impact off-site receptors. The project will be obliged to comply with BS 5228 Noise Control on Construction and open sites Part 1. The appointed contractor shall implement measures outlined to eliminate or reduce noise levels where possible, including	No

		fitting all plant and equipment with appropriate mufflers or silencers. Table 5.1: Potential light pollution effects are deemed unlikely. <u>Comment:</u> While noting that it is stated that light pollution effects are deemed unlikely, I consider that light impact impacts, in addition to noise and vibration are likely during construction phase. The construction phase would be short term in duration. Construction impacts will be temporary and localised. Impacts will be managed through the outline/final CEMP. At operation phase the project would likely result in potential noise and light impacts due to the occupation of the housing scheme and childcare facility, including impacts arising from traffic and use of the open spaces. These impacts are expected to be typical of this primarily residential scheme of this size. P.A.'s Condition 21 states the lighting design shall be as per Meath County Council's Public Lighting Technical Specification & Requirements document. I consider that lighting impacts will be mitigated by the provision of public lighting to the satisfaction of the planning authority.	
--	--	---	--

		Accordingly, I do not consider that the project would likely result in significant effects on the environment in terms of air quality (noise, vibration, light pollution).	
1.8 Will there be any risks to human health, for example due to water contamination or air pollution?	Yes	<u>EIASR</u> Table 5.3: Potential effects to human health are anticipated to be slight. Potential effects on sensitive receptors are unlikely to be significant, pending the implementation to best practice construction procedures and mitigation measures for environmental protection. Construction stage effects are anticipated to be negligible given the nature of the development and characteristics of the surrounding area. Effects during operation stage anticipated to be slight and permanent in nature and will have a low intensity type impact <u>Comment:</u> The potential for water contamination and air pollution (noise and dust emissions) during construction phase is likely. These works would be managed by implementation of the outlined/ final CEMP. As outlined above at Item 1.7, construction impacts will be temporary and localised. The operational phase of the proposed development will not likely cause risks to human	No

		health through water contamination or air pollution due to the nature, scale and design of the scheme, connection to public water systems and use of SuDS features in the surface water management system. Accordingly, I do not consider this aspect of the project likely to result in a significant effect on the environment.	
1.9 Will there be any risk of major accidents that could affect human health or the environment?	No	<u>EIASR:</u> Table 5.1: The risks to human health are anticipated to be negligible given the nature of the proposed development including best practice procedures and mitigation measures that will be applied to avoid effects. <u>Comment:</u> Having regard to the nature, scale and location of the proposed development, I consider that there is no risk of major accidents.	No
1.10 Will the project affect the social environment (population, employment)	Yes	<u>EIASR:</u> Table 5.2: The site is located in a moderately populated area of moderate environmental sensitivity. It is located within the Trim Rural electoral division, a townland of 35.4km² in size, with a total population of 9,201 people in 2022 and a population density of 260 per km².	No

		Some slight effects are anticipated as a result of the proposed activity, however the extent is anticipated to be localised and significant effects are not envisaged pending implementation to best practice construction procedures and mitigation measures for environmental protection. Table 5.3: Construction stage impact and nuisances will be temporary. Effects associated with the operational phase are anticipated to be long-term. <u>Comment:</u> The project increases localised temporary employment at the subject site for the duration of the construction phase. The construction phase would be short term in duration and impacts will be temporary, localised and addressed by the mitigation measures in the outline/final CEMP. The operational phase would (as per SFI response) result in provision of 82no. residential units, and a childcare facility indicated to cater for 19no. children. Employment would generated by the provision of the childcare facility, although I consider that employment numbers would be low. The subject site is located at the edge of town, and adjoins established residential areas to the north, east and south. There is an industrial estate on the opposite side of Athboy Road (opposite The Belfry). The entrance to The Belfry on Athboy	
--	--	---	--

		Road is approx. 1.3km walking distance to Trim town centre (High St.), and is approx. 780m west of a supermarket on C1 Mixed Use zoned lands on the southern side of Athboy Road. The site is in relative proximity to other services and amenities and has the capacity to accommodate the likely impacts associated with the anticipated population increase. Accordingly, I do not consider this aspect of the project likely to result in a significant effect on the social environment of the area.	
1.11 Is the project part of a wider large scale change that could result in cumulative effects on the environment?	Yes	<u>EIASR:</u> Section 3.1.10 (Local Planning Context): The site is located on the western outskirts of a well-developed townland area. There is potential for cumulative effects to occur within the surrounding environment as a result of further development. The majority of applicable granted applications in the vicinity consist of minor alterations/ adjustments to residential units and Retention Permission applications. Table 3.1 contains 1no. planning application in the vicinity: P.A. Ref. 2460523. This is a proposed 316sqm industrial unit at 13/13a IDA Industrial Estate, Athboy Road, Trim.	No

		Due to scale of this project and nature of applications in the vicinity of the site, the potential cumulative effects are deemed to be low. Table 5.1: A review of existing and previous planning applications under consideration by the Council indicates the majority of applicable granted applications in the vicinity consist of minor alterations/ adjustments to residential units and Retention Permission applications. The closest IPC or IE licenced site to the site is Trimproof Limited (IPC License P0604-01), ca. 1.1km southeast of the site. Table 5.3: It is considered that cumulative effects with other existing and/or approved projects are not likely to cause significant effects on the environment. <u>Comment:</u> The site is zoned A1: protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities. Guidance in the Development Plan states development proposals on these lands primarily consist of infill developments and extension and refurbishment of existing properties. Lands to the west of the site are zoned RA Rural Area and are outside the Trim settlement boundary.	
--	--	--	--

		I note that the industrial unit permitted by P.A. Ref. 2460523 has not been constructed, as viewed on site visit. That site is located within an industrial estate, approx. 500m from the appeal site (straight line distance). Having regard to the distance of proposed industrial unit site to the subject appeal site, I do not consider that the implementation of that permission and the subject project would result in cumulative effects on the environment.	
2. Location of proposed development			
2.1 Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining or have the potential to impact on any of the following: - European site (SAC/ SPA/ pSAC/ pSPA) - NHA/ pNHA - Designated Nature Reserve - Designated refuge for flora or fauna - Place, site or feature of ecological interest, the preservation/conservation/ protection of which is an objective of a development plan/ LAP/ draft plan or variation of a plan	Yes	European site (SAC/ SPA/ pSAC/ pSPA) The site is not located on, in, adjoining or has the potential to impact on any European sites. <u>EIASR:</u> Table 5.2: The project is located in a developed environment ca.360m north of the nearest Natura 2000 site (River Blackwater & Boyne SAC & SPA). Watercourses and surface runoff are seen as the main potential pathway for effects on Natura 2000 sites. These sites are hydrologically linked to Whitehall Stream which flows through the proposed development from north to south and adjoins the aforementioned sites ca. 750m downstream. A Stage II Appropriate Assessment (NIS) has been prepared for the proposed residential development. In summary, the report concludes that there is no potential for the proposed development to result in adverse effects on the integrity of any European sites.	No

		<u>Comment:</u> I estimate that – - River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC is approx. 370m to south - River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA is approx. 450m to south of the subject site Whitehall Stream traverses the northern part of the subject site, and discharges to River Boyne. There is therefore an indirect hydrological connection from the subject site to the 2no. European sites cited above. I have carried out AA Screening and Stage 2 AA at Appendix 2 of this report. I have concluded that the proposed development either alone or in combination with other plans or projects would not result in likely significant effects on the integrity of any European sites. NHA/pNHA The site is not located on, in, adjoining or has the potential to impact on any NHA or pNHA. The nearest pNHA is Trim (001357), approx. 4km to east on the River Boyne (straight line distance). I do not consider that the project would likely result in a significant effect on the environment in terms of these designations. Designated Nature Reserve The site is not located within or in the vicinity of any designated nature reserve, as viewed on the	
--	--	--	--

		NPWS website (www.npws.ie, accessed 03 September 2026). I do not consider that the project would likely result in a significant effect on the environment in terms of this designation. Designated refuge for flora or fauna The site is not located within or in the vicinity of a designated refuge for flora or fauna. It is not located within a Wildfowl Sanctuary, as viewed on the NPWS website (www.npws.ie, accessed 03 September 2026). I do not consider that the project would likely result in a significant effect on the environment in terms of this designation. Place, site or feature of ecological interest, the preservation/conservation/ protection of which is an objective of a development plan/ LAP/ draft plan or variation of a plan None	
2.2 Could any protected, important or sensitive species of flora or fauna which use areas on or around the site, for example: for breeding, nesting, foraging, resting, over-wintering, or migration, be affected by the project?	Yes	SFI ECIA: The proposed development site broadly comprises three connected agricultural fields utilised for cattle grazing. The following habitats were recorded within the proposed development site: • GA1 Improved Agricultural Grassland; • WL1 Hedgerows; • FW4 Drainage Ditches; • FW2 Lowland/Depositing River;	No

