



# DRAFT VARIATION NO. 5 – MEATH COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## 2021-2027

---

### CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT

Submissions received to the Draft Variation No. 5 of  
Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027, as varied

May 2026



**Draft Variation No. 5 to the Meath County  
Development Plan 2021-2027, as varied**

**Chief Executive's Report**

**Submissions Received**

**Report to Council under Section 58 (11) of the  
Planning and Development Act 2024, (as  
amended).**

## **Chief Executive's Report - Draft Variation No. 5 Consultation Process**

## Contents

---

Contents.....	5
<b>PART 1: INTRODUCTION TO CHIEF EXECUTIVES REPORT.....</b>	<b>9</b>
1.1 Purpose and Contents of the Chief Executive’s Report.....	10
1.2 Summary of Proposed Variation No. 5 of the Meath CDP 2021 – 2027, as varied.....	10
1.3 Consultation Process.....	12
1.4 Approach to Consideration of Submissions.....	13
1.5 Conclusion.....	13
2.0 Index of Submissions.....	14
<b>Part 2: Summary of Prescribed Bodies Submissions &amp; Chief Executives Response &amp; Recommendations.....</b>	<b>19</b>
Submission No. MH-C217-75: OFFICE OF THE PLANNING REGULATOR (OPR).....	20
Submission No. MH-C217-79: DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING, LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HERITAGE.....	29
Submission No. MH-C217-61: NATIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY (NTA).....	30
Submission No. MH-C217-14: OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS.....	31
Submission No. MH-C217-48: UISCE ÉIREANN.....	35
Submission No. MH-C217-19: TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE IRELAND (TII).....	36
Submission No. MH-C217-40: DUBLIN AIRPORT AUTHORITY (DAA).....	37
Submission No. MH-C217-77: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION & YOUTH.....	38
Submission No. MH-C217-25: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT.....	39
Submission No. MH-C217-42: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (EPA).....	40
Submission No. MH-C217-64: ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BOARD (ESB).....	41
Submission No. MH-C217-74: IARNRÓD ÉIREANN.....	43
Submission No. MH-C217-15: FINGAL COUNTY COUNCIL (FCC).....	44
Submission No. MH-C217-65: LOUTH COUNTY COUNCIL (LCC).....	45
Submission No. MH-C217-5: AN GARDA SÍOCHÁNA.....	46
Submission No. MH-C217-3: INLAND FISHERIES IRELAND.....	47
<b>Part 3: Summary of submissions &amp; Chief Executive’s Response &amp; Recommendations.....</b>	<b>48</b>
Submission No. MH-C217-1: Withdrawn.....	49
Submission No. MH-C217-2: Dave Boyne.....	49

Submission No. MH-C217-4: Mark Keane .....	49
Submission No. MH-C217-6: Dowdstown Developments Ltd (Declan Brassil & Co.) .....	50
Submission No. MH-C217-7: Ann Holmes, Brendan Little & Carmel Kelly (BMA Planning) .....	51
Submission No. MH-C217-8: Stamullen Community Alert.....	51
Submission No. MH-C217-9: John Purfield .....	52
Submission No. MH-C217-10: H&N Construction (Declan Brassil & Co.) .....	53
Submission No. MH-C217-11: Shannon Homes.....	54
Submission No. MH-C217-12: Loughglynn Developments Ltd t/a Hora Homes.....	54
Submission No. MH-C217-13: John Connaughton Ltd & Carroll Estates Dunboyne Ltd (Brock McClure Planning & Development Consultants).....	55
Submission No. MH-C217-16: Earlsfort Developments Drogheda Ltd (Hughes Planning & Development Consultants).....	56
Submission No. MC-C217-17: Buvinda Developments (Brady Hughes Consulting).....	58
Submission No. MH-C217-18-MRP Investment & Development Ltd., ES Corella Creek (Declan Brassil & Co.) .....	59
Submission No. MH-C217-20: McGarrell Reilly (Genesis Planning Consultants).....	60
Submission No. MH-C217-21: Cloncurry Homes (McCutcheon Halley Planning Consultants)....	61
Submission No. MH-C217-22: Greenwalk Homes Ltd (JSA Planning) .....	62
Submission No. MH-C217-23: Solkerry Ventures Ltd (Brock McClure Planning).....	63
Submission No. MH-C217-24: Keystone Development Ltd (CEA Architects).....	63
Submission No. MH-C217-26: Kells Anglers.....	65
Submission No. MH-C217-27: Kells Anglers.....	66
Submission No. MH-C217-28: Kells Anglers.....	67
Submission No. MH-C217-29: Kells Anglers.....	68
Submission No. MH-C217-30: Protect East Meath Ltd .....	70
Submission No. MH-C217-31: Kells Anglers.....	75
Submission No. MH-C217-32: Kevin and Dermot Cassidy (Hendrik W van der Kamp, Town Planner) .....	76
Submission No. MH-C217-33: Irene Sands (Brady Hughes Consulting).....	78
Submission No. MH-C217-34: Smith Family (Brady Hughes Consulting).....	79
Submission No. MH-C217-35: Burke Family (Brady Hughes Consulting).....	80
Submission No. MH-C217-36: John Levins (Brady Hughes Consulting) .....	81

Submission No. MH-C217-37: McNeece Family (Brady Hughes Consulting) .....	82
Submission No. MH-C217-38: McGarrell Reilly Homes (McCutcheon Halley Planning Consultants) .....	83
Submission No. MH-C217-39: Jimmy Carroll (JSA Planning) .....	85
Submission No. MH-C217-41: Julianstown & District Community Association .....	86
Submission No. MH-C217-43: Gem Construction (JSA Planning) .....	87
Submission No. MH-C217-44: Eileen Kelly (Brady Hughes Consulting) .....	88
Submission No. MH-C217-45: Eileen Kelly (Brady Hughes Consulting) .....	89
Submission No. MH-C217-46: Margaret Joyce (Local Traveller Community Group) .....	90
Submission No. MH-C217-47: Anthony Donnelly (on behalf of Proudstown Landowners) Jim Flood, Andrew Flood, Tadhg Donnelly .....	91
Submission No. MH-C217-49: Glenveagh Homes Ltd (JSA Planning) .....	92
Submission No. MH-C217-50: Cairn Homes Properties Ltd (Declan Brassil) .....	93
Submission No. MH-C217-51: Paul Morrin (Avison Young) .....	94
Submission No. MH-C217-52: Alanna Homes .....	95
Submission No. MH-C217-53: Morrin Family (TPA Planning Consultants) .....	96
Submission No. MH-C217-54: Patricia Thorpe .....	97
Submission No. MH-C217-55: Margaret Joyce .....	98
Submission No. MH-C217-56: Withdrawn .....	99
Submission No. MH-C217-57: Margaret Joyce .....	99
Submission No. MH-C217-58: Castlethorn (SLA Planning) .....	100
Submission No. MH-C217-59: Manley Construction Ltd .....	101
Submission No. MH-C217-60: Grange Rath CLG .....	102
Submission No. MH-C217-62: Loughcrew Developments (JSA Planning) .....	102
Submission No. MH-C217-63: Michael Ryan (KPMG Planning) .....	103
Submission No. MH-C217-66: Paul Murray (Shay Scanlon Architect) .....	104
Submission No. MH-C217-67: Melvin Properties Ltd (Corr & Associates) .....	105
Submission No. MH-C217-68: Patrick Cosgrove (Shay Scanlon Architect) .....	106
Submission No. MH-C217-69: Albert Developments Ltd (JSA Planning) .....	107
Submission No. MH-C217-70: Hemeryck Family (PD Lane Associates) .....	107
Submission No. MH-C217-71: Castlethorn (SLA Planning) .....	108

Submission No. MH-C217-72: Balgeeth Holdings Unlimited (Downey Planning).....	109
Submission No. MH-C217-73: Brian Delaney (Manahan Planners) .....	110
Submission No. MH-C217-76: Navan RFC (Gaffney & Cullivan Architects Ltd).....	111
Submission No. MH-C217-78: Pat Clarke (Gaffney & Cullivan Architects Ltd).....	112
<b>Part 4: SEA Screening for Draft Variation No. 3 Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027, as varied .....</b>	<b>114</b>

## **PART 1: INTRODUCTION TO CHIEF EXECUTIVES REPORT.**

# Part 1

---

## 1.1 Purpose and Contents of the Chief Executive’s Report.

Meath County Council gave notice of its intention to vary the existing Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2026 in accordance with Section 58 of the Planning and Development Act 2024 (as amended).

The purpose of the Chief Executive’s Report is to present the outcomes of the consultation process carried out on Proposed Variation No.5 to the Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027, as varied. Its primary function is to list and summarise the main issues raised in the submissions received during the consultation process and to provide recommendations in response to the submissions. This report will be issued to the Elected Members of Meath County Council for consideration.

Pursuant to Section 58 of the Planning and Development Act 2024, as varied, this Report provides details of the submissions and observations received and sets out the following information:

1. Lists the persons or bodies who made a submission or observation on the proposed variation;
2. Summarises the issues raised by the person or bodies in the submissions including recommendations and submissions made by the Minister, OPR and NTA;
3. Provides the response of the Chief Executive to the issues raised, taking account of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, the statutory obligations of the planning authority, and any relevant policies or objectives for the time being of the Government or any Minister of the Government.
4. Provides the recommendations of the Chief Executive as to how any recommendations made by the Minister and the OPR in their submissions should be dealt with; and
5. Includes the assessment of the Chief Executive of the proposed variation for the purposes of strategic environmental assessment or appropriate assessment, taking into account the submissions received under this section.

## 1.2 Summary of Proposed Variation No. 5 of the Meath CDP 2021 – 2027, as varied

In April 2025 the National Planning Framework (NPF) First Revision was adopted to address evolving challenges in relation to climate change, housing, regional development and population growth.

On the 29th of July 2025 following the approval of the Revised NPF, the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage published the NPF Implementation; Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines in accordance with Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended). The NPF Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines will replace the Housing Supply Target Methodology for Development Plan Guidelines for Planning Authorities, published in December 2020. Local authorities are now required to update development plans to reflect the national targets set out by the Department. The NPF Housing Growth Requirement Guidelines requires sufficient zoning in

# Part 1

---

County Meath to deliver 2,942 units annually up to 2034. This figure reduces to 1,362 from 2035 to 2040.

In accordance with Section 43 of the Planning and Development Act 2024 (as amended), the County Development Plan is mandated to be consistent with the National Planning Framework and the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy. Accordingly, Proposed Variation 5 is required to integrate the updated housing figures into the Core Strategy to ensure consistency with the planning hierarchy.

As required by Section 3.0 of the NPF Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines, local authorities must initially assess the current adopted Development Plan and review the Core Strategy, related settlement strategies and zoning objectives against the objectives of the NPF Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines.

The purpose of Variation No. 5 is to give effect to the following amendments:

**1. Proposed Amendment No. 1: Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 Volume 1 - Written Statement**

To update the County Development Plan to take account of the new housing targets set out in the National Planning Framework Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines published by the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage in July 2025 and issued under Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

**2. Proposed Amendment No.2: Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 Volume 2 - Written Statement for Settlements**

In order to ensure consistency with the Written Statement of the Development Plan (Volume 1) and the revised housing targets, the Written Statements for the settlements that contain lands proposed for rezoning are required to be amended as part of this variation. The amendments primarily relate to adjustments to the household allocation for the relevant areas and projected population growth having regard to Census 2022 data and the new annual housing growth requirements for the county as set out in the NPF Implementation Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines 2025.

**3. Proposed Amendment No.3: Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 Volume 2 - Maps for Settlements**

In order to ensure consistency with the National Planning Framework and accommodate revised housing targets for the County, it is proposed to amend land use zonings as shown on the County Development Plan Map Sheets. It is also proposed to amend the development / settlement boundaries accordingly to ensure any lands that have been identified for development within the lifetime of the Plan fall within the development boundary of the relevant settlement.