		• WS1 Scrub; and • ED3 Recolonising Bare Ground. The proposed development comprises almost entirely improved agricultural grassland (GA1). There are existing hedgerows (WL1) forming the western boundary of the site and crossing the centre of the site. The Whitehall Stream flows through the northern section of the site (lowland / depositing river (FW2)). There is no remaining established riparian habitat along this section of the stream. It is heavily modified, emerging from a culvert under The Belfy development, and entering a submerged culvert/drain under a farm access track into adjacent property. No evidence of any protected mammal species was recorded within the site or surrounds. No badger setts or other mammal resting places were recorded within or bounding the site. A fox was observed travelling through the site during the bat activity survey. Some mammal entry/exit points were noted under the existing fence separating the site and adjacent property to east. No otter or badger activity was recorded during camera trap surveys. There were observations of fox, hedgehog and brown rat travelling within the site. Regarding bats, 2no. PRFs were identified in central hedgerow (Tree ID: 476), No other clear PRFs were identified on any tree. There is	
--	--	--	--

		potential for features to have gone unrecorded in higher reaches of trees. No bats were recorded emerging from these features during emergence survey. 4no. species were recorded during bat activity survey: common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, Leisler's bat and Daubenton's bat. Bat activity was mostly correlated with linear features (i.e. hedgerows) within and bounding the site with highest activity recorded along the central hedgerow and along Whitehall Stream in adjacent property east of the proposed development site. Daubenton's bat echolocation calls were recorded from east of the site. Daubenton's bat activity was not recorded along Whitehall Stream or within the site. Bird species recorded during field surveys were hooded crow, rook, jackdaw, magpie, woodpigeon, swallow, house martin, swift, starling, robin, blackbird, song thrush, blue tit, great tit, pied wagtail, linnet, house sparrow, yellowhammer, buzzard, herring gull (flyover) and lesser black-backed gull (flyover). Swift and yellowhammer are Red-Listed. No kingfisher activity of nesting burrows was recorded along Whitehall Stream. Stream does not offer suitable nesting banks for kingfisher. To east of site the narrow fast-moving stream and visible banks (heavily overgrown with no exposed soil on steep/vertical faces) comprise unsuitable nesting habitat for kingfisher. No suitable kingfisher nesting habitat was recorded on	
--	--	--	--

		Stream's open channel sections at Butterstream Manor and prior to outfall to River Boyne. While highly modified and limited in habitat value, it is possible that brook lamprey occur within Whitehall Stream. Existing soakaway feature offers some potential habitat for amphibians (e.g. common frog, smooth newt) Potential impacts on the following at construction phase: • 2no. European sites River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC [002299] and River Boyne and Blackwater SPA [004232] as a result of potential contaminated surface water run-off • Whitehall Stream due to pollutants entering via surface water run-off • Prey availability for otter due to contaminated surface waters • Removal of nesting habitat during breeding season <u>Comment:</u> Matters relating to impacts on European sites and any relevant QIs/conservation objectives are addressed in the AA Screening and Stage 2 NIS, whereby I have concluded that the proposed development alone or in combination with any other plans or projects would not result in significant effects on the integrity of any European site.	
--	--	---	--

		I note that mitigation measures are outlined at Section 6 of the EclA. I note that the Section 6 does not expressly refer to the Outline CEMP, although it does refer to 3no. other good practice guidance documents. I consider that the designed-in mitigation and targeted mitigation devised to address the potential impacts are described. 4no. bat boxes are proposed on trees along western boundary hedgerow in order to mitigate the loss of potential roosting habitat. The P.A.'s Condition 15(b) requires hedgehog gates between gardens to be provided (as recommended by P.A. Ecologist). Should the Commission be minded to grant permission, it is recommended that a similar condition is attached. Having regard to all information on file, including details to address potential surface water contamination at construction phase and other measures relating to protection of flora and fauna, I consider that protected, important or sensitive species of flora or fauna would not be affected by the project.	
2.3 Are there any other features of landscape, historic, archaeological, or cultural importance that could be affected?	Yes	<u>EIASR:</u> Section 3.1.7: Archaeological Heritage Features: There are no archaeological heritage features located within site boundary. Site is not within area	No

		of archaeological importance. The closest archaeological heritage features include: • Burnt mound (ME036-060) located ca. 55m to north • Burnt mound (ME036-059) located ca. 135m north • Ritual site – holy well (ME036-050) located ca. 350m to south. Architectural Heritage Features The are no architectural heritage features located within the site. The site is not located within an area of archaeological importance. Closest architectural heritage features to the site include: • Water pump (Code:14328078) located c 64m to south • Old Rectory – rectory/glebe/vicarage/curate's house located (Code:14328046) c.710m to southeast • House (Code:14328049) located c.742m to east • Post box (Code:14328048) located c.740m to east <u>Development Plan:</u> Development Plan Landscape Character Assessment Maps shows that the site is located within 'Area 5', Boyne Valley, i.e., the River Corridors and Estuaries category. It is indicated to be of Exceptional Value and High Sensitivity.	
--	--	--	--

		The site is not within or adjacent to Trim Historic Core & Porchfields Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) There are no protected structures located on site. The nearest is RPS Ref. 91301, approx. 75m to south; cast-iron water pump, c. 1870 with slender pumping arm and fluted cap. (This would appear to be the same water pump cited in the EIASR as (NIAH) Code:14328078). <u>Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA)</u> lodged with the application states • The site contains no monuments listed in Record of Monuments and Places or Sites and Monuments Record. • The nearest monument to the site is ME036-060 (Burnt mound), located 153m to the north. • No Protected Structures listed in the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 or sites listed in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH) are located within the site. • Archaeological activity consisting of a small, plough out burnt mound/spread C4 measuring 3m by 3m was identified in Trenches 14 and 14a excavated in Field 2. No other features of archaeological significance were exposed, however, agricultural furrows, stone-filled drains, remains of a former field boundary depicted on OS map were recorded.	
--	--	--	--

		• It is recommended that should preservation in situ not be feasible, the plough out burnt mound/spread C4 exposed in Field 2 be preserved by record (excavated). An area measuring 10m by 10m shall be stripped of topsoil and any archaeological features exposed be preserved by record (excavated). Monitoring of groundworks is recommended. • Written and photographic record of the townland boundary to be impacted is recommended. <u>SFI EclA:</u> Section 3.4.1: The hedgerow which crosses the centre of the site is part of the townland boundary between the Crowpark and Corporationland townlands. <u>Comment</u> Having regard to site's location accessed via The Belfry housing estate to the north, and which is bounded to established residential development to the south along Kildalkey Road and to the east along Butterstream Manor, I consider that the proposal would not affect the Boyne Valley landscape character. I note that the much of the existing hedgerow which forms the townland boundary between Corporationland (3rd Division) and Crowpark (1st	
--	--	--	--

		Division) townlands would be retained in the proposed landscape strategy for the site. In the absence of any protected structures within the site and the distance of the site to the Trim Historic Core and Porphfields ACA to the east, I consider that the proposed development would not have any effects on the historic, cultural or architectural importance of the area. For completeness, I note that the 4no. Architectural Heritage Features cited in the applicant's EIASR related to entries on the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH), as viewed on the NIAH website (www.buildingsofireland.ie, accessed 09 September 2026). With regard to archaeological impacts, I note the AIA's recommendations and also those of the DAU (DHLGH) relating to archaeological excavation and monitoring. DAU recommends the archaeologist assist in the integration of archaeological mitigation in the CEMP. Should the Commission be minded to grant permission, it is recommended that this element of the DAU's condition be attached. With regard to AIA recommendation that written and photographic evidence of townland boundary to be impacted, I consider that the inclusion of a condition to this effect would be reasonable. Should the Commission be minded to grant	
--	--	---	--

		permission, it is recommended that a similar condition be attached. In terms of detail, I consider that the inclusion of same within a landscape condition (as distinct from the recommended archaeological condition) would be appropriate. Having regard to the above, I consider that the proposed development would not adversely affect the archaeological importance of the area.	
2.4 Are there any areas on/around the location which contain important, high quality or scarce resources which could be affected by the project, for example: forestry, agriculture, water/coastal, fisheries, minerals?		<u>EIASR:</u> Table 5.1: The project does not include extensive use of natural resources. Significant negative effects arising from the use of land or soil are not anticipated. Table 5.2: Site is not within or directly connected to any mountain or forest areas <u>Comment</u> As viewed on site visit, the site had recently been used for livestock grazing. Lands to west of the site were in agricultural use (livestock grazing) on date of site visit. I consider that the proposed development would, if permitted and implemented, result in the subject site no longer being available for agricultural use. However, as it is zoned A1 Existing Residential and is located within the Trim settlement boundary, I consider that the use of the site for residential	

		use would be in compliance with the land use zoning objective. For completeness, I draw to the Commission's attention that the matter of material contravention of the A1 land use zoning is discussed in the main report. Accordingly, I consider that the project would not give rise to significant effects on the environment with regard to high quality or scarce resources.	
2.5 Are there any water resources including surface waters, for example: rivers, lakes/ponds, coastal or groundwaters which could be affected by the project, particularly in terms of their volume and flood risk?	Yes	See Items 1.2, 1.6 and 2.1. In addition, I have outlined in the main report that the proposed development is considered to be in compliance with the requirements of Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive (WFD), and which also refers to Appendix 3 relating to WFD screening.	No
2.6 Is the location susceptible to subsidence, landslides or erosion?	No	<u>EIASR</u>: Teagasc soil mapping indicates that the surface / quaternary sediments across the majority of the site are classified as "Till derived chiefly from limestone (TLs)" There are no geological heritage features located within, or in immediate environs of the subject site, the closest being a section of the denoted "Boyne River, Trim" (MH027) ca. 4.1km to southeast	No

		<u>Comment:</u> I note the following on the GSI website and Development Plan mapping: • No landslide events recorded at or in the wider environs of the subject site. (GSI website (www.gsi.ie, accessed 03 September 2026): • There are no mapped geological sites in the vicinity of the subject site, as viewed on Development Plan Map 8.4 (Geological Heritage Sites). Having regard to the above, I consider that there is no evidence identified of these risks.	
2.7 Are there any key transport routes (eg National primary Roads) on or around the location which are susceptible to congestion or which cause environmental problems, which could be affected by the project?	Yes	<u>EIASR:</u> Section 3.2: Construction Project Manager/Site Manger will have overall responsibility of ensuring the measures outlined in Project CMP/EOP are adhered to, including monitoring impact of construction/operational traffic on local traffic conditions and local road conditions. <u>Mobility Management Plan (MMP):</u> Section 3: Fig. 3 outlines walking times and public transport accessibility. Bus stops located within 15-minute walk of site are served by 5no. bus routes served by Bus Éireann and TFI Local link network; Table 1 refers. Section 6.0 lists a range of mobility management measures relating to implementation/consulting/monitoring, marketing	No

		and communications, walking and cycling and public transport. <u>Comment:</u> The site would be accessed from R154 (Athboy Road), via an existing housing estate, The Belfry. The nearest connection to the M3 motorway network is at Navan (South) to the north east or Dunshaughlin to the south east. The nearest connection to the national road network is at the N51 at Athboy, approx. 9km to north west. At construction phase, construction traffic would access the subject site via the lands to the west. Condition 19(g) of the P.A.'s decision requires submission of a Construction Stage Traffic Management Plan for agreement. Should the Commission be minded to grant, it is recommended that a similar condition is attached. At operational phase, traffic calming measures are proposed within The Belfry. The proposed development would result in an increase in traffic generated at this location, including in terms of access via The Belfry to the T-junction at R154 (Athboy Road). The applicant's response to the grounds of appeal includes that TRICS survey data shows the traffic generated will increase only by a max. of 44no. trips (arrival and departures) in either peak hour periods (AM and PM) which result in increased traffic of no more than 7.9% in either peak hour period. PICADY operational assessment carried out on The Belfry's Existing	
--	--	--	--

		access shows that these additional trips will have a negligible impact on the surrounding road network. I consider that it has been adequately demonstrated that the project, in combination with The Belfry housing estate, would function within the T-junction's capacity, and that the key transport routes in the vicinity of the site would not be congested by or otherwise affected the project. However, in terms of detail, I note that the P.A.'s conditions do not specifically refer to the MMP lodged with the application. I note mobility management measures outlined in the applicant's MMP (dated July 2025), and have outlined in the main report some inconsistencies regarding public bus transportation services, vis-à-vis information viewed on the Bus Éireann website on 03 September 2026. As outlined in the main report, should the Commission be minded to grant permission, it is recommended that a condition is attached requiring a MMP be submitted for approval, which takes account of public bus services in the vicinity of the site. Accordingly, I do not consider that the project would likely result in a significant effect on the environment in terms of transportation.	
2.8 Are there existing sensitive land uses or community facilities (such as hospitals, schools etc) which could be affected by the project?	Yes	<u>EIASR:</u> Describes the subject site and some of the surrounding area.	No

		<u>Comment:</u> I note that the EIASR does not refer to any sensitive land uses in the vicinity such as schools or hospitals. I consider that the sensitive land uses that could be affected by the project are the existing residential properties bounding the site to the north, east and south. With regard to the potential impacts (such as noise, dust, traffic) that could arise at construction phase, I note that these matters would be addressed in a final CEMP and Construction Traffic Management Plan. At operational phase traffic calming measures are proposed within The Belfry. There will be an increase in activity within the subject site (traffic generation, use of open spaces, use of childcare facility) which are considered to be typical of housing schemes of this scale sited in established urban neighbourhood locations and are within acceptable parameters for same. The SFI response includes separate drawings showing details of areas to be under the control of a proposed management company and of the Council (when taken in charge). Should the Commission be minded to grant permission, conditions relating to a management company and taking in charge are recommended. No negative impacts on residential amenity are anticipated.	
--	--	---	--

3. Any other factors that should be considered which could lead to environmental impacts

3.1 Cumulative Effects: Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulative effects during the construction/ operation phase?

No

EIASR:

Section 3.1.10: The majority of applicable granted applications in the vicinity consist of minor alterations/ adjustments to residential units and Retention Permission applications.

Table 3.1 contains 1no. planning application in the vicinity: P.A. Ref. 2460523 relating to a 316sqm industrial unit at 13/13a IDA Industrial Estate, Athboy Road, Trim.

Due to scale of this project and nature of applications in the vicinity of the site, the potential cumulative effects are deemed to be low.

Commentary

As outlined previously, I note that the industrial unit permitted by P.A. Ref. 2460523 has not been constructed, as viewed on site visit. That site is located within an industrial estate, approx. 500m from the appeal site (straight line distance). Having regard to the distance of the permitted industrial unit site to the subject appeal site, I do not consider that the implementation of that permission and the subject project would result in cumulative effects on the environment.

No other developments have been identified in the EIASR.

No

		I this regard I note that no other developments have been identified in the vicinity which would give rise to cumulative significant effects with the project. As such no cumulative significant effects on the area are reasonably predicted.	
3.2 Transboundary Effects: Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects?	No	There are no transboundary effects arising.	No
3.3 Are there any other relevant considerations?	No	N/A	N/A
C. CONCLUSION			
No real likelihood of significant effects on the environment	☒	EIAR Not Required.	
Real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	☐	EIAR Required	
D. MAIN REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS			
Regard has been had to: (a) the nature and scale of the project, which is below the threshold in Schedule 5, Part 2,			

- Class 10(b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units
- Class 10(b)(iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area (non-business district area)

(b) the location of the site on zoned lands (zoned A1 Existing Residential) and other relevant policies and objectives in the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027, and the results of the strategic environmental assessment of this plan undertaken in accordance with the SEA Directive (2001/42/EC)

(c) the site's edge of town location which is served by public services and infrastructure.