The proposed rezonings are summarised below with details provided as to the existing and proposed land use zoning objectives for each individual area. The proposed rezonings are illustrated individually through updated land use zoning map sheets for the relevant settlements / areas with the proposed variations clearly marked on each sheet. Where no zoning changes are proposed in settlements under this Variation, the current map sheets remain in effect.

A total of 11 settlements have been identified for rezoning as follows:

# Part 1

---

- Dunboyne
- Southern Environs of Drogheda
- Navan
- Kilcock
- Dunshaughlin
- Enfield
- Bettystown-Laytown-Mornington East-Donacarney- Mornington (East Meath)
- Duleek
- Stamullen
- Athboy
- Carlanstown

The Variation documentation also set out the methodology that was used to determine the development capacity of existing zoned lands, including detailed information on the identification of additional lands that are most likely to contribute to delivering the revised housing targets as set out in Guidelines.

It should be noted that the variation relates to the impacts of the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements (July 2025) Guidelines on the current Development Plan and proposes updates to the relevant sections accordingly. Other national policies and guidance that may have been published since the adoption of the Plan do not form part of this variation and will be considered during the preparation of the next County Development Plan.

## 1.3 Consultation Process

Consultation on Draft Variation No. 5 to the County Development Plan 2021-2027, as varied, together with respective Strategic Environmental Assessment and Appropriate Assessment Screening Reports was carried out for a period of 4 weeks from 31<sup>st</sup> of March 2026 to 1<sup>st</sup> of May 2026 inclusive.

The key elements of the consultation programme are set out below:

- Notices of the Proposed Draft Variation No. 5 to the County Development Plan 2021 -2027, as varied, were published in the Meath Chronicle, the Drogheda Independent and the Meath County Council Public Consultation Portal. The notices included information on how to make a submission on the Proposed Draft Variation No. 5 and associated Environmental Reports.
- Notice of the Proposed Draft Variation No.5 together with information on public consultation issued to the Prescribed Bodies and adjoining Local Authorities.
- The Draft Variation No. 5 and associated Environmental Reports were placed on public display in Buvinda House, each Municipal District Office, online at [www.consult.meath.ie](http://www.consult.meath.ie), the Meath County Council website and all MCC Social Media Platforms. All relevant websites and social media platforms included details of the consultation on the Proposed Draft Variation No. 5 including information on how to make a submission via the online Consultation Portal and by post. Updates and reminders were issued via Social Media Platforms.

Seventy-nine submissions were received during the Proposed Draft Variation No. 5 consultation period.

# Part 1

---

## 1.4 Approach to Consideration of Submissions

Each submission was reviewed to allocate the issue to the relevant section appropriate of the Proposed Draft Variation of the County Development Plan 2021-2027, as varied. The 'Index of Submissions', outlined in Section 2 below, identifies each submission by unique submission number, name, proposed amendment number to which it related, and page number where it is contained in the report.

Proposed changes to the text are identified in **blue** while text proposed for deletion contains a ~~strike through~~. Further proposed modifications to the text arising from submissions to Proposed Variation No.5 are *underlined and italicised in green*.

## 1.5 Conclusion

In accordance with Section 58(12) of the Planning and Development Act 2024 as amended, the Members, having considered the Proposed Variation and Chief Executive's Report, may, by resolution as they consider appropriate, make the variation, with or without modifications, or they may refuse to make it.



---

Kieran Kehoe  
Chief Executive

# Part 1

---

## 2.0 Index of Submissions

Submission No.	Name	Agent (if applicable)
MH-C217-1	Withdrawn	
MH-C217-2	Dave Boyne	
MH-C217-3	Inland Fisheries Ireland	
MH-C217-4	Mark Keane	
MH-C217-5	An Garda Síochana	
MH-C217-6	Dowdstown Developments Ltd	Declan Brassil & Co.
MH-C217-7	Ann Holmes, Brendan Little & Carmel Kelly	BMA Planning
MH-C217-8	Stamullen Community Alert	
MH-C217-9	John Purfield	
MH-C217-10	H&N Construction	Declan Brassil & Co.
MH-C217-11	Shannon Homes	
MH-C217-12	Loughglynn Developments Ltd t/a Hora Homes	
MH-C217-13	John Connaughton Ltd and Carroll Estates Dunboyne Ltd	Brock McClure Planning & Development Consultants
MH-C217-14	Office of Public Works	
MH-C217-15	Fingal County Council	
MH-C217-16	Earlsfort Developments Drogheda Ltd	Hughes Planning and Development Consultants
MH-C217-17	Buvinda Developments	Brady Hughes Consulting

## Part 1

MH-C217-18	MRP Investment & Development Ltd., ES Corella Creek	Declan Brassil & Co.
MH-C217-19	Transport Infrastructure Ireland	
MH-C217-20	McGarrell Reilly	Genesis Planning Consultants
MH-C217-21	Cloncurry Homes	McCutcheon Halley Chartered Planning Consultants
MH-C217-22	Greenwalk Homes Ltd.	JSA Planning
MH-C217-23	Solkerry Ventures Ltd	Brock McClure Planning
MH-C217-24	Keystone Development Ltd	CEA Architects
MH-C217-25	Department of Transport	
MH-C217-26	Kells Anglers	
MH-C217-27	Kells Anglers	
MH-C217-28	Kells Anglers	
MH-C217-29	Kells Anglers	
MH-C217-30	Protect East Meath Limited	
MH-C217-31	Kells Anglers	
MH-C217-32	Kevin and Dermot Cassidy	Hendrik W van der Kamp, Town Planner
MH-C217-33	Irene Sands	Brady Hughes Consulting
MH-C217-34	Smith Family	Brady Hughes Consulting
MH-C217-35	Burke Family	Brady Hughes Consulting
MH-C217-36	John Levins	Brady Hughes Consulting

## Part 1

MH-C217-37	McNeece Family	Brady Hughes Consulting
MH-C217-38	McGarrell Reilly Homes	McCutcheon Halley Chartered Planning Consultants
MH-C217-39	Jimmy Carroll	JSA Planning
MH-C217-40	Dublin Airport Authority (DAA)	
MH-C217-41	Julianstown and District Community Association	
MH-C217-42	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	
MH-C217-43	GEM Construction	JSA Planning
MH-C217-44	Eileen Kelly	Brady Hughes Consulting
MH-C217-45	Eileen Kelly	Brady Hughes Consulting
MH-C217-46	Margaret Joyce (Local Traveller Community Group)	
MH-C217-47	Anthony Donnelly (on behalf of Proudstown Landowners) Jim Flood, Andrew Flood, Tadhg Donnelly	
MH-C217-48	Uisce Éireann (Irish Water)	
MH-C217-49	Glenveagh Homes	JSA Planning
MH-C217-50	Cairn Homes Properties Ltd	Declan Brassil & Co.
MH-C217-51	Paul Morrin	Avison Young
MH-C217-52	Alanna Homes	
MH-C217-53	Morrin Family	TPA Planning Consultants
MH-C217-54	Patricia Thorpe	

## Part 1

---

MH-C217-55	Margaret Joyce	
MH-C217-56	Withdrawn	
MH-C217-57	Margaret Joyce	
MH-C217-58	Castlethorn	SLA Planning
MH-C217-59	Manley Construction Ltd	
MH-C217-60	Grange Rath CLG	
MH-C217-61	National Transport Authority	
MH-C217-62	Loughcrew Developments	JSA Planning
MH-C217-63	Michael Ryan	KPMG Planning
MH-C217-64	Electricity Supply Board	
MH-C217-65	Louth County Council	
MH-C217-66	Paul Murray	Shay Scanlon Architect
MH-C217-67	Melvin Properties Ltd	Corr & Associates
MH-C217-68	Patrick Cosgrove	Shay Scanlon Architect
MH-C217-69	Albert Developments Ltd.	JSA Planning
MH-C217-70	Hemeryck Family	PD Lane Associates
MH-C217-71	Castlethorn	SLA Planning
MH-C217-72	Balgeeth Holdings Unlimited	Downey Planning
MH-C217-73	Brian Delaney	Manahan Planners
MH-C217-74	Iarnród Éireann	

## Part 1

---

MH-C217-75	Office of the Planning Regulator	
MH-C217-76	Navan RFC	Gaffney and Cullivan Architects Ltd
MH-C217-77	Department of Education and Youth	
MH-C217-78	Pat Clarke	Gaffney and Cullivan Architects Ltd
MH-C217-79	Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage	

## **Part 2**

---

### **Part 2: Summary of Prescribed Bodies Submissions & Chief Executives Response & Recommendations**

### Submission No. MH-C217-75: OFFICE OF THE PLANNING REGULATOR (OPR)

#### Submission No. MH-C217-75: Office of the Planning Regulator

##### Summary of Submission:

The Office of the Planning Regulator (OPR) welcomes the preparation of Draft Variation No. 5 to the Meath County Development Plan 2021–2027, as varied, noting that the Variation responds to revised housing growth requirements arising from the National Planning Framework (NPF) First Revision (2025) and associated NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines for Planning Authorities. (2025).

The OPR commends the Planning Authority for identifying the majority of additional residential lands in locations that reflect the principles of compact growth, infrastructure capacity, sequential development and sustainable transport accessibility, and confirms that the overall quantum of lands proposed provides an appropriate housing delivery pipeline.

The OPR also acknowledges that the proposed Variation does not include wider updates for more recently published national guidance (beyond the immediate housing-growth requirement purpose) and encourages the Planning Authority to prepare a further variation “as soon as possible” to align the County Development Plan with, in particular, the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines (2024) and the Planning Design Standards for Apartments Guidelines (2025).

With respect to the Variation the OPR considers that the zoning objectives are generally well located and aligned with national and regional policy and has set out three recommendations and two observations under four themes as follows:

- 1) Implementation of the housing growth requirements (Recommendation 1),
- 2) Southern Environs of Drogheda (Recommendation 2),
- 3) Flood risk management (Recommendation 3 + Observation 1), and
- 4) Active travel (Observation 2)

#### **1. Implementation of the Housing Growth Requirements (Recommendation 1)**

The Office of the Planning Regulator acknowledges that Proposed Variation No. 5 has been prepared in response to the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements (2025) and welcomes that new residential lands are proposed at 24 locations in 11 settlements across the County with a focus on the higher tier settlements.

While the OPR states that it is satisfied that the overall quantum of residentially zoned land proposed will provide an appropriate pipeline for housing delivery over the plan period, it requires greater clarity regarding the basis for the calculation of housing capacity within the Core Strategy.

Specifically, the OPR recommends that the Planning Authority provide a fully updated Core Strategy Table to incorporate the following:

- The quantum of additional lands proposed for residential development in each settlement in the proposed Variation;

## Part 2

---

- The proposed densities (having regard to the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines (2024)); and
- The resultant housing yields.

### **2. Southern Environs of Drogheda (Recommendation 2)**

The OPR identifies the Southern Environs of Drogheda as an area of significant strategic importance, noting Drogheda’s designation as a Regional Growth Centre and the scale of planned and ongoing public investment in transport infrastructure, including the proposed DART+ extension referenced in the Greater Dublin Area Transport Strategy 2022–2042.

The OPR outlines that:

- while Drogheda is not currently designated as a Transport Oriented Development (TOD), the extension of DART+ would materially strengthen its TOD potential and support National Policy Objective (NPO) 99 of the NPF First Revision (2025) relating to accelerated delivery of TOD at suitable locations;
- Site PA 01 is located approximately 2km east of Drogheda railway station, with largely undeveloped greenfield lands lying between the station and the subject site; and
- access to PA 01 is proposed via Mill Road, which currently lacks a footpath, notwithstanding existing school access along that route.