(d) the pattern of existing and permitted development in the area

(e) the location of the site outside of any sensitive location specified in article 109(4)(a) of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 as amended and the absence of any potential impacts on such locations

(f) the guidance set out in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Guidance for Consent Authorities regarding Sub-threshold Development, issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government (2003)

(g) The criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended

(h) The features and measures proposed by the applicant envisaged to avoid or prevent what otherwise be significant effects on the environment, including those identified in the Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan, Significant Further Information (SFI) Ecological Impact Assessment, SFI Site Specific Flood

Risk Assessment, SFI Natura Impact Statement, Archaeological Impact Assessment, Mobility Management Plan, Arboricultural Assessment, Traffic and Transport Assessment and Landscape Strategy

(i) in doing so, the Commission concluded that by reason of the nature, scale and location of the project, the development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment and an Environmental Impact Assessment and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Assessment Report would not, therefore, be required.

Inspector _____

Date _____

Approved (DP/ADP) _____

Date _____

Appendix 2: Appropriate Assessment

Screening for Appropriate Assessment	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics	
Brief description of project	Permission is sought for construction of 85no. residential units, comprising 73no. houses and 12no. apartments. The subject site is accessed via The Belfry housing estate, at Athboy Road, Trim, Co. Meath. Following a request for Further Information, the proposed development was amended (by Significant Further Information (SFI)) to comprise 82no. residential units (72no. houses and 10no. apartments) and a creche. The description of proposed development is further detailed at Section 2.0 of the main report.
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	The project site is not located within or adjacent to any European site. Distances to nearest European sites are outlined in Step 2 below. Proposed development is located on a 2.65ha site. Whitehall Stream runs from the north western corner of the site in a south east direction, all within the northern part of the site. <u>SFI Natura Impact Statement [Updated]</u> received by the P.A. on 04 February 2026 outlines: The site comprises 3no. agricultural fields with Whitehall Stream flowing through the site. Surface Waters: Site topography indicates the site is generally flat, albeit falls from south to north. An OPW channel Whitehall Stream separates the site's area into two. Site has been divided into 2no. principal catchment areas for collection and disposals for stormwater runoff from impermeable areas. Collected surface water runoff shall discharge into detention basins. Attenuated water from each basin shall pass through a petrol interceptor and hydrobrake (for each basin) before discharging into existing open ditch. In addition to detention basins, SuDS features consist of permeable paving for parking bays, 1no. conveyance swale at north and 1no. bioretention area at south of catchment 2

	Stormwater from catchments 1 and 2 will discharge to existing ditch (Whitehall Stream) via a flow control device, at a maximum rate of 2l/s and 7.3l/s respectively. Updated surface design as a result of FI request: • Northern and central attenuation basis incorporate 1:4 side slopes • Footprint of northern basin is increased from 450sqm to 744sqm and central basin is increased from 800sqm to 890sqm • Only under 1-in-30+100-year event will the area see water with the maximum water depth within the northern detention area limited to 300mm • Central attenuation system comprises attenuation tank beneath detention basin. During 1-in-30year storm event, surface water will be retained within the attenuation tank. No standing water is expected in overlying detention basin. Only in 1-100year event will there be water with max. 300mm water depth. • Culverting of the existing ditch in centre of site has been revised and it is now proposed to connect this ditch to the OPW channel (Whitehall Stream) Foul Waters: A continuous foul pipe network for the proposed development is impractical as it would need to traverse the existing OPW channel. It is proposed to make 2no. connections to the existing 9inch diameter Asbestos Cement (AC) sewer pipe: • A 225mm uPVC pipe will serve catchment 1, discharging into a newly constructed manhole • Another 225mm uPVC pipe will serve catchment 2, which will discharge to an existing manhole located on the same AC sewer pipe. Hydrology: Whitehall Stream (EPA Code 07B04) is heavily modified and culverted underground for most of its length. It rises in agricultural land north of Trim, flows under Oaktree Business Park, the R154 and The Belfry. It emerges from the culvert at the northern site boundary and flows in an open channel for approx. 60m through the site, before entering a short culvert under a farm access track and emerging in an open channel <u>adjacent</u> to the eastern boundary of the site, within the neighbouring property. The stream flows in an open channel for approx. 200m adjacent to the development site, then enters a culvert
--	--

	before crossing the Butterstream Manor residential development access road. There is an approx. 50m section of open channel adjacent to residential properties in Butterstream Manor, where the stream is again culverted until shortly before it outflows into River Boyne approx. 750m downstream of the development site. Ex-situ Connectivity is described with particular reference to the highly modified nature of Whitehall Stream watercourse. Otter: No holts, resting places or signs of otter were recorded within the development site. It does not contain suitable habitat for otter. Culverts include numerous grates which likely comprise a barrier to any potential otter movement. Salmon: This stream is highly unlikely to offer significant spawning grounds for salmon, which spawn in clean gravels in well oxygenated water with good water quality River Lamprey: Juvenile lamprey recorded during (2006) Boyne survey likely comprise brook lamprey (not a QI of River Boyne and Blackwater SAC). Whitehall Stream was not included in survey. It is possible that brook lamprey occur within the stream. Kingfisher: No kingfisher activity of nesting burrows was recorded along stream. Stream along development site does not offer suitable nesting banks for kingfisher. The watercourse (open channel) to east of site is a narrow, fast-moving stream and visible banks (heavily overgrown with no exposed soil on steep or vertical faces) comprise unsuitable nesting habitat for kingfisher. No suitable habitat was recorded on the open channel sections at Butterstream Manor and prior to outfall to River Boyne.
Screening report	Yes (as part of document titled NIS)
Natura Impact Statement	Yes Note: A revised NIS was submitted as SFI. One of the main changes in the SFI NIS [Updated] is the enlargement of the proposed attenuation areas.
Relevant submissions	Development Applications Unit, Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage (DAU, DHLGH) in a letter dated 24 September 2025 discusses archaeology and contains a condition relating to same. No issues relating to nature conservation are raised by DAU.

	Uisce Éireann (UÉ) in a letter dated 18 September 2025 states that a Confirmation of Feasibility (COF) has been issued advising that water & wastewater connections are feasible subject to upgrades. Water: The COF states a connection is feasible without infrastructure upgrade by Uisce Éireann. This CoF does not extend to developments fire flow requirements. Wastewater: The COF states a connection is feasible subject to upgrades. It notes there are constraints in the Uisce Eireann wastewater network. The applicant should identify areas in conjunction with the Local Authority, where stormwater separation /infiltration removal works to the wastewater network can be identified and carry out works to remove these flows, diverting them to surface water bodies or dedicated storm sewers which are not connected to any Uisce Eireann wastewater / combined sewers. Uisce Eireann will consider a new connection offset by storm separation works to remove storm runoff with a peak flow the equivalent of a 1 in 1 year storm event equalling no less than 3 times the peak dry weather flow for the new development for wastewater discharge. The proposal indicates that Uisce Éireann assets are present on site. The Developer must demonstrate that proposed structures and works will not inhibit access for maintenance or endanger structural or functional integrity of the assets during and after the works. Drawings (showing clearance distances, changing to ground levels) and Method Statements should be included in the Detailed Design of the Development. A wayleave in favour of Uisce Éireann will be required over the assets that are not located within the Public Space. Uisce Éireann requests any grant of permission be conditioned as follows: The applicant shall enter into a Connection Agreement(s) with Uisce Éireann to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network and adhere to standards and conditions set out in that agreement. The letter sets out an UÉ standard condition. Health Service Executive, National Environmental Health Service in a letter dated 23 September 2025 states this report refers only to those sections which are relevant to the HSE and have an Environmental Health impact. This application is assessed
--	--

	• in the context of any potential significant public health effect from noise, dust, odour or potential of pollution of any surface or groundwater resource • under the remit of Healthy Ireland and Irelands Climate Action Plan and exploring opportunities for the incorporation of initiatives regarding health gain or climate and sustainability It recommends • construction measures outlined in section 4 of the CEMP are included as condition to protect the environment and public health • bin stores are provided with drainage and a means of hosing down. • all safe walking and cycling routes should be identified within a radius of at least 5km around the development site along with information measures intended to promote the use of public transport
<u>P.A. Ecologist's report (18 March 2026):</u> With regard to AA the Ecologist determined that, in light of best scientific knowledge, including in particular the nature of the predicted impacts that may arise from the project, following implementation of the (blank) outlined in the NIS to reduce any potential for impacts to water quality within the River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC and SPA, that the project is not likely to have a significant effect on the QIs of any European sites in light of their Conservation Objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. In reaching this determination the Ecologist considered the location and scale of the project, mitigation proposed to protect water quality, the evidence supplied that the site is not of ex-situ value to Kingfisher, Otter, lamprey, Salmon or wintering birds and that the 2024 AER for Trim WWTP indicates that the plant is within the ELVs, is not having an impact to water quality and has the sufficient capacity. The report recommends 4no. conditions, of which Condition 3 states - All mitigation measures outlined in the EclA and NIS shall be implemented in full. <u>Grounds of Appeal:</u> The grounds of appeal (from both third parties) did not raise issues relating specifically to AA. The grounds of appeal from Karl Cleary include that there are protected species on both sides of boundary wall. The further response from Karl Cleary includes that stream flows into River Boyne, a SAC and SPA, deemed At Risk by EPA, and fear that Inland Fisheries' efforts protecting and respawning salmon in the Boyne will be in vain. <u>Observations:</u> The observation received from Siobhan Byrne includes (proposal) is contrary to EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC). <u>Note:</u>	

An Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) was lodged with the application.