The OPR expresses concern that zoning PA 01 for immediate residential development, in the absence of a broader planning and transport framework, could result in:

- piecemeal development;
- an isolated and potentially car-dependent residential development; and
- development occurring in advance of confirmed sustainable connectivity to the rail station, town centre, and surrounding neighbourhoods.

The OPR notes positively that a Local Transport Plan (LTP) for Drogheda is currently being prepared and considers that this should inform a more comprehensive planning framework for the wider southern environs.

Accordingly, under Recommendation 2, the OPR recommends that the Planning Authority:

- makes the Plan without the zoning of Southern Environs of Drogheda PA 01 at this time; and
- includes an objective to engage with Louth County Council in to prepare a planning framework for lands between Drogheda railway station and Mill Road, informed by the final LTP and focused on integration, permeability and sustainable transport connectivity.

### **3. Flood Risk Management (Recommendation 3 and Observation 1)**

The OPR welcomes the preparation of a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to accompany Proposed Variation No. 5 and acknowledges that it has been undertaken in accordance with the relevant Guidelines.

## Part 2

Notwithstanding this, the OPR identifies a number of flood-related concerns at specific locations, including:

- residential zonings overlapping Flood Zones A and/or B at Dunboyne/Clonee/Pace and Kilcock Environs;
- overlap between past flood extents and parts of proposed development lands at Dunboyne/Clonee/Pace; and
- the proximity of watercourses or floodplains to proposed residential lands at Dunshaughlin, Navan and Stamullen.

The OPR considers that further site-specific investigation is required to establish whether Stage 3 Detailed Flood Risk Assessments are necessary for certain sites and advises that, where highly vulnerable development would be located within Flood Zones A or B (or less vulnerable development in Flood Zone A) and the Plan-Making Justification Test has not been passed, zoning should be amended or restricted to water-compatible uses. Accordingly, the OPR recommends that the Planning Authority:

- amend land use zonings so that highly vulnerable development is not permitted on either Flood Zone A or Flood Zone B and less vulnerable development is not permitted on Flood Zone A at Dunboyne/Clonee/Pace PA01 and Kilcock Environs PA01; and
- undertake a site visit to establish whether a Stage 3 FRA is required

In addition, under Observation 1, the OPR advises that:

- the SFRA should more clearly outline how future climate change scenarios and associated mitigation measures have been assessed for specific sites in Navan and Enfield; and
- the Planning Authority should review and map historic flood extents (including data from floodinfo.ie) in relation to identified lands.

#### **4. Active Travel (Observation 2)**

The OPR highlights the importance of integrating land use planning with active travel objectives, consistent with relevant national and regional policy objectives.

The OPR advises that, for a number of proposed development locations — including Athboy (PA03), Carlanstown (PA01), Dunboyne/Clonee/Pace (PA01), Navan (PA01), the Southern Environs of Drogheda (PA02) and Stamullen (PA01) — the Planning Authority should actively investigate opportunities to create walking and cycling permeability links between proposed residential lands and existing adjacent neighbourhoods.

Under Observation 2, the OPR suggests that where such permeability opportunities are identified, they should be supported by specific Development Plan objectives, thereby embedding active travel considerations into the implementation of the zoning strategy set out in Variation No. 5.

#### **Chief Executive Response**

The Chief Executive welcomes the submission from the Office of the Planning Regulator (OPR) and recognises and endorses the role of the OPR within the Planning System. Meath County Council has

a very positive working relationship with the OPR and looks forward to continuing and developing relations through further engagement in all functions of the office.

On a point of clarification, and in response to the OPR's request that the Planning Authority prepare a subsequent Variation to align the Development Plan with recent Ministerial Guidelines, the Chief Executive would like to confirm that Variation No. 3 to the Development Plan, adopted on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2025, aligned the Development Plan with the referenced national guidance documents.

### **1. Implementation of the Housing Growth Requirements**

Meath County Council welcomes the OPR's recognition of the approach taken in preparing the Variation and in identifying additional residential lands that are positioned in locations that reflect the principles of compact growth, infrastructure capacity, sequential development and sustainable transport accessibility. The Authority also welcomes the OPR's acknowledgement that the overall quantum of lands proposed for residential zoning provides an appropriate housing delivery pipeline. The Authority also wishes to emphasise that the Variation has been deliberately scoped and structured as a targeted and time-critical response to revised housing targets and is not intended to be treated as a de facto Development Plan review, but rather a proportionate and focused Variation that actively and comprehensively responds to the requirements of the revised NPF and associated Guidelines.

The OPR's recommendation in this regard relates primarily to the presentation and clarity of the Core Strategy, rather than to the appropriateness of the lands zoned. In particular, the OPR seeks additional clarity on how residential yields have been derived, specifically the relationship between the area of lands proposed for residential development, the density assumptions applied having regard to the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines (2024), and the resultant housing capacity identified in the Core Strategy Supplementary Tables. The OPR recommends that clearer articulation be provided to demonstrate how land quantum, density ranges and yields interrelate via a full revised Core Strategy table.

In response, the Chief Executive is satisfied that the Core Strategy, when read holistically with the Written Statement, Settlement Strategies and associated environmental assessments, demonstrates compliance with the Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines and provides a robust strategic framework for housing delivery. The Chief Executive also notes that:

- Table 12.2B Core Strategy Supplementary Table should be read in conjunction with Table 12.2 Core Strategy of the existing Development Plan and relates solely to the settlements that are the subject of this variation;
- The variation is not intended to represent a complete appraisal of the current core strategy and should be focused solely on demonstrating how the lands proposed to be brought forward for residential development can contribute to achieving the revised housing targets for the county;
- The '**potential**' housing yield figures in the Core Strategy Supplementary Table are indicative and strategic in nature, consistent with national guidance; and
- Precise yields and site-specific densities will be appropriately determined at local level plan making stage, masterplanning and development management stage, informed by detailed design proposals for the future development of the subject lands.

Notwithstanding the above, the Chief Executive accepts that additional explanatory clarity can be provided within the Core Strategy tables to explicitly set out density assumptions and yield calculations, without altering the underlying zoning strategy or the intent of the Variation. The potential housing yields calculated for the lands proposed to be brought forward for residential development as part of the Variation have been derived by applying an 80% net development area to each land parcel. In certain instances, a density range was applied to provide the necessary flexibility to respond to site constraints or evolving circumstances that cannot be accurately determined until detail design / planning application stage. A minor modification comprises of additional explanatory body text and footnote to the existing Core Strategy Table is recommended to address the concerns raised.

### **2. Southern Environs of Drogheda**

The OPR identifies the Southern Environs of Drogheda as a strategically significant location given Drogheda's designation as a Regional Growth Centre and the scale of planned and committed investment in public transport infrastructure, including the proposed DART+ extension. The OPR expresses concern that zoning of Proposed Amendment PA 01, in isolation from a comprehensive planning and transport framework, may risk piecemeal development and insufficient integration with the wider urban area, including the town centre, railway station and existing neighbourhoods. Particular emphasis is placed on the need to ensure sustainable connectivity, permeability and alignment with transport planning.

The Chief Executive acknowledges the strategic planning considerations raised by the OPR and concurs that the long-term development of the Southern Environs of Drogheda should be guided by comprehensive, plan-led frameworks, including cross-boundary collaboration with Louth County Council and informed by the emerging Drogheda Local Transport Plan. The Chief Executive would also like to clarify that the PA01 lands at Colpe will be accessible via a new spine road to the south of the Educate Together school which is completed as far as the school. .

The consented planning application (reference number: LB180620) involves road infrastructure including a link street approximately 720m in length, including 3 no. roundabout junctions. It is also proposed to extend a 230m long spur of the link street to the east to facilitate a connection to the existing school on Mill Road (Gaelscoil an Bhradain Feasa), the realignment of a section of Colpe Road and the southern section of Mill Road together with cycle lanes and footpaths. The section of the Road that serves the school is in situ.

It is also noted that Variation No. 5 is specifically intended as a focused statutory response to revised housing growth requirements, rather than a full strategic reappraisal of the Drogheda settlement. In this context, the OPR itself confirms that the zoning objectives within the Variation are generally well located and aligned with national and regional policy. The Chief Executive would also like to highlight that the consented development (Reg. Ref: 212412) at Colpe West for 95no. residential units, childcare facility, outdoor play space and associated road infrastructure, currently subject to a High Court Stay, can be considered by ACP once the lands are zoned for residential use. Paragraph 22(vi) of the relevant High Court Judgement in the case between Protect East Meath Limited and Meath County Council notes that the order will be:

*22(vi) a stay on any current or future planning applications or appeals (including, for the avoidance of doubt, planning appeals numbers 313190-22, 313187-22 and 314352-22) that are affected by the order of certiorari, until a variation to the plan made in the light of the order of the court comes into force, or pending further order of the court in the meantime, with liberty to apply, in lieu of the stay granted to at para. 84(iv)(b) of the judgment of 17th February, 2023;*

These lands are in single ownership, fully accessible and capable of immediate activation (as confirmed by the landowners submission on Proposed Draft Variation No.5 – reference MH-C217-11) which align fully with the recommendations of the NPF Housing Target Guidelines for lands that are suitable for rezoning to residential use.

The Chief Executive is satisfied that the inclusion of PA 01 is justified in the context of meeting Meath’s statutory housing obligations within the lifetime of the current Development Plan. The Authority will imminently commence the preparation of a Joint Urban Area Plan with Louth County Council which will be the appropriate mechanism to provide a strategic framework for the sustainable development of Drogheda which will include the lands between the train station and Mill Road, south of the rail line. The JUAP will be fully consistent and compliant with the Joint Local Transport Plan for Drogheda that is currently being progressed. The preparation of the JUAP should not impede the delivery of housing on accessible and suitably located lands in line to meet the requirements of national policy.

Accordingly, while recognising the need for further strategic planning work in the area, the Chief Executive is satisfied that the existing commitment to prepare a Joint Urban Area Plan for Drogheda in collaboration with Louth County Council will satisfactorily address the OPR’s requirement to prepare a planning framework for the area between the train station and Mill Road. The JUAP will provide the framework for the future development of the wider lands setting out a clear vision for the integration of the lands with the surrounding environs and the wider Drogheda settlement.

### **3. Flood Risk Management**

The Chief Executive notes that flood risk management has been a central consideration throughout the preparation of Variation No. 5 and reiterates that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) has informed the zoning strategy and the formulation of site-specific objectives. The Plan also includes robust Development Management policies which prohibit highly vulnerable development in Flood Zone A and restricts such development in Flood Zone B, unless appropriate justification is demonstrated in accordance with national guidelines, together with specific objectives safeguarding flood-prone lands and requiring detailed flood risk assessment at planning application stage.

In response to Recommendation 3, the flood risk matters raised are consistent with those outlined by the Office of Public Works (OPW) submission and have been carefully considered. A meeting took place between JBA Flood Consultants, Meath County Council and the OPW on 26/05/26 to discuss the items raised in the OPW submission and discuss Meath County Council’s response to same.

For Dunboyne/Clonee/Pace (PA 01), it is considered appropriate to retain the existing zoning approach having regard to the safeguards provided under Specific Objective DCE OBJ 23 which is included as a new objective in the draft variation, and ensures that residential development will not be permitted on lands identified within Flood Zones A or B. OPW have noted that the site is subject to a Map Review, with a requirement for a Stage 3 Flood Risk Assessment at Development Management stage subject to revision. The Draft Variation SFRA will be updated to include a short clarification regarding the ongoing OPW Map Review.

For Kilcock Environs (PA 01), it has been confirmed through consultation with the OPW on 26 May 2026 that the flood mapping for Kilcock is currently being reviewed by the OPW. A short clarification regarding the ongoing OPW Map Review will be included in the SFRA to acknowledge this review. The overlap of residentially zoned lands at Kilcock with Flood Zone B is noted. Following consultation with the OPW, it is considered appropriate to retain the existing zoning

approach having regard to the safeguards provided under spot objective KIL OBJ 5B which is included in the Draft Variation to ensure that lands located within Flood Zone B are safeguarded and protected as a storage area. KIL OBJ 5B reads as follows - *Planning applications for development proposals on the lands that are subject to Spot Objective KIL OBJ 5B shall be accompanied by a Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment carried out in accordance with the requirements of the "Planning System and Flood Risk Management –Guidelines for Planning Authorities."* Lands that are impacted by Flood Zone B and Climate Change shall be reserved for storage areas only and kept free from vulnerable land uses.

In relation to the sites identified under Recommendation 3 (ii), site-specific assessment requirements are addressed within the SFRA and through the Development Management process. For Dunshaughlin (PA 01 and PA 02), site visits have been undertaken and existing SSFRAs are referenced, with further assessment required as appropriate. For Navan (PA 05), it is acknowledged that drainage features are not formally mapped and will be addressed at Development Management stage. For Stamullen (PA 01), the watercourse is located at a distance from the site and additional climate change mapping will be incorporated into the SFRA.

Overall, it is considered that the SFRA, in conjunction with specific objectives and Development Management controls, provides an appropriate and plan-led framework to manage flood risk without the need for further zoning amendments at this stage

### **Observation 1 – Flood Risk Management,**

In relation to Observation 1, the matters raised are noted. For Navan PA 01, PA 02 and PA 03, climate change impacts are being addressed through the requirement for site-specific flood risk assessment, as set out in the SFRA and reinforced through associated spot objectives. For Enfield PA 02, the site is identified as being subject to historical flooding only and additional historic flood information will be incorporated into the final SFRA. In response to item (ii), the SFRA will be updated to incorporate historic flood extents for Dunboyne/Clonee/Pace PA 01, as identified on FloodInfo.ie.

In this context, the Chief Executive is satisfied that the existing policy framework, when read alongside the SFRA and the site-specific objectives included in the Variation, adequately addresses the flood risk concerns raised. Further clarification will be provided within the final SFRA regarding climate change allowances, historic flood mapping and mitigation measures; however, it is not considered necessary or proportionate to remove or materially amend land use zonings at this stage. Flood risk matters will continue to be robustly addressed through Development Management, supported by the strengthened SFRA and the explicit site-specific safeguards embedded in the Variation.

### **4. Active Travel**

The OPR advises that greater emphasis should be placed on active travel and permeability in the implementation of Proposed Variation No. 5, particularly in ensuring that new residential lands are well connected to existing settlements, services and amenities by walking and cycling. The OPR highlights a number of locations where opportunities may exist to improve permeability between proposed development lands and adjoining neighbourhoods and suggests that such opportunities should be reflected through specific Development Plan objectives.

The Chief Executive notes that the promotion of active travel, permeability and sustainable mobility is strongly embedded within the Meath County Development Plan 2021 -2027. These policies seek to reduce car dependency, support compact urban form, and ensure that new development integrates appropriately with existing communities. The Variation reinforces these

objectives by directing growth to locations with existing or planned infrastructure and by supporting compact and sequential development patterns. Opportunities for direct linkages can be addressed at planning application stage through the development management process.

The Chief Executive supports the OPR's observation and is satisfied that, through a combination of existing Development Plan policies and the implementation mechanisms agreed through the development management process, active travel and permeability will be appropriately addressed.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

#### 1. Implementation of the Housing Growth Requirements

It is recommended that Table 12.2B *Core Strategy Supplementary Table* be amended with a minor modification to clarify the proposed densities and resultant housing yields that apply to each of the settlements that include lands proposed to be brought forward for residential development under this Variation.

Insert the following body text above Table 12.2B Core Strategy Supplementary Table

*For the purposes of calculating the projected number of units that may be achieved on the newly zoned A2 New Residential lands, a net development area of 80% of the site area was used to account for unknown site constraints and the need to provide non-residential space as part of future development proposals. It should be noted that the potential number of units listed in the table per settlement are indicative only and should not be viewed as a de-facto cap or unit target for the lands.*

Correct the typographical error for the Area of Adjusted Lands (Column B) for Drogheda as follows:

~~11.03~~ 20.66.

Minor modification to insert an asterisk and footnote to the existing Core Strategy Table 2.12

An asterisk and footnote will be inserted adjacent to the 11 relevant settlements in the existing Core Strategy Table 2.12 to clarify for readers of the Core Strategy Table that the *Core Strategy Supplementary Table* (Table 12.2B) provides for the inclusion of additional zoning quantum to facilitate the delivery of the NPF Housing Growth Targets 2025. The footnote will read as follows;

*\*Additional Zoning Quantum to accommodate the revised housing growth requirements as set out in the NPF Housing Growth Requirements: Implementation Guidelines (2025) is included in Table 2.12B Core Strategy Supplementary Table.*

#### 2. Southern Environs of Drogheda

It is recommended that PA 01 Southern Environs of Drogheda be retained and the Variation adopted including this land parcel.

No modifications are required in relation to the inclusion of an objective to prepare a framework plan for the area between the train station and Mill Road.

## Part 2

### 3. Flood Risk Management

It is recommended that no modifications to the land use zonings proposed for Drogheda (PA 01), Kilcock (PA 01), Dunshaughlin (PA 01 and PA 02), Navan (PA 05) and Stamullen (PA 01) be made.

Having regard to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, existing Development Plan flood risk management policies and the inclusion of site-specific objectives within Proposed Variation No. 5, it is recommended that no modifications be made to the Variation in response to this submission.

The following minor clarifications will be included in the final SFRA to address the items raised in both the OPR and OPW submissions;

1. The SFRA will be updated to include additional GSI SAR historic mapped extents under Section 2.2.
2. The SFRA will be updated to include a short clarification regarding the ongoing OPW Map Review in Dunboyne/Clonee/Pace and Kilcock.
3. In relation to Stamullen, the SFRA will be updated accordingly to reflect the best available and most up to date flood mapping including consideration of climate change impacts on the site.
4. For Enfield PA 02, additional historic flood information will be incorporated into the final SFRA.
5. The SFRA will be updated to incorporate historic flood extents for Dunboyne/Clonee/Pace PA 01, as identified on FloodInfo.ie.
6. JBA will amend the SFRA Addendum to include some further guidance on SuDS and nature-based solutions guidance, referencing the OPW Best Practice Interim Guidance Document and the Implementation Guidance for Planners. The additional text will be:

*“In particular it is noted that the sites will offer opportunities to integrate nature-based solutions to reduce runoff and deliver benefits for both water quality and biodiversity. At development management stage applicants should implement the Best Practice Interim Guidance Document ‘Nature-based Solutions to the Management of Rainwater and Surface Water Runoff in Urban Areas’, as well as the Guidance Document for Planners, Developers and Developer Agents ‘Implementation of Urban Nature-based Solutions’ wherever possible”.*

The above clarifications will not result in any changes to the land-use zonings which form part of the draft variation.

### 4. Active Travel

No modifications are required in respect of active and the proposed variation.

## Part 2

### Submission No. MH-C217-79: DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING, LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HERITAGE

Submission No. MH-C217-79: Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage

#### Summary of Submission:

The Department advises that, having regard to the SEA Environmental Report, Appropriate Assessment Screening Report and Natura Impact Report, the proposed rezonings will not result in significant adverse effects on European Sites, subject to the implementation of mitigation measures. The Department welcomes the inclusion of Objective INF OBJ 25B relating to surface water management but suggests an additional site-specific SuDS objective for lands east of Kilcock.

#### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive welcomes the Department's confirmation that Proposed Variation No. 5 will not adversely affect European Sites, having regard to the mitigation measures identified. The inclusion of Objective INF OBJ 25B strengthens water quality protection and provides an additional layer of safeguard for biodiversity countywide.

The Meath County Development Plan contains detailed objectives promoting Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems, nature-based solutions and best practice surface water management. These measures will be implemented and assessed in detail at planning application stage through the development management process.

In this context, the Chief Executive considers that the existing policy framework provides sufficient protection and will ensure that the requirements of the Habitat Directive regarding the prevention of adverse effects on QIs for the Rye Water Valley/Carton SAC and preserving the integrity of this European Site are fulfilled. As such, it is considered that no further site-specific objective is required at plan level and this matter will be appropriately addressed at development management. However, as detailed in the OPR and OPW submission responses, JBA will amend the SFRA Addendum to include some further guidance on SuDS and nature-based solutions guidance as requested by the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage submission.

#### Chief Executive Recommendation

JBA will amend the SFRA Addendum to include further guidance on SuDS and nature-based solutions, referencing the OPW Best Practice Interim Guidance Document and the Implementation Guidance for Planners. The minor modification text will be as follows:

*"In particular it is noted that the sites will offer opportunities to integrate nature-based solutions to reduce runoff and deliver benefits for both water quality and biodiversity. At development management stage applicants should implement the Best Practice Interim Guidance Document 'Nature-based Solutions to the Management of Rainwater and Surface Water Runoff in Urban Areas', as well as the Guidance Document for Planners, Developers and Developer Agents 'Implementation of Urban Nature-based Solutions' wherever possible".*

## Part 2

### Submission No. MH-C217-61:NATIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY (NTA)

#### Submission No. MH-C217-61:National Transport Authority (NTA)

##### Summary of Submission:

The National Transport Authority (NTA) places significant emphasis on the integration of land use and sustainable transport, particularly through the provision of filtered permeability and high-quality walking and cycling connections between new and existing residential areas. The NTA identifies a number of proposed zoning locations where connectivity will be critical, with specific importance placed on the following settlements / proposed amendments:

- Dunboyne/Clonee/Pace (PA 01)
- Southern Environs of Drogheda (PA 01 and PA 02)
- Navan (PA 01)
- Enfield (PA 02)
- East Meath (PA 01)
- Stamullen (PA 01)
- Athboy (PA 03)
- Carlanstown (PA 01)

The submission recommends that the Planning Authority ensure that Filtered Permeability connections can be delivered between the proposed rezonings above and adjacent residential areas to support more sustainable travel modes.

##### Southern Environs of Drogheda PA 01

In relation to the above referenced lands at Colpe, the submission raises concerns regarding the connectivity potential of the lands due to the severance of the rail line. The submission also recommends that development of certain lands be informed by masterplanning and local transport planning to avoid the emergence of car-dependent development and to ensure alignment with national and regional climate and mobility objectives.

##### Chief Executive Response

Meath County Council (MCC) has a key role to play in the implementation and facilitation of sustainable transportation through both its infrastructure and land use policies. At a strategic level, MCC continues to integrate land use and transportation to achieve sustainable development through the progression of a number of Local Area Plans, Masterplans and Public Realm Plans in line with National and Regional Policy objectives including the NTA's GDA Transport Strategy 2022-2042. In this regard, higher density development is taking place within plan frameworks along existing transport corridors. Current land use policy has also been developed in anticipation of planned strategic public transport investments that will directly benefit the County.

Through MCC's role in Development Management, permeability is a key objective in all new developments and in particular residential development, maximising the ability of future residents

## Part 2

to avail of public transport and active modes of travel. Filtered permeability is deployed on a regular basis as standard practice within all new developments. MCC's Active Travel Department is focused on providing key connections through existing developments to improve permeability for walking, cycling and access to public transport.

Proposed Variation No. 5 is a targeted response to revised housing growth requirements rather than a comprehensive re-evaluation of settlement strategies. The Planning Authority is committed to the preparation of a Joint Urban Area Plan and an associated Local Transport Plan for Drogheda, which will provide an integrated framework addressing transport, connectivity, permeability and land use.

In relation to the PA 01 lands at Drogheda, it should be clarified that the lands are classified as Tier 1 serviced lands and benefit from direct accessibility via a new spine road to the south of the Educate Together school which has commenced construction and is in situ as far as the school. A Local Transport Plan is being prepared for the area, and any redevelopment of the lands will be compliant with the requirements of the LTP.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No modifications are required to the variation in respect of this submission.