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

European Site (code)	Qualifying interests Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date) Aim to Maintain or Restore the favourable conservation status is outlined	Distance from proposed development (km) (straight line distance)	Ecological connections	Consider further in screening Y/N
River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299)	1099 Lampetra fluviatilis River Lamprey (Restore) 1106 Salmo salar Salmon (Restore) 1355 Lutra lutra Otter (Maintain) 7230 Alkaline fens (Maintain) 91E0 Alluvial forests with Alnus glutinosa and Fraxinus excelsior (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae)* (Restore)	0.37km	Indirect via surface water	Y
Boyne Coast and Estuary SAC (001957)	Estuaries [1130] (Maintain) Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140] (Maintain)	37km	Indirect via surface water Due to considerable distance of this SAC downstream of Whitehall Stream, there is no potential pathway for effects and no	N

	Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210] (Maintain) Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310] (Restore) Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritimae) [1330] (Maintain) Embryonic shifting dunes [2110] (Restore) Shifting dunes along the shoreline with Ammophila arenaria (white dunes) [2120] (Restore) Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (grey dunes) [2130] (Restore)		potential for significant effects on SAC	
River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA [004232]	[A229] Kingfisher Alcedo atthis (Maintain)	0.44km	Indirect via surface water	Y

Note 1:

For completeness, I note that the applicant's AA screening (contained in SFI NIS [Updated] document) also includes an assessment for

- Girley (Drewstown) Bog SAC [002203]
- Boyne Estuary SPA [004080]
- North-West Irish Sea SPA (004236)

Each of these 3no. European sites have been excluded from further assessment. I concur that further assessment of these European sites is not required.

Note 2:

In terms of detail, there would appear to be errors in respect of the submitted assessment for

- (a) Boyne Estuary SPA, whereby it is outlined that there is no potential pathway for effects and also that potential connectivity is further assessed for its significance
- (b) North-West Irish Sea SPA (39.7km from the subject site), whereby it is outlined that there is no potential pathway for effects and also that potential connectivity is further assessed for its significance.

However, as outlined at Note 1, the 2no. European sites are not brought forward for further assessment in the applicant's AA screening.

Note 3:

The SFI NIS [Updated] states at Section 5.1.2 that the only species of SCI for the **River Nore SPA** is kingfisher, and that the SPA supports nationally important numbers of breeding kingfisher, with a total of 19 pairs recorded during surveys in at the site in 2010 (Cummins et al., 2010).

I note that the reference to River Nore SPA would appear to be in error.

The reference to 19 pairs recorded in 2010 would however appear to be largely consistent with the information contained in the NPWS conservation objective for this site (www.npws.ie accessed 04 September 2026). It outlines that a survey of six SAC river catchments in 2010 identified this SPA as supporting 15-19 breeding territories/pairs, and the measure 'breeding territories' is as per Cummins et al. (2010).

Accordingly, I consider the reference to River Nore SPA to be a typographical error.

Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination) on European Sites

AA Screening matrix

Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
Site 1: River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299) 1099 Lampetra fluviatilis River Lamprey (Restore)	Indirect Construction phase: Negative impacts (temporary) on surface water/water quality due to construction related emissions including increased sedimentation and construction related pollution. Whitehall Stream flows through the project site and enters the	Reduction in water quality has potential to negatively impact habitats and species for which this SAC is designated.

1106 Salmo salar Salmon (Restore)	River Boyne approx. 750m downstream.	
1355 Lutra lutra Otter (Maintain)	Noise or dust-related effects on habitats or species within SAC are not anticipated	
7230 Alkaline fens (Maintain)	Operational phase: No pathway for effects arising from surface water. Foul waters will connect to existing network.	
91E0 Alluvial forests with Alnus glutinosa and Fraxinus excelsior (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae)* (Restore)		
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): Y	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?	
	Impacts	Effects
Site 2: River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA [004232] [A229] Kingfisher Alcedo atthis (Maintain)	Indirect Noise or dust-related effects on the SCI of this SPA are not anticipated at either construction or operation phase. Construction phase: Whitehall Stream flows through the project site, and enters River Boyne approx. 750m downstream. There is hydrological connectivity between the project and the SPA, and potential for surface waters containing pollutants to enter the stream and the SPA. Operational phase: As above for River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299).	A reduction in water quality could affect the foraging requirements of this species, should they be of sufficient magnitude/duration.

	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): Y
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?
Step 4 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site	
I note the content of Section 3.3.3 Ex-situ connectivity of the applicant's AA screening (in SFI NIS [Updated] document), which discusses the qualifying <u>faunal</u> species of nearby European sites cumulatively comprise otter, Atlantic salmon, river lamprey and kingfisher. In addition to describing Whitehall Stream as a heavily modified watercourse, it outlines • Grates on the culverts are a likely barrier to potential otter movement, the project site does not contain suitable habitat for otter and there are no records of otter utilizing this stream within the surrounding area • Whitehall Stream is highly unlikely to offer any significant spawning grounds for salmon • It is possible that brook lamprey occurs within the stream, although this is not a QI of this SAC • No kingfisher activity (or) nesting burrows was recorded along the stream, stream at project site does not offer suitable nesting banks and no suitable kingfisher habitat was recorded on open channel sections of stream at Butterstream Manor development and prior to outfall to River Boyne. Having regard to the above, I note the unlikelihood of ex-situ impacts arising for these faunal SCIs of these 2no. European sites. However, notwithstanding this, and having regard to the various construction works proposed within the subject site including the proposal to connect the ditch which crosses the centre of the site to the OPW channel (Whitehall Stream), site visit, review of the conservation objectives and supporting documents, I consider that in the absence of mitigation measures beyond best practice construction methods and in taking a precautionary approach, the proposed development has the potential to result in significant effects on River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC and the River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA. I concur with the applicant's findings that such impacts could be significant in terms of stated conservation objectives of the SAC and SPA when considered on their own and in combination with other plans and projects in relation to pollution related pressures on qualifying interest habitats and species	

Screening Determination

Significant effects cannot be excluded

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as

amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that it is not possible to exclude that the proposed development alone will give rise to significant effects on River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299) and River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (004232) in view of the sites conservation objectives. Appropriate Assessment is required.

Appropriate Assessment

The requirements of Article 6(3) as related to appropriate assessment of a project under part XAB, sections 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) are considered fully in this section.

Taking account of the preceding screening determination, the following is an appropriate assessment of the implications of the proposed development of a residential scheme and 1no. creche in view of the relevant conservation objectives of River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC and River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA based on scientific information provided by the applicant.

The information relied upon includes the following:

- Natura Impact Statement [Updated] submitted as Significant Further Information (SFI) on 04 February 2026, prepared by Gannon and Associates.
- SFI Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA)
- Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP)

I am satisfied that the information provided is adequate to allow for Appropriate Assessment. I am satisfied that all aspects of the project which could result in significant effects are considered and assessed in the NIS and mitigation measures designed to avoid or reduce any adverse effects on site integrity are included and assessed for effectiveness.

Submissions/observations

Relevant submissions from prescribed bodies are outlined in the previous AA Screening (Step 1) as follows:

- Development Applications Unit, Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage
- Uisce Éireann
- Health Service Executive, National Environmental Health Service

Grounds of Appeal:

The grounds of appeal (from both third parties) did not raise issues relating specifically to AA.

The further response from Karl Cleary includes reference to a SAC and SPA.

Observations:

The observation received from Siobhan Byrne includes (proposal) is contrary to EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC).