## Submission No. MH-C217-14: OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS

### Submission No. MH-C217-14: Office of Public Works

#### Summary of Submission:

The Office of Public Works (OPW), as the State body responsible for the coordination and implementation of flood risk management policy, made a detailed submission focused exclusively on flooding and flood risk management in relation to Proposed Draft Variation No. 5 to the Meath County Development Plan 2021–2027.

The OPW references National Policy Objective 78 of the revised National Planning Framework, which requires planning authorities to promote sustainable development by avoiding inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding and by fully accounting for the potential impacts of climate change. The submission provides both general flood risk guidance and extensive site-specific observations across a number of settlements affected by Proposed Variation No. 5.

In particular, the OPW raises concerns regarding:

- Dunboyne / Clonee / Pace, where proposed residential zoning overlaps Flood Zones A and B, noting that OPW flood mapping for the River Tolka is currently under review and flood mapping for this area may change. SAR Flood Mapping for 2020-2021 also shows flood extents to the north of the site.
- Kilcock, where zoning relies on a Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment (RPS, 2025). The OPW welcomes the use of more recent and detailed local studies but advises that high-end future climate change scenarios should also be considered and that water-compatible uses may be more appropriate in Flood Zone B storage areas.

## Part 2

- Dunshaughlin, Enfield and Stamullen, where GSI Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) flood mapping and FRAM studies indicate the potential for seasonal or pluvial flooding affecting lands proposed for development.
- Navan, where the OPW recommends the identification and protection of key flood defence infrastructure, mapping of defended areas, and recognition of arterial drainage benefiting lands, particularly in relation to proposed employment zonings.

The OPW also strongly emphasises the importance of nature-based solutions and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS), recommending that Strategic Flood Risk Assessments guide the selection of appropriate SuDS techniques and promote integrated, area-based surface water management rather than reliance on individual site-by-site engineered solutions.

### **Chief Executive Response**

Meath County Council welcomes the submission received from the Office of Public Works. Meath County Council (MCC) has a key role to play in the implementation and facilitation of flood mitigation measures through both its infrastructure and land use policies. Meath County Council in partnership with the OPW wishes to continue to take a proactive approach towards flooding mitigation. The planning Authority will continue to rely upon flood risk maps that identify any potential flood issues related to a proposal for development.

Flood risk management has been a central consideration in the preparation of Proposed Variation No. 5, which is accompanied by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) prepared in accordance with the Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines and the requirements of the revised National Planning Framework. The Chief Executive notes the OPW's site-specific observations and confirms that the zoning strategy is informed by the SFRA alongside national and local flood risk datasets, including CFRAM and FRAM studies, GSI flood mapping and floodinfo.ie records. Importantly, the Meath County Development Plan contains a strong and precautionary flood risk policy framework which prohibits the location of highly vulnerable development, including residential use, within Flood Zone A, and restricts such development within Flood Zone B unless the Justification Test is satisfied. In addition, Proposed Variation No. 5 includes site-specific objectives which explicitly state that no vulnerable uses shall be permitted within Flood Zones A or B on affected lands and that detailed site-specific flood risk assessment will be required at planning application stage where appropriate.

### **Site Specific Responses**

#### **Dunboyne / Clonee / Pace**

The overlap of residentially zoned lands at Dunboyne / Clonee / Pace with Flood Zones A and B is noted. The OPW has confirmed that flood mapping for the River Tolka in this area is currently subject to a Map Review, with updated mapping to be published for consultation later in 2026. It is also noted that additional mapping referenced on FloodInfo.ie is National Indicative Fluvial Mapping (NIFM) and not derived from the Tolka Flood Study.

## Part 2

---

Following consultation between JBA Consulting, Meath County Council and the OPW on 26 May 2026, it was confirmed that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) approach remains appropriate. The lands are safeguarded under Specific Objective DCE OBJ 23 which is included as a new objective in the draft variation, and ensures that residential development will not be permitted on lands identified within Flood Zones A or B. The Draft Variation SFRA will be updated to include a short clarification regarding the ongoing OPW Map Review.

### **Kilcock**

MCC acknowledges that the OPW is currently reviewing the flood mapping for Kilcock and notes that the OPW flood mapping in the area may change as part of the review process. A short clarification regarding the ongoing OPW Map Review will be included in the SFRA to acknowledge this review. The overlap of residentially zoned lands at Kilcock within Flood Zone B is noted. Following consultation between JBA Consulting, Meath County Council and the OPW on 26 May 2026, it was confirmed that a spot objective has been included in the Draft Variation to ensure that lands located within Flood Zone B are safeguarded and protected as a storage area. KIL OBJ 5B which is included as a new objective in the draft Variation reads as follows - *Planning applications for development proposals on the lands that are subject to Spot Objective KIL OBJ 5B shall be accompanied by a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment carried out in accordance with the requirements of the "Planning System and Flood Risk Management –Guidelines for Planning Authorities."* Lands that are impacted by Flood Zone B and Climate Change shall be reserved for storage areas only and kept free from vulnerable land uses.

In regard to clarification sought on if the SFRA considered the high-end future scenario, the MRFS has been applied in this instance as the HEFS was not assessed as part of the Kilcock Flood Relief Scheme (FRAMS) 2025. On this basis, the use of the MRFS within the SFRA is considered appropriate and consistent with the available evidence base.

### **Dunshaughlin.**

In relation to the clarification sought on the Strategic Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment (SSFA), the SSFA referred to was undertaken in respect of General Enterprise and Employment lands located downstream of site No. 2 and not specifically for the subject residential lands. This position was clarified by JBA Consulting in consultation with the OPW on 26 May 2026. Notwithstanding this, the SFRA confirms that the information available is sufficient to inform zoning decisions at plan-making stage. It is further noted that a site-specific flood risk assessment will be required at development management stage to address site-specific issues in greater detail.

### **Navan**

The recommendation to prepare a register of key flood defence infrastructure is noted. Meath County Council will consider this recommendation internally with a view to developing an

## Part 2

appropriate register of flood infrastructure. The Register will not however form part of this variation.

The need to ensure the protection and ongoing maintenance of flood defences, including consideration of their standard of protection, climate change impacts, ownership and maintenance responsibilities, is acknowledged. These matters will be addressed, as appropriate, through ongoing engagement with the OPW and relevant stakeholders.

The zoning of Site No. 5 as E1/E3 Strategic Employment land within an Arterial Drainage benefiting area is noted. Drainage features and any associated flood risk will be appropriately assessed at Development Management stage. Accordingly, site-specific flood risk assessment requirements will be determined on a case-by-case basis, having regard to the nature and scale of proposed development and the guidance set out in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

### **Stamullen**

The comments are noted in relation to the Mid – Range scenario mapping available from the Fingal East Meath FRAM Study and the data will be obtained and incorporated into the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). The SFRA will be updated accordingly to reflect the best available and most up to date flood mapping including consideration of climate change impacts on the site.

### **Nature-based Solutions and SuDS**

JBA will amend the SFRA Addendum to include some further guidance on SuDS and nature-based solutions guidance, referencing the OPW Best Practice Interim Guidance Document and the Implementation Guidance for Planners.

**The additional text will be:**

*“In particular it is noted that the sites will offer opportunities to integrate nature-based solutions to reduce runoff and deliver benefits for both water quality and biodiversity. At development management stage applicants should implement the Best Practice Interim Guidance Document ‘Nature-based Solutions to the Management of Rainwater and Surface Water Runoff in Urban Areas’, as well as the Guidance Document for Planners, Developers and Developer Agents ‘Implementation of Urban Nature-based Solutions’ wherever possible”.*

### **Chief Executive Recommendation**

It is recommended that no modifications to the land use zonings proposed for Drogheda (PA 01), Kilcock (PA 01), Dunshaughlin (PA 01 and PA 02), Navan (PA 05) and Stamullen (PA 01) be made.

Having regard to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, existing Development Plan flood risk management policies and the inclusion of site-specific objectives within Proposed Variation No. 5, it is recommended that no modifications be made to the Variation in response to this submission.

The following minor clarifications will be included in the final SFRA to address the items raised in both the OPR and OPW submissions;

## Part 2

1. The SFRA will be updated to include additional GSI SAR historic mapped extents under Section 2.2.
2. The SFRA will be updated to include a short clarification regarding the ongoing OPW Map Review in Dunboyne/Clonee/Pace and Kilcock.
3. In relation to Stamullen, the SFRA will be updated accordingly to reflect the best available and most up to date flood mapping including consideration of climate change impacts on the site.
4. For Enfield PA 02, additional historic flood information will be incorporated into the final SFRA.
5. The SFRA will be updated to incorporate historic flood extents for Dunboyne/Clonee/Pace PA 01, as identified on FloodInfo.ie.
6. JBA will amend the SFRA Addendum to include some further guidance on SuDS and nature-based solutions guidance, referencing the OPW Best Practice Interim Guidance Document and the Implementation Guidance for Planners. The additional text will be:

*“In particular it is noted that the sites will offer opportunities to integrate nature-based solutions to reduce runoff and deliver benefits for both water quality and biodiversity. At development management stage applicants should implement the Best Practice Interim Guidance Document ‘Nature-based Solutions to the Management of Rainwater and Surface Water Runoff in Urban Areas’, as well as the Guidance Document for Planners, Developers and Developer Agents ‘Implementation of Urban Nature-based Solutions’ wherever possible”.*

The above clarifications will not result in any changes to the land-use zonings which form part of the draft variation.

### Submission No. MH-C217-48: UISCE ÉIREANN

#### Submission No. MH-C217-48: Uisce Éireann (Irish Water)

##### Summary of Submission:

Uisce Éireann (UÉ) thanks Meath County Council for the consultation and welcomes the opportunity to engage with the Authority on the Proposed Variation No.5 of the Development Plan.

Uisce Éireann raises no objection to Proposed Variation No. 5 but notes that cumulative implementation of all of the proposed rezoning (cumulative effect) will necessitate network upgrades, stormwater separation and phased infrastructure delivery. The submission highlights the use of national capacity registers and advises that some infrastructure upgrades may be developer-led if required. Uisce Éireann also highlights that should capacity constraints emerge over the life-time of the Plan, new connections will be agreed / facilitated on a first-come, first-served basis.

##### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive notes the continued constructive engagement with Uisce Éireann and acknowledges the observations regarding capacity and serviceability. The Development Plan

## Part 2

clearly requires that development proceeds only where adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is available or can be provided in a timely manner.

Infrastructure constraints will be addressed through phased development, coordination with Uisce Éireann and developer-led solutions where appropriate. These matters will be managed through the planning application process and development contributions framework.

MCC will continue to work with Uisce Éireann in developing a safe, stable and sustainable supply of potable water and efficient wastewater treatment system throughout the County, in line with all national and European Union regulatory requirements.

Meath County Council will have regard to the water services capacity available in each settlement when considering the merits and viability of any planning proposal being assessed. All applications received by the Planning Authority will continue to be referred to Uisce Éireann as part of the statutory pre connection agreement, in particular new developments and any future planned road and public realm projects.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

The Chief Executive is satisfied that the existing Development Plan policies adequately address the issues raised and that no amendment to the Variation is required.

## Submission No. MH-C217-19: TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE IRELAND (TII)

### Submission No. MH-C217-19: Transport Infrastructure Ireland

#### Summary of Submission:

Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) acknowledges the publication of Proposed Variation No. 5 and confirms that the Variation does not conflict with or undermine national road objectives. TII reiterates the importance of safeguarding the capacity, efficiency, safety and long-term investment in the national road network, including the TEN-T routes traversing County Meath. With respect to the land use zoning proposals for the 11 settlements that are the subject of Variation No.5, TII recommends the integration of transport and land use planning in the interests of supporting compact development.

The submission highlights the role of Local Transport Plans and Area Based Transport Assessments (ABTAs) in integrating land-use and transport planning, particularly for key settlements such as Navan, Dunboyne and Drogheda. TII notes ongoing engagement with the Council on ABTAs and emphasises that any infrastructure works required on the national road network to facilitate local development must be funded by the Planning Authority or developers, rather than TII.

#### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive welcomes the submission from TII and notes its confirmation that the proposed zoning amendments do not occur on lands directly accessing, or in the immediate vicinity of the national road network. The Meath County Development Plan contains a

## Part 2

comprehensive set of objectives to protect national roads, in line with the Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines, the NPF and the EMRA RSES and TII notes that Proposed Variation No.5 does not propose to alter existing Plan policies that relate to the maintenance of the safe and efficient operation of the national roads network.

The Planning Authority is actively progressing transport-led evidence-based strategies, including Area Based Transport Assessments and Local Transport Plans, for settlements identified in the RSES, and will continue to engage with TII as these studies advance. The Authority will continue to integrate transport and land use planning to promote compact growth and a shift towards more sustainable transport modes in line with national planning policy.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

The Chief Executive is satisfied that the Development Plan and Proposed Variation No. 5 appropriately safeguard national road infrastructure and that no modification to the Variation is necessary in response to this submission.

## Submission No. MH-C217-40: DUBLIN AIRPORT AUTHORITY (DAA)

### Submission No. MH-C217-40: Dublin Airport Authority (DAA)

#### Summary of Submission:

The Dublin Airport Authority (DAA) welcomes Proposed Variation No. 5 to the Meath County Development Plan 2021–2027 and acknowledges that the Variation has been prepared to give effect to the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines (2025). While the DAA plc has no objection in principle to the rezoning of lands for residential development, it draws specific attention to the proposed residential zoning at Dunboyne, which it states lies within Airport Noise Zones C and D, as well as within the Noise Abatement Objective Contours.

The submission refers to Policy DM OBJ-111 of the Meath County Development Plan, which seeks to strictly control noise-sensitive development within Zones B, C and D of the Dublin Airport Noise Zones, and notes that this policy is intended to support the balanced approach to aircraft noise management under EU Regulation 598/2014. DAA advises that populations within the relevant noise contours are included in the assessment of Highly Annoyed (HA) and Highly Sleep Disturbed (HSD) populations for the purposes of achieving the Noise Abatement Objective, regardless of noise insulation measures.

DAA requests that the planning authority ensure robust policy safeguards are applied to protect future residents from inward noise impacts and to safeguard the operational resilience of Dublin Airport. In particular, the submission seeks:

- requirements for appropriate noise insulation measures for residential development within the airport noise contours; and
- clear notification requirements for prospective purchasers and occupiers regarding the presence of elevated aircraft noise levels and the site's location within designated Airport Noise Zones.

#### Chief Executive Response

## Part 2

The Chief Executive welcomes the submission from the DAA and acknowledges its role as operator of Dublin Airport and its statutory responsibilities in relation to aircraft noise management. The Chief Executive notes DAA's acknowledgement of the purpose of Proposed Variation No. 5 and its support in principle for the delivery of additional housing in response to revised national targets.

The Chief Executive confirms that the Meath County Development Plan contains a comprehensive policy framework for managing development in the environs of Dublin Airport, which seek to control noise-sensitive development within Airport Noise Zones B, C and D and to require appropriate mitigation measures where development is permitted. These policies are expressly aligned with the Balanced Approach to aircraft noise management and continue to apply in full to any residential lands proposed for rezoning under Variation No. 5.

In relation to the lands at Dunboyne, the Chief Executive notes that the inclusion of such lands within Airport Noise Zones does not preclude residential development but requires careful management of residential amenity and full compliance with Development Plan objectives at planning application stage. Matters relating to aircraft noise exposure, residential amenity, noise insulation, building orientation and layout, and mitigation measures will be rigorously assessed through development management and conditioned as appropriate. The Chief Executive also confirms that requirements for prospective occupier and purchaser notification regarding aircraft noise are already embedded within the Development Plan policy framework and will continue to be applied to relevant developments.

The Chief Executive is satisfied that the existing Development Plan policies, read in conjunction with the implementation mechanisms available through development management, provide an appropriate and robust framework to protect residential amenity while safeguarding the continued safe and efficient operation of Dublin Airport.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to Proposed Variation No. 5 is required in response to this submission.

## Submission No. MH-C217-77: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION & YOUTH

### Submission No. MH-C217-77: Department of Education & Youth

#### Summary of Submission:

The Department of Education and Youth highlights projected population growth arising from the Variation and the potential requirement for additional school places across a range of settlements. It emphasises the importance of expanding existing schools where possible, protecting land for future educational use and ensuring that enabling infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner.

The Department has had regard to the potential unit yield arising from the rezoning of lands proposed under Variation No. 5 and notes that should all units materialise, the demand for school places will increase and will likely place pressure on the existing schools network. In relation to the settlements that are the subject to the Variation, the Department notes that population

## Part 2

---

growth will likely give rise to demand for additional primary schools in Drogheda and Dunshaughlin while demand for primary school places in the remaining settlements and post primary school places in all 11 settlements could likely be accommodated by expansions to existing schools.

### Chief Executive Response

Meath County Council acknowledge the submission received from the Department of Education and Youth.

Regarding schools and wider community infrastructure, the Council notes the points raised in the submission in respect to forward planning for education provision, including the need for early identification of sites, accommodation for Special Educational Needs, and the integration of school provision with new and existing communities. The planning for such facilities will be informed by the County-wide Social Infrastructure Audit, which is being prepared in parallel with the Draft County Development Plan 2027-2033, which is currently being prepared, and will assess existing and future requirements for schools, childcare, healthcare and other community facilities in line with projected population growth.

The Planning Authority will continue to work closely with the Department to identify future requirements, protect appropriate lands and coordinate the delivery of enabling infrastructure. This collaborative approach ensures that educational needs arising from population growth can be addressed in a timely and plan-led manner.

### Chief Executive Response

No further amendment is recommended in response to this submission.

## Submission No. MH-C217-25: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

### Submission No. MH-C217-25: Department of Transport

#### Summary of Submission:

The Department of Transport welcomes the proactive approach taken by Meath County Council in preparing Proposed Variation No. 5 in response to revised housing growth requirements arising from the first revision of the National Planning Framework. The Department emphasises that all future development proposals should align with national transport and planning policy including the National Planning Framework, the National Sustainable Mobility Policy, the Climate Action Plan, NIFTI and the Road Safety Strategy. The submission highlights the importance of compact growth, integrated land-use and transport planning, and ensuring that residential development is directed to locations that are, or can be, effectively served by sustainable transport modes.

The Department further advises that the safety, capacity and operational efficiency of the strategic road network must be safeguarded, particularly where lands are proximate to national roads or key junctions. The need for Traffic and Transport Assessments for significant development proposals is emphasised, together with the integration of walking, cycling, public transport, parking management, mobility hubs, travel plans, EV charging and future-proofing

## Part 2

measures. Consideration of climate resilience is also highlighted, particularly in relation to long-term infrastructure reliability.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive welcomes the submission from the Department of Transport and confirms that the principles of compact growth, integrated land-use and transport planning and climate resilience are central to Proposed Variation No. 5. The zoning strategy focuses on higher order settlements within the established settlement hierarchy and prioritises lands that have access to existing infrastructure or can be realistically serviced during the lifetime of the Development Plan. Such lands were identified as part of a county wide Settlement Capacity Audit that was undertaken in preparation for the Proposed Variation No.5 and involved engagement with Meath County Council's Transportation Department.

The Meath County Development Plan contains a robust policy framework under Chapter 5 (Movement Strategy) which requires Traffic and Transport Assessments to be undertaken for significant development proposals, safeguards the strategic road network, promotes demand management measures and prioritises walking, cycling and public transport over private car use. These policies continue to apply to all lands proposed for rezoning under the Variation.

Proposed Variation No. 5 does not introduce any zoning proposals that would undermine the safety, capacity or function of the national or strategic road network, and no proposed rezoned lands directly access national routes. Policy objectives relating to climate resilience, EV infrastructure and sustainable mobility are embedded within the Development Plan and will continue to be implemented through the development management process.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

## Submission No. MH-C217-42: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (EPA)

### Submission No. MH-C217-42: Environmental Protection Agency

#### Summary of Submission:

The Environmental Protection Agency's submission focuses on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) requirements, including the integration of environmental considerations into the plan-making process, implementation of mitigation measures, monitoring of environmental effects and preparation of an SEA Statement following adoption. The EPA note that their functions do not include approving or enforcing SEAs or plan and emphasises the importance of alignment with higher-level plans and programmes.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive welcomes the EPA's submission and confirms that environmental considerations have been fully integrated into Proposed Variation No. 5 through the Strategic

## Part 2

---

Environmental Assessment process, Appropriate Assessment Screening and Natura Impact Reporting.

Mitigation measures identified through the SEA process are embedded within the Development Plan framework and will be implemented through development management and project-level assessment as appropriate.

A SEA Statement will be prepared following adoption of the Variation in accordance with the SEA Regulations, clearly setting out how environmental considerations and submissions have been taken into account. The Chief Executive is satisfied that Proposed Variation No. 5 complies fully with SEA requirements.

### **Chief Executive Recommendation**

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

## **Submission No. MH-C217-64:ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BOARD (ESB)**

### **Submission No. MH-C217-64: Electricity Supply Board (ESB)**

#### **Summary of Submission:**

ESB welcomes the opportunity to make a submission to Proposed Variation no.5 noting that it is a landowner and employer in Meath with property and infrastructural assets throughout the county. ESB has welcomed the positive and productive collaboration with MCC in the delivery of electricity infrastructure to date

ESB outlines the scale of investment required to reinforce electricity transmission and distribution capacity to support accelerated housing delivery and national decarbonisation targets. The submission emphasises safeguarding existing assets, facilitating new infrastructure and ensuring zoning frameworks support the delivery of public utilities.

ESB highlights the importance of early identification of suitable sites for infrastructure noting the benefits of collaboration between MCC and ESB in ensuring the timely delivery of infrastructure in tandem with development. The ESB request that the Authority ensures that public utilities are permissible under all zonings.

#### **Chief Executive Response**

The Chief Executive welcomes the ESB submission and recognises the strategic importance of electricity infrastructure to underpin housing growth, economic activity and climate action. The Development Plan includes specific policies under Chapter 6 that support the delivery, upgrading and protection of energy infrastructure.

Ensuring that public utilities are permissible across zoning categories will be considered as part of the Draft Meath County Development Plan. The Planning Authority will continue to engage

## Part 2

---

proactively with ESB Networks to ensure alignment between housing delivery and electricity capacity.

### **Chief Executive Recommendation**

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

## Part 2

---

### Submission No. MH-C217-74:IARNRÓD ÉIREANN

#### Submission No. MH-C217-74: Iarnród Éireann

##### Summary of Submission:

Iarnród Éireann (IÉ) welcomes the opportunity to submit observations on the Proposed Variation no. 5 to the Development Plan noting the Variation has been prepared in response to the publication of the Revised NPF (2025) and the NPF Implementation Guidelines (July 2025).

IÉ emphasises the strategic role of rail infrastructure in supporting sustainable growth, including delivery of the DART+ Programme, protection of the Navan Rail Line corridor, promotion of transport-orientated development (TOD) and the expansion of rail freight. The submission highlights the alignment between rail investment and national climate objectives.

##### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive welcomes the submission from Iarnród Éireann noting that the priorities identified in the submission will facilitate the projected population increase and compact growth as envisaged for Meath. The Chief Executive also confirms strong alignment between Proposed Variation No. 5 and national rail investment priorities. The Development Plan supports DART+, safeguards the Navan Rail Line corridor and promotes transport-orientated development at rail-accessible locations.

The Planning Authority recognises the role of rail in facilitating compact growth and reducing transport emissions and will continue to engage with Iarnród Éireann as rail projects progress.