River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299):**Summary of Key issues that could give rise to adverse effects (from screening stage):****(i) Water quality degradation (construction)**

Qualifying Interest features likely to be affected	Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (summary- inserted) (Relevant Attributes) Maintain / restore favourable conservation condition	Potential adverse effects	Mitigation measures (summary) SFI NIS [Updated] Section 5.4.
1099 Lampetra fluviatilis River Lamprey	(Restore) Attribute: Distribution of larvae. Target: Not less than 50% of sample sites with suitable habitat positive for larval brook/river lamprey Attribue: Extent and distribution of spawning nursery habitat. Target: No decline in extent and distribution	NIS: A potential release of high levels of sediment could smother nursery silts and spawning gravels and has potential to interfere with conservation objective of restoring favourable condition. A potential release of high levels of sediment could smother nursery silts and spawning gravels and has potential	Pollution control measures. Application of industry standard controls, including Inland Fisheries Ireland (IFI) guidelines, CEMP. Regarding in-stream works, minor landscaping works are proposed along Whitehall Stream and 3no. headwalls will be created for overflow of surface waters from on-site attenuation areas into Whitehall Stream. Works will follow cited IFI

	of spawning and nursery beds	to interfere with the conservation objective of maintaining favourable condition. Note: In respect of this Attribute, NIS refers to 'the conservation objective of <u>maintaining</u> favourable condition' (emphasis added). However, the conservation objective for River Lamprey is 'to restore'.	guidelines.	
1355 Lutra lutra Otter	(Maintain) Includes: Attribute: Fish biomass available. Target: No significant decline.	NIS: An accidental release of pollutants during <u>construction and/or operational phases</u> has been identified as having the potential to impact on water quality within the SAC, which could impact on the availability of fish. Significant impact on water quality could cause reduction in prey populations and availability. Comment: See <u>Note 1</u> below regarding reference to 'construction and/or operational phases'.	As above.	
1106 Salmo salar Salmon	(Restore) Attribute: Number and distribution of redds. Target: Number and occurrence.	NIS: A potential release of high levels of sediment (during construction) could	As above.	

	Attribute: Water quality. Target: EPA Q value.	smother spawning gravels and has potential to interfere with conservation objective of achieving favourable condition. An accidental release of pollutants during the <u>construction and/or operational phases</u> has been identified as having the potential to impact on water quality within SAC, thereby impacting water quality.		
7230 Alkaline fens	(Maintain) Attribute: Habitat area. Notes: Alkaline fen has not been mapped in detail for SAC. Total current area of qualifying habitat is unknown. Main areas of alkaline fen occur in vicinity of Lough Shesk, Freekan Lough, Newtown Lough in upper reaches of Stonyford River.	NIS: Habitat is located 20km upstream of outflow location of Whitehall Stream. There is no pathway for impact, no potential for impact on this QI and it is therefore excluded. Comment: I note that Lough Shesk is approx. 20km north west of the subject site (straight line distance), is west of Clonmellon, Co. Westmeath, and upstream of the subject site. Having regard to the above, I concur that impacts on this QI can be excluded.	N/A	
91E0 Alluvial forests with Alnus	(Restore) Attribute: Woodland size	NIS: Alluvial forest occurs west of Drogheda, over 40m downstream. Threats	N/A	

glutinosa and Fraxinus excelsior (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae)*	Note: aim to reduce habitat fragmentation Attribute: Woodland structure: indicators of overgrazing. Target: All 5 indicators of overgrazing absent. Attribute: Vegetation composition: negative indicator species. Target: Negative indicator species cover not greater than 10%.	are from fragmentation, invasive species and grazing, processes not related to this project. Given nature of project and distance, there is no identified pathway for impact from contaminated surface water discharge during construction phase. Comment: Having regard to the above, I concur that impacts on this QI can be excluded.	
---	--	--	--

Note 1:

The reference in Table 4 (Stage 2: NIS) relating to otter, which states an accidental release of pollutants **during the construction and/or operational phases** has been identified as having potential to impact on water quality within the SAC, which could impact on the availability of fish, would appear to be inconsistent with the content of Table 1 (Stage 1 AA Screening).

Table 1 states, with regard to River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC [002299], that

- The SAC at approx. 360m south of the development site is significantly beyond any zone of sensitivity for noise or dust-related effects on habitats or species within the SAC, and there **is no potential for such effects** as a result of the proposed development during **either construction or operation**.
- There is potential for surface waters containing pollutants to enter the stream, and subsequently the SAC, **during the construction phase**. **During operation** surface waters will be directed to two on-site attenuation areas with overflow outfalls to Whitehall Stream via petrol interceptors and hydrobrakes. Foul waters will connect to existing network which runs east of the development site. **There is no pathway for effects during the operational phase**. There is potential connectivity between the proposed development and the SAC via surface waters **during the construction phase**. This connectivity is therefore further assessed for its significance.

In addition, it is further outlined at Section 5.2 Impact Prediction (of the NIS) that there is no pathway for effects during the operational phase.

As outlined in the previous Stage 1 AA Screening, I am satisfied that impacts relating to pollution to surface waters at operational phase can be screened out.

Operational phase impacts are therefore not assessed further at Stage 2 AA (NIS).

Assessment of issues that could give rise to adverse effects:

- (i) Water quality degradation during construction phase.

The NIS outlines (at Section 5.2) that there is potential for pollutants generated during construction phase to enter Whitehall stream via surface water run-off, in the absence of mitigation, i.e.:

- Sediment generated from earth works and site clearance, including instream works required for installation of three new headwalls for the proposed surface water overflow;
- Hydrocarbons from vehicles/spills; and
- Cementitious material from construction works involving concrete/cement, including instream works required for installation of 3no. new headwalls for the proposed surface water overflow.

I note that based on the information contained in the SFI NIS that a pollution event of significant magnitude or potential release of high levels of sediment could enter the surface water system (Whitehall Stream) and be transported to downstream European sites.

This has the potential to impact the aquatic environments of these sites which may compromise the conservation objectives of River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC.

In the absence of mitigation, disturbance to aquatic species may be possible as a result of contamination and deterioration in water quality resulting from pollution/silt laden surface water emissions from the project site. This may affect habitat suitability within River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC for river lamprey and salmon, and which may affect prey availability for otter.

Mitigation measures and conditions

Mitigation measures (see Section 5.4.2 of SFI NIS [Updated]) include a range of pollution control measures. I consider that some of the mitigation measures would appear to be standard construction practices that would be required to be undertaken, in any event, in the construction of a residential scheme of this nature and scale. However, proposed in-stream works are also described, which include creation of a dry works area prior to commencement, which will be isolated from the watercourse (Whitehall Stream) and no works will be undertaken outside the isolated works area. Siltation is proposed to be addressed by installation of silt fences along the length of both banks of Whitehall Stream within the development site and adjacent to the existing boundary fence which separates the site's eastern boundary from the stream.

In-combination effects

I am satisfied that in-combination effects have been assessed adequately in the NIS; see Section 5.5.

For completeness, I noted on site visit that the 1no. permitted development cited

(P.A. Ref.24/60523 granted for industrial unit within existing industrial estate approx. 500m north of the subject site) has not been implemented.
I am satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated that no residual adverse risks would remain post the application of mitigation measures.

Findings and conclusions

The applicant determined that following the implementation of mitigation measures the construction and operation of the proposed development alone, or in combination with other plans and projects, would not adversely affect the integrity of River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299).

No direct impacts are predicted. Indirect impacts would be temporary in nature at the construction stage and mitigation measures are described to prevent ingress of sediment contaminated or other polluted water leaving the site, particularly with regard to Whitehall Stream which flows through the northern part of the site. I am satisfied that the mitigation measures proposed to prevent adverse effects have been assessed as effective and can be implemented. No significant in combination effects are predicted.

Based on the information provided, I am satisfied that adverse effects arising from aspects of the proposed development can be excluded.

Reasonable scientific doubt

I am satisfied that no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of adverse effects.

Site Integrity

The proposed development will not affect the attainment of the Conservation objectives of the River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299). Adverse effects on site integrity can be excluded and no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of such effects.