The Chief Executive is satisfied that the existing policy framework fully supports the issues raised and that no amendment to the Variation is required.

##### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

## Part 2

---

### Submission No. MH-C217-15:FINGAL COUNTY COUNCIL (FCC)

<b>Submission No. MH-C217-15: Fingal County Council (FCC)</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>
Fingal County Council acknowledged receipt of the notification of the Proposed Variation and stated that it has no comments to make in relation to same.
<b>Chief Executive Response</b>
The Chief Executive welcomes the confirmation from Fingal County Council that it has no comments or objections to Proposed Variation No. 5. The Chief Executive is satisfied that the proposed Variation does not give rise to any cross-boundary planning, environmental or infrastructural issues affecting Fingal County Council's administrative area and that appropriate statutory consultation has been undertaken in accordance with legislative requirements
<b>Chief Executive Recommendation</b>
No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

## Part 2

---

### Submission No. MH-C217-65: LOUTH COUNTY COUNCIL (LCC)

#### Submission No. MH-C217-65: Louth County Council (LCC)

##### Summary of Submission:

Louth County Council welcomes the opportunity to make a submission on Proposed Variation No. 5 to the Meath County Development Plan 2021–2027. Louth County Council recognises the strategic importance of Drogheda as a Regional Growth Centre and supports continued collaboration between the two authorities to ensure Drogheda functions as a single, integrated functional urban area.

In relation to Proposed Variation No. 5, Louth County Council notes the rezoning of two parcels of White Land to A2 – New Residential in the southern environs of Drogheda, totalling approximately 20.66 hectares, and confirms that it has no further comments to make in relation to these proposals.

##### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive welcomes the submission from Louth County Council and acknowledges its recognition of Drogheda’s role as a Regional Growth Centre and the importance of continued cross-boundary collaboration. The Chief Executive notes Louth County Council’s confirmation that it has no objections to, or further comments on, the proposed residential zonings in the southern environs of Drogheda.

The Chief Executive welcomes the constructive engagement between both authorities and confirms Meath County Council’s ongoing commitment to collaborative working, including the preparation of a Joint Urban Area Plan for Drogheda.

##### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

## Part 2

---

### Submission No. MH-C217-5: AN GARDA SÍOCHÁNA

<b>Submission No. MH-C217-5: An Garda Síochána</b>
<b>Summary of Submission:</b>
The submission from An Garda Síochána notes that they have no observations to make in relation to Proposed Variation No.5.
<b>Chief Executive Response</b>
<p>The Chief Executive notes the submission from An Garda Síochána and welcomes the confirmation that no observations or concerns have been raised in relation to Proposed Variation No. 5.</p> <p>The Chief Executive is satisfied that the proposed zoning amendments and settlement-level changes do not raise any policing, safety or operational concerns at Development Plan stage. Matters relating to community safety, passive surveillance and operational policing requirements will continue to be addressed, as appropriate, through development management and detailed design at application stage.</p>
<b>Chief Executive Recommendation</b>
No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

## Part 2

---

### Submission No. MH-C217-3: INLAND FISHERIES IRELAND

#### Submission No. MH-C217-3: Inland Fisheries Ireland

##### Summary of Submission:

Inland Fisheries Ireland (IFI), the statutory agency responsible for the protection, management and conservation of inland fisheries, submitted an observation focusing on the protection of surface and groundwater resources and aquatic habitats. IFI highlights that rezoning land to address housing needs has the potential to increase pressures on receiving waters if not underpinned by fully operational infrastructure.

IFI emphasises that development should not proceed in advance of demonstrable capacity in potable water supply, foul drainage, and stormwater infrastructure and that adequate long-term maintenance arrangements must be in place. IFI stresses the importance of infrastructure delivery preceding, rather than following, development and zoning decisions, in order to ensure compliance with the National Planning Framework, the Water Framework Directive and the protection of fisheries resources.

##### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission from Inland Fisheries Ireland and recognises its statutory role in protecting inland fisheries and aquatic environments. The Chief Executive notes that the matters raised relate primarily to the implementation and phasing of development rather than to the principle of zoning for residential use at Development Plan stage.

The Meath County Development Plan contains a comprehensive framework of infrastructure, water quality and environmental protection policies which require that development only proceeds where adequate water services and drainage infrastructure are available or can be provided in a timely manner. Proposed Variation No. 5 does not in itself authorise development, and all proposals for development on rezoned lands will be subject to detailed assessment at planning application stage, including consideration of impacts on surface waters, groundwater, fisheries and compliance with the Water Framework Directive.

The Chief Executive is satisfied that the concerns raised by IFI are appropriately addressed through policies and objectives contained within the Development Plan, the Strategic Environmental Assessment process and development management controls, including conditions relating to phasing and infrastructure delivery.

##### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

## **Part 3**

---

### **Part 3: Summary of submissions & Chief Executive's Response & Recommendations**

## Part 3

---

Submission No. MH-C217-1: Withdrawn

Submission No. MH-C217-2: Dave Boyne

### Summary of Submission:

The submission requests that the Planning Authority rezone the 'Littles Farm' lands in Enfield for residential development, stating that the lands were previously zoned for housing, are proximate to the railway station and have access provided for from an existing roundabout. The submission suggests that a single larger greenfield site would be preferable to the activation of smaller parcels within the town.

The submission does not address the specific parcels identified in Proposed Variation No. 5 for Enfield, but instead seeks the rezoning of alternative lands not included in the published Variation.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive notes the submission and acknowledges the request for the rezoning of alternative lands at Enfield. However, Proposed Variation No. 5 is a targeted statutory variation and the public consultation is confined to the amendments as published, including the specific Enfield zoning changes identified in the Variation documentation.

The rezoning of 'Littles Farm' is not included as a proposed amendment under Variation No. 5 and therefore falls outside the scope of this statutory variation process. The Planning Authority is not in a position to introduce new, additional residential rezonings at locations not identified in the published draft Variation as part of this consultation.

The Chief Executive advises that any request to rezone lands not included in Variation No. 5 should be brought forward during the public consultation stage of the Draft County Development Plan (or via a subsequent variation process that is not limited to the 11 settlements and specific land parcels of Variation No. 5), where such proposals can be assessed comprehensively in the context of the full Core Strategy, Settlement Strategy, environmental assessment and infrastructure capacity.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

Submission No. MH-C217-4: Mark Keane

### Summary of Submission:

The submission raises concerns regarding the level of information and transparency provided on zoning decisions and requests broader boundary reviews and extended residential and amenity zoning in Navan, including along the Slane Road and Dublin Road. It expresses a preference for less reliance on compact higher density forms and seeks greater provision of family housing with private gardens.

### Chief Executive Response

## Part 3

Proposed Variation No. 5 is a targeted response to revised housing growth requirements and includes specific, identified amendments to the Core Strategy tables, settlement household allocations and a defined set of land use zoning amendments.

Proposed Variation No. 5 identifies the proposed lands for rezoning having regard to the Settlement Capacity Audit and the requirement to prioritise serviced or serviceable lands that are most likely to deliver within the plan period. This approach is fully compliant with the requirements of the Development Plan Guidelines 2022. Furthermore, the Proposed Variation No.5 should not be construed as a full review of the Development Plan’s zoning strategy for Navan or the county.

To the extent that the submission seeks additional rezoning of lands beyond those identified in the published draft Variation, such requests fall outside the scope of Variation No. 5 and cannot be progressed through this statutory consultation process. The planning authority must consider submissions only insofar as they relate to the proposed amendments as published.

The Chief Executive advises that broader proposals regarding settlement boundary expansion, additional zoning on the Dublin Road or Slane Road and wider policy matters relating to density and housing typology should be made during the public consultation on the Draft County Development Plan (or a subsequent variation process not limited to the 11 settlements and specific land parcels of Variation No. 5).

### **Chief Executive Recommendation**

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### **Submission No. MH-C217-6: Dowdstown Developments Ltd (Declan Brassil & Co.)**

#### **Summary of Submission:**

The submission supports Proposed Amendment No. 02 in Enfield, which rezones the subject lands from A2 Phasing (Post 2027) to A2 – New Residential. The submission outlines that the lands form the next sequential phase of the ongoing Johnstown Demesne residential development and cites an established delivery track record, including permissions and units constructed.

The submission states that the lands are sequentially preferable, contiguous to existing residential development, proximate to the town centre and rail station, and are considered serviceable. It requests that the Planning Authority retain the proposed amendment when adopting the Variation.

#### **Chief Executive Response**

The Chief Executive welcomes the submission and notes the support for the Planning Authority’s approach to bringing forward identified Tier 1 lands in Enfield to support the delivery of revised housing targets during the lifetime of the current Development Plan.

Proposed Variation No. 5 identifies the subject lands for rezoning having regard to the Settlement Capacity Audit and the requirement to prioritise serviced or serviceable lands that are most likely to

## Part 3

---

deliver within the plan period. The proposed amendment aligns with the sequential approach to development and consolidation of the settlement.

### **Chief Executive Recommendation**

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-7: Ann Holmes, Brendan Little & Carmel Kelly (BMA Planning)

#### **Summary of Submission:**

The submission seeks the rezoning of lands at Drummond House, Enfield for A2 – New Residential (and associated community/employment components), noting the lands were previously identified for residential development in earlier plan frameworks and were de-zoned in the current Development Plan.

The submission argues that Enfield should expand westwards, that the current Variation proposals for Enfield are overly conservative, and that the subject lands are suitable and serviceable, with proximity to the town, rail station and existing services.

#### **Chief Executive Response**

The Chief Executive notes the submission. Proposed Variation No. 5 is a targeted and time critical statutory variation aimed at responding in a timely manner to delivering additional housing for the county based on revised targets set out in the NPF Guidelines. Proposed Variation No. 5 identified a series of sites for rezoning in line with the requirements of the Development Plan Guidelines 2022 and having regard to the countywide Settlement Capacity Audit that was undertaken in preparation of this Variation.

The Chief Executive advises that any request to rezone lands not included in Proposed Variation No. 5 should be made during the public consultation stage of the Draft County Development Plan or as part of a subsequent variation or process that is not limited to the 11 settlements and specific land parcels of Variation No. 5, so that the proposal can be assessed comprehensively against the settlement strategy, tiered and sequential zoning methodology, infrastructure capacity and the full suite of environmental assessments.

#### **Chief Executive Recommendation**

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-8: Stamullen Community Alert

#### **Summary of Submission:**

The submission supports planned growth in Stamullen in principle and acknowledges the need to align the Development Plan with updated housing growth requirements. It notes the increased household allocation for Stamullen and the proposal to rezone c.5.11ha of land to A2 – New Residential.

The submission seeks clear, binding commitments that infrastructure and services keep pace with growth, with particular emphasis on continuous footpaths and active travel permeability, improved

## Part 3

---

public transport infrastructure (including bus stop facilities and improved linkage to Gormanston rail station), enhanced recreation/open space provision (including parks and sports facilities), and strategic road infrastructure including a link road connection to M1 Junction 7. The submission also advocates for the need to increase social and community infrastructure in parallel with population growth.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive welcomes the submission and notes the support in principle for the proposed rezoning in Stamullen, together with the emphasis placed on ensuring that housing delivery is accompanied by appropriate transport and community infrastructure.

Proposed Variation No. 5 has been prepared to address revised housing growth requirements and includes a targeted rezoning at Stamullen to support delivery within the current plan period. The existing Development Plan contains policies and objectives that require sustainable development patterns, pedestrian and cycle connectivity, integration of new development with existing communities, and the delivery of necessary infrastructure through development management and the development contribution framework.