River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA [004232]

Summary of Key issues that could give rise to adverse effects (from screening stage):

(ii) Water quality degradation (construction)

Qualifying Interest features likely to be affected	Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes (as relevant summary) Favourable conservation condition	Potential adverse effects	Mitigation measures (summary) SFI NIS [Updated] Section 5.4.2
[A229] Kingfisher Alcedo atthis (Maintain)	(Maintain) Note: Relevant Attributes, Measures and Targets are not listed in Table 4 of SFI NIS [Updated]. Relevant content from Conservation Objectives for this site viewed on NPWS website (www.npws.ie , accessed 04 September 2026) is outlined below: Attribute: Water quality. Measure: Water quality indicators. Target: Both biotic (i.e. Q-value) and abiotic indices reflect overall good-high quality status.	Reduction in prey availability due to reduction in water quality	As above for River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299).

Assessment of issues that could give rise to adverse effects:

(i) Water quality degradation during construction phase.

The NIS outlines (at Section 5.2) that there is potential for pollutants generated during the construction phase to enter Whitehall stream via surface water run-off, in the absence of mitigation, i.e.:

- Sediment generated from earth works and site clearance, including instream works required for installation of three new headwalls for the proposed surface water overflow;
- Hydrocarbons from vehicles/spills; and
- Cementitious material from construction works involving concrete/cement, including instream works required for installation of 3no. new headwalls for the proposed surface water overflow.

I note that based on the information contained in the SFI NIS [Updated] that a pollution event of significant magnitude or potential release of high levels of sediment could enter the surface water system (Whitehall Stream) and be transported to downstream European sites.

This has the potential to impact the aquatic environments of these sites which may compromise the conservation objectives of River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (004232).

In the absence of mitigation, disturbance to Kingfisher may be possible as a result of contamination and deterioration in water quality resulting from pollution/silt laden surface water emissions from the project site, such that there may be potential for temporary reduction in availability of fish prey for Kingfisher.

Mitigation measures and conditions

As above for River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299).

In combination effects

As above for River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299).

Findings and conclusions

The applicant determined that following the implementation of mitigation measures the construction and operation of the proposed development alone, or in combination with other plans and projects, would not adversely affect the integrity of River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (004232).

No direct impacts are predicted. Indirect impacts would be temporary in nature at the construction stage and mitigation measures are described to prevent ingress of sediment contaminated or other polluted water leaving the site, particularly with regard to Whitehall Stream which flows through the northern part of the site. I am satisfied that the mitigation measures proposed to prevent adverse effects have been assessed as effective and can be implemented. No significant in combination effects are predicted.

Based on the information provided, I am satisfied that adverse effects arising from

aspects of the proposed development can be excluded.

Reasonable scientific doubt

I am satisfied that no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of adverse effects.

Site Integrity

The proposed development will not affect the attainment of the Conservation objectives of the River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (004232). Adverse effects on site integrity can be excluded and no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of such effects.

Appropriate Assessment Conclusion: Integrity Test

In screening the need for Appropriate Assessment, it was determined that the proposed development could result in significant effects on River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299) and River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (004232) in view of the conservation objectives of those sites and that Appropriate Assessment under the provisions of S177U/S177AE was required.

Following an examination, analysis and evaluation of the NIS all associated material submitted including the NIS [Updated] submitted as Significant Further Information (SFI), and taking into account the observation of Uisce Éireann, I consider that adverse effects on site integrity of the River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299) and River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (004232) can be excluded in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and that no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of such effects.

My conclusion is based on the following:

- Detailed assessment of construction and operational impacts
- NIS [Updated] (received by the planning authority as Significant Further Information)
- Effectiveness of mitigation measures proposed in SFI Natura Impact Statement [Updated] and Outline CEMP
- Application of planning conditions to ensure application of these measures

The proposed development will not affect the attainment of conservation objectives for River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299) and River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (004232).

Appendix 3: Water Framework Directive

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT SCOPING TABLE			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Coimisiún Pleanála ref. no.	ACP-501279-MH-26	Townland, address	Site bounded to north by The Belfry, rear of dwellings on Kildalkey Road to south, Talbot Court/Butterstown Stream to east and agricultural lands to the west, on Athboy Road, Trim, Co. Meath
Description of project		Permission is sought for construction of 85no. residential units, comprising 73no. houses and 12no. apartments. The subject site is accessed via The Belfry housing estate, at Athboy Road, Trim, Co. Meath. Following a request for Further Information, the proposed development was amended (by Significant Further Information (SFI)) to comprise 82no. residential units (72no. houses and 10no. apartments) and a creche. The description of proposed development is further detailed at Section 2.0 of the main report.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		The proposed development is located on a 2.65ha site. Whitehall Stream runs from the north western corner of the site in a south east direction, all within the northern part of the site. <u>SFI Natura Impact Statement [Updated]</u> received by the P.A. on 04 February 2026 outlines: The site comprises 3no. agricultural fields with Whitehall Stream flowing through the site. Whitehall Stream (EPA Code 07B04) is heavily modified and culverted underground for most of its length. It rises in agricultural land north of Trim, flows under Oaktree Business Park, the R154 and The Belfry. It emerges from the culvert at the northern site boundary and flows in an open channel for approx. 60m through the site, before entering a short culvert under a farm access track and emerging in an open channel adjacent to the eastern boundary of the development site, within the neighbouring property. The stream flows in an open channel for approx. 200m adjacent to the development site, then enters a culvert before crossing the Butterstream Manor residential development access road.	

	There is an approx. 50m section of open channel adjacent to residential properties in Butterstream Manor, where the stream is again culverted until shortly before it outflows into River Boyne approx. 750m downstream of the development site. <u>EIA Screening Report (EIASR)</u> lodged with the application states: Site is located within the Boyne Catchment, Hydrometric Area 07, BOYNE_SC_070 Sub-Catchment, BOYNE_080 Sub-Basin. The principle hydrological features in the vicinity of the site are Whitehall Stream and River Boyne. Whitehall Stream is heavily modified and is culverted underground for a significant portion of its length. It adjoins the River Boyne main channel ca. 750m downstream and the River Boyne Main channel which is located ca. 450m to the south of the site. River Boyne flows in an easterly direction eventually flowing through Drogheda and discharges into the *River Liffey ca. 42km northeast of the proposed development. According to EPA maps, both the Stream which runs through the proposed development and the River Boyne have a WFD status of “Moderate” and are “At Risk” in accordance with WFD objectives. EPA Maps were consulted to determine if any WFD River Network Routes designated as Designated Salmonid Waters under S.I. No. 293/1988 - European Communities (Quality of Salmonid Waters) Regulations 1988 existed in the surrounding areas of the site. The River Boyne main channel is included in the register, therefore there is a risk of adverse effects on salmonid habits occurring in the absence of mitigation measures. With regard to Soils, Geology and Hydrogeology, it outlines • Teagasc soil mapping indicates that surface / quaternary sediments across the majority of the site are classified as “Till derived chiefly from limestone (TLs)”. A portion of the soils at the site, along the banks of the Boyne tributary are described as “Alluvium undifferentiated (A)”. The Geological Survey of Ireland (GSI) bedrock database indicates that soils of the proposed site are underlain at depth by the Lucan Formation, which consists predominantly of dark limestone and shale. The formation ranges from 300m to 800m in thickness. • According to GSI maps, the site overlies a locally important aquifer, of bedrock which is generally moderately productive (Lm). Groundwater vulnerability index is described as high. The
--	--

	hydrogeological setting - across the majority of the site is described as moderate permeability subsoil overlain by well-drained soil - along the banks of the Boyne tributary is described as moderate permeability subsoil overlain by poorly drained (gley) soil. • No groundwater source protection zones or protected hydrological features such as holy wells or springs are located within the site or in surrounding environs. The closest karst feature is a ‘spring’ (ID: IE_GSI_Karst_40K_8905) located ca. 3.9km to the northeast. • There are no geological heritage features located within, or in the immediate environs of the subject site, the closest being a section of “Boyne River, Trim” (MH027) ca. 4.1km to southeast. With regard to designated sites: • There are no designated areas (SPAs, SACs or NHAs) within the site or within the immediate vicinity • The project is located ca. 360m from the nearest Natura 2000 site (River Boyne & River Blackwater SAC). Watercourses and surface runoff are seen as the main potential pathway for effects on Natura 2000 sites. • The nearest designated areas include: - **River Boyne & River Blackwater SAC (002299) ca. 360m south - ***River Boyne & River Blackwater SPA (004232) ca. 410m south - Girley (Drewstown) Bog SAC (002203) & NHA (001580) ca. 14.5km northwest - Jamestown Bog NHA (001324) ca. 8km north - Trim pNHA (001357) ca. 4.2km east *The reference to River Liffey would appear to be an error. I note that River Boyne continues to flow towards Drogheda. As transitional waterbody Boyne Estuary (IE_EA_010_0100) it flows (from west to east) through the town and outfalls to the Boyne Estuary Plume Zone (IE_EA_010_0000), a coastal waterbody. ** and ***: I have noted in Appendix 2 (AA Screening and Stage 2 AA) that the site’s distance to the 2no. European sites is as follows (approx.): - River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (002299): 370m
--	---

	- River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA [004232]: 440m Flood Risk <u>Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027</u> The SFRA (Development Plan mapping (Vol.4)) shows a limited area within the northern part of the subject site is Flood Zone A, and to a much lesser extent, Flood Zone B. These 2no. Flood Zones follow the route of Whitehall Stream. The remainder of the site is within Flood Zone C. <u>Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment (submitted as Significant Further Information)</u> The SFI SSFRA states: (at Section 3.3): Review of past flood events information does not indicate that the site experienced historic flooding. Due to the absence of karst features within the site boundary and the immediate vicinity, the risk of groundwater flooding is deemed low. (at Section 7.2: Justification Test: Part 2): Vast majority of the site is located within Flood Zone C, with Flood Zones A and B limited to the Whitehall Stream corridor. The site-specific hydraulic model confirms that the proposed development will not increase flood risk elsewhere. The access route from Athboy Road (R154) via internal roads within The Belfry is in Flood Zone C and at low risk of flooding. The development will incorporate a stormwater management system designed to retain surface water on site and discharge flows at the agreed greenfield runoff rate. The FFL for residential properties has been set so that sufficient freeboard has been provided over the modelled flood levels, including climate change and culvert blockages which will mitigate current and future flood risk. The conclusion of the SFI SSFRA (Section 8) includes that the modelling results confirm that the vast majority of the site, including all developable areas, lies within Flood Zone C and is therefore at low risk of flooding, the proposed development will not be at risk of flooding during the design flood events, will not increase flood risk elsewhere and instead provides a net reduction in local flood risk.
Proposed surface water details	SFI Natura Impact Statement [Updated] outlines: <u>Surface Waters</u>

	Site topography indicates the site is generally flat, albeit falls from south to north. An OPW channel Whitehall Stream separates the site's area into two. Development site has been divided into 2no. principal catchment areas for collection and disposals for stormwater runoff from impermeable areas. Collected surface water runoff shall discharge into detention basins. Attenuated water from each basin shall pass through a petrol interceptor and hydrobrake (for each basin) before discharging into existing open ditch. In addition, SuDS features consist of permeable paving for parking bays, 1no. conveyance swale at north and 1no. bioretention area at south of catchment 2 Stormwater from catchments 1 and 2 will discharge to existing ditch (Whitehall Stream) via a flow control device, at a maximum rate of 2l/s and 7.3l/s respectively. Updated surface design (as a result of FI request): • Northern and central attenuation basis incorporate 1:4 side slopes • Footprint of northern basin in increased from 450sqm to 744sqm and central basin from 800sqm to 890sqm • The attenuation systems shall be provided with an impermeable membrane, where required, at or above the highest recorded groundwater strike level. This will prevent groundwater ingress into the attenuation systems. • Only under 1-in-30+100-year event will the area see water with the maximum water depth within the northern detention area limited to 300mm • Central attenuation system comprises attenuation tank beneath detention basin. During 1-in-30year storm event, surface water will be retained within the attenuation tank. No standing water is expected in overlying detention basin. Only in 1-100year event will there be water with max. 300mm water depth. • Culverting of the existing ditch in centre of site has been revised and it is now proposed to connect this ditch to the OPW channel (Whitehall Stream)
Proposed water supply source & available capacity	Proposed water supply is a new connection to public mains. Uisce Éireann (UÉ) in a letter dated 18 September 2025 states that a Confirmation of Feasibility (COF) has been issued to the applicant advising that water & wastewater connections are feasible subject to upgrades.

	With regard to water, it outlines: The COF states a connection is feasible without infrastructure upgrade by Uisce Éireann. This CoF does not extend to developments fire flow requirements. Uisce Éireann: website Separately, I note that the UÉ website contains the following information in respect of water supply/treatment in Trim • it is progressing a major project to upgrade Trim Water Treatment Plan which supplies over 12,000 customers in Trim and surrounding areas (www.water.ie, accessed 08 September 2026). It outlines benefits of the upgrade will ensure secure water supply, ensure compliance with current drinking water quality regulations, enable the supply to be removed from EPA's Remedial Action List and enable social and economic growth of the area. The project commenced in June 2025 and is expected to be completed in 2027. • The 10-year water supply capacity register indicates that there is capacity available in Trim ('Green' indicator), as of information published in April 2026.
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues	SFI Natura Impact Statement [Updated] outlines: <u>Foul Waters</u> A continuous foul pipe network for the proposed development is impractical as it would need to traverse the existing OPW channel. It is proposed to make 2no. connections to the existing 9inch diameter Asbestos Cement (AC) sewer pipe: • A 225mm uPVC pipe will serve catchment 1, discharging into a newly constructed manhole • Another 225mm uPVC pipe will serve catchment 2, which will discharge to an existing manhole located on the same AC sewer pipe. Uisce Éireann (UÉ) letter dated 18 September 2025 states that a COF has been issued, and outlines the following with regard to wastewater: The COF states a connection is feasible subject to upgrades. There are constraints in the Uisce Eireann wastewater network. The applicant should identify areas in conjunction with the Local Authority, where stormwater separation /infiltration removal works to the wastewater network can be identified and carry out

	works to remove these flows, diverting them to surface water bodies or dedicated storm sewers which are not connected to any Uisce Éireann wastewater / combined sewers. Uisce Éireann will consider a new connection offset by storm separation works to remove storm runoff with a peak flow the equivalent of a 1 in 1 year storm event equalling no less than 3 times the peak dry weather flow for the new development for wastewater discharge. The proposal indicates that Uisce Éireann assets are present on site. The Developer must demonstrate that proposed structures and works will not inhibit access for maintenance or endanger structural or functional integrity of the assets during and after the works. Drawings (showing clearance distances, changing to ground levels) and Method Statements should be included in the Detailed Design of the Development. A wayleave in favour of Uisce Éireann will be required over the assets that are not located within the Public Space. Uisce Éireann requests any grant of permission be conditioned as follows: The applicant shall enter into a Connection Agreement(s) with Uisce Éireann to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network and adhere to standards and conditions set out in that agreement. The letter sets out an UÉ standard condition. Uisce Éireann: website Separately, I note that the UÉ website outlines that there is spare capacity ('Green' indicator) in the Trim Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), as of information published in April 2026 (www.water.ie, accessed 08 September 2026).
Others?	In addition to designated areas outlined above (in respect of EIASR), other Protected Areas for the purposes of WFD are outlined below (www.catchments.ie, accessed 07 September 2026): Drinking Waters: - Rivers: BOYNE_100 This point in River Boyne is east of Trim town centre, approx. 3.3km from subject site (straight line distance). - Lakes: none in vicinity

	- Groundwater: IE_EA_G_002 (Name: Trim) underlies the site - GSI Public Supply Source Protection Areas: Nearest is TRIM PWS. SI Inner Protection Area and Outer Protection Area are a short distance east of Trim, south of River Boyne - NFGWS Group Scheme Source Protection Areas Kiltale, approx. 11km southeast of site. - Bathing Water Areas: None - Shellfish Areas: None
--	---

Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection							
Identified water body	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater) (Consider all phases)	Mitigation Measures proposed	Is mitigation sufficient? Will there be any residual impacts?
River	IE_EA_07B041200 EPA name: WHITEHALL 07	Moderate (2019-2024)	At Risk	Significant Issues: Morphological Significant Pressures: HYMO (Hydromorphology)	Surface water run-off at construction and operational phases.	Construction phase: - CEMP - mitigation measures outlined in SFI NIS [Updated],including measures for in-stream works; Section 5.4 refers.	Mitigation sufficient. No residual impacts anticipated.

						Operational phase: - Design - SuDS measures (including attenuation, swale)	
Groundwater	Underlying site IE_EA_G_002 Trim	Good (2019-2024)	At Risk	Significant Issues: Chemical Quality Diminution For SW, Nutrients Significant Pressures: DWTS, Unknown, Ag	As above	As above	Mitigation sufficient. No residual impacts anticipated.