In relation to the specific requests for enhanced pedestrian networks, bus stop infrastructure, connectivity to rail services, open space and recreational facilities, these matters will be addressed through the assessment of individual development proposals, masterplanning where required, and the application of Development Plan standards and objectives. The request for major strategic road infrastructure (including any new link road to M1 Junction 7) is noted; however, such proposals extend beyond the limitations and scope of Variation No. 5 and would require separate appraisal, route selection, environmental assessment, funding and cross-agency coordination. The Chief Executive is satisfied that the Development Plan framework is the appropriate mechanism to secure the requested active travel and amenity measures at development stage, and no amendment to the Stamullen zoning proposal is required on foot of this submission.

The Chief Executive would also like to note that the Planning Department are currently undertaking a Social Infrastructure Audit of a number of settlements across the county, including Stamullen which examines and analyses the availability, capacity and spatial distribution of existing social infrastructure facilities, to identify current and future requirements, which will inform policy objectives within the Draft Development Plan based on anticipated settlement growth.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission. It is recommended to retain the Stamullen rezoning as published.

Submission No. MH-C217-9: John Purfield

### Summary of Submission:

The submission supports the rezoning of PA01 Stamullen from RA – Rural Area to A2 – New Residential, noting that the site currently functions as an unmanaged vacant area and that plan-led development is preferable.

## Part 3

The submission requests that future development explicitly protects residential amenity for adjoining residents, including step-down in height along shared boundaries, adequate separation distances to avoid overlooking, high-quality boundary treatment and landscaping, and construction management measures to minimise disruption.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive welcomes the submission and notes the support for the proposed rezoning and plan-led residential development of the subject lands.

The Meath County Development Plan includes development management standards relating to residential amenity, privacy, separation distances, boundary treatment and landscaping, and these will apply to any future planning application for development of the subject lands. The Planning Authority will ensure that development proposals provide an appropriate interface with existing residential areas and that layout, scale and design respond to the established context.

Construction impacts, including noise, dust, traffic management and phasing, are standard matters addressed through planning conditions and the requirement for Construction Management Plans where appropriate. The Chief Executive is satisfied that these matters are appropriately addressed through the existing Development Plan policy framework and development management process.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission. It is recommended to retain the Stamullen rezoning as published.

## Submission No. MH-C217-10: H&N Construction (Declan Brassil & Co.)

### Summary of Submission:

The submission supports Proposed Amendment No. 02 in Dunshaughlin which rezones a portion of lands from A2 Phasing (Post 2027) to A2 – New Residential. The submission states that this will facilitate an initial phase of residential development and references delivery experience and claimed ‘shovel ready’ status.

In addition, the submission seeks an extension of the proposed amendment to include adjoining lands (approximately 5.94ha) currently zoned A2 Phasing (Post 2027), and requests that the Core Strategy Supplementary Table be amended accordingly to reflect additional land and yield.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive welcomes the support for Proposed Amendment No. 02 in Dunshaughlin and notes the reference to delivery capacity and the desirability of bringing forward serviced Tier 1 lands within the lifetime of the Development Plan.

Proposed Variation No. 5 identifies specific lands for rezoning in Dunshaughlin, having regard to the Settlement Capacity Audit and the requirement to prioritise lands that are serviceable and likely to deliver within the plan period. The Chief Executive is satisfied that the proposed amendment as published supports continuity of supply while remaining proportionate within the scope of this targeted variation.

## Part 3

To the extent that the submission seeks to rezone additional adjoining lands that are not included in the published draft Variation, such a request should be made during the public consultation stage of the Draft County Development Plan or as part of a subsequent variation process not limited to the 11 settlements and specific land parcels of Variation No. 5, where the proposal can be assessed comprehensively against the tiered and sequential zoning methodology, infrastructure capacity and environmental assessment.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission. It is recommended to retain the PA 02 Dunshaughlin rezoning as published.

### Submission No. MH-C217-11: Shannon Homes

#### Summary of Submission:

The submission expresses full support for the proposed rezoning of lands at Mill Road, Drogheda (PA 02 Southern Environs of Drogheda) that are in the ownership of the submitter. The submission outlines that the lands are fully serviced with roads infrastructure in place. The submission references a live residential planning application currently before An Coimisiún Pleanála and emphasises the urgent need to progress housing delivery in this location, citing sustained demand and the submitter's long-standing track record of residential construction in East Meath. The submission also highlights the provision of lands for educational purposes in the past, demonstrating the integrated delivery of community infrastructure.

#### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive notes that the submission aligns closely with the purpose and intent of Draft Variation No. 5, which seeks to prioritise serviced, sequential and deliverable residential lands capable of contributing to housing supply within the remaining plan period. The confirmation of existing infrastructure provision, active planning status and a clear commitment to early commencement of development supports the inclusion of these lands within the Draft Variation. The submission reinforces the robustness of the evidence base underpinning the Variation and supports its alignment with national housing policy.

#### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission. It is recommended to retain the PA 02 Southern Environs of Drogheda rezoning as published

### Submission No. MH-C217-12: Loughlynn Developments Ltd t/a Hora Homes

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission welcomes the Proposed Variation No. 5 relating to the rezoning of lands adjoining the Castletown Manor development in Athboy from RA – Rural Amenity to A2 – New Residential. The submission details the successful delivery of residential development on adjoining lands, including housing, retirement units and childcare facilities, and confirms that the subject lands benefit from existing access, water and wastewater infrastructure.

## Part 3

---

It further outlines an agreement with Clann na Gael GAA to facilitate a reallocation of residential zoning objectives to lands that are more likely to deliver housing within the plan period, while supporting the expansion of sporting facilities elsewhere. The submission expressly states an intention to commence construction within a short timeframe following adoption of the Variation.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive considers that the matters raised are consistent with the findings of the Settlement Capacity Audit for Athboy and with the objectives of Draft Variation No. 5. The lands are sequentially located, fully serviced and demonstrably capable of early activation. The cooperative land-use approach referenced in the submission further supports the plan-led and coordinated delivery of housing and community infrastructure. The submission does not raise matters that would warrant amendment to the Draft Variation.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission. It is recommended to retain the PA 01, 02 and 03 Athboy rezonings as published

### Submission No. MH-C217-13: John Connaughton Ltd & Carroll Estates Dunboyne Ltd (Brock McClure Planning & Development Consultants)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission supports increased housing for Dunboyne and seeks the rezoning of lands located to the north-east of the proposed Dunboyne Eastern Distributor Road for residential development as part of Draft Variation No. 5. The submission notes that the subject lands are in single ownership, immediately adjacent to the existing urban envelope of Dunboyne, and directly served by strategic transport infrastructure either delivered or committed.

Significant reliance is placed on the delivery of the Dunboyne Eastern Distributor Road and on national investment in public transport, most notably the DART+ West programme, which is cited as fundamentally altering the accessibility and Tier status of the settlement. The submission asserts that, when considered in combination, this infrastructure positions the lands as Tier 1 and capable of early residential delivery at scale, in a manner consistent with national compact growth objectives.

The submission further contends that the Settlement Capacity Audit underpinning Draft Variation No. 5 is overly restrictive and fails to adequately account for the cumulative effect of committed infrastructure investment. It is argued that excluding the subject lands from the Draft Variation risks under-utilising Dunboyne's strategic role within the settlement hierarchy and may constrain housing supply at a location well suited to sustainable growth

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the comprehensive nature of the submission and the strategic importance of Dunboyne within the County's settlement hierarchy, particularly in light of committed and planned transport investment. It is accepted that the delivery of the Eastern Distributor Road and DART+ West will continue to enhance the accessibility and attractiveness of the settlement for residential development over the medium to long term.

## Part 3

However, Draft Variation No. 5 has been prepared within a specific statutory context focusing on the timely delivery of housing to meet increased targets. Its purpose is to address revised housing growth requirements within the remaining lifetime of the current County Development Plan ensuring that there is an adequate quantum of zoned residential lands to accommodate additional growth. This included the provision of 50% headroom to account for lands that may not be brought forward over the lifetime of the Plan. The Settlement Capacity Audit underpinning the Draft Variation applied a consistent methodology, with a particular focus on Tier 1 serviced lands capable of activation in the short term in line with the requirements of the *Development Plans Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2022*.

While the lands identified in this submission may form part of Dunboyne's longer-term growth potential, they were not identified through that assessment process as necessary to meet housing delivery requirements within the current plan period. Introducing additional lands at this stage would extend the scope of the Draft Variation beyond its intended purpose and would pre-empt the more comprehensive and evidence-led examination of Dunboyne's growth role that is appropriately undertaken through the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission

### Submission No. MH-C217-16: Earlsfort Developments Drogheda Ltd (Hughes Planning & Development Consultants)

#### Summary of Submission:

The submission relates to c. 15 hectares of land at Rathmullan Road, Rathmullan, located within the southern environs of Drogheda and currently zoned WL – White Lands under the Meath County Development Plan 2021–2027. The lands are located to the immediate west of the PA02 lands proposed be rezoned from WL to A2 under this Variation. The submission requests that the lands be rezoned to A2 – New Residential as part of Variation No. 5, or alternatively that they be identified for residential zoning in the next County Development Plan.

The submission notes that the revised housing growth requirements for Meath County, including the requirement to provide an additional 5,652 dwellings over 2026–2027, constitute a material change in circumstances that warrants the rezoning of additional lands within Drogheda.

The submission describes the site as strategically located adjacent to established residential areas and supported by existing road, pedestrian and cycle infrastructure along Rathmullan Road. The proximity of the lands to Drogheda town centre, rail and bus services, the M1 motorway and existing community infrastructure is emphasised. It is contended that the lands represent a logical and sequential extension of the built-up area of Drogheda, consistent with compact growth principles.

Significant reliance is placed on the planning history of the lands and adjoining sites, including:

- Previous permissions and applications for large-scale residential development;

## Part 3

---

- A recently refused Large-Scale Residential Development (LRD) application for 249 units, currently under appeal, where the refusal was confined to Appropriate Assessment matters;
- Extensive pre-planning engagement and detailed technical assessments undertaken over a prolonged period.

The submission asserts that the lands are readily deliverable, supported by an extensive body of environmental, infrastructural and design assessments, and are capable of accommodating between 525 and 750 residential units in accordance with national compact growth guidance.

Flood risk is addressed in detail, with the submitters referencing recent OPW flood mapping (November 2025) and previous planning and appeal decisions, all of which they state confirm the absence of flood risk constraints affecting developability.

Environmental sensitivities, including proximity to the River Boyne and Blackwater SAC and the Brú na Bóinne World Heritage Site, are acknowledged within the submission, where it is contended that previous assessments and permissions demonstrate that residential development can be accommodated without adverse effects, subject to appropriate mitigation and compliance with Appropriate Assessment.

The submission notes that rezoning of the lands would support national and regional policy objectives, including compact growth, transport-oriented development and the delivery of housing at scale in a designated Regional Growth Centre. The submission also suggests that previous High Court judgments do not preclude rezoning but require that it be undertaken through a compliant and plan-led process.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive welcomes the detailed and comprehensive submission.

Variation No. 5 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021–2027 has been prepared for the specific purpose of giving effect to the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines (2025). The scope of the Variation is limited to necessary amendments to housing targets, household allocations and related zoning adjustments required to ensure consistency with the revised Core Strategy. It does not constitute a full review of settlement strategies or zoning patterns.

The subject lands at Rathmullan Road are currently zoned WL – White Lands, reflecting the outcome of previous High Court judgments which identified an over-zoning of lands in the Southern Environs of Drogheda relative to population projections at the time the Development Plan was adopted. Any proposal to rezone lands in this area must therefore be progressed in a carefully considered and plan-led manner.

While the Chief Executive acknowledges the site's location adjacent to existing residential development, its proximity to transport and services, and the extensive planning history referenced in the submission, it is considered that the rezoning of additional lands of this scale within the Southern Environs of Drogheda would be more appropriately addressed in the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan.

## Part 3

The Chief Executive notes that Variation No. 5 already identifies, and addresses zoning adjustments required to support the revised housing targets in a manner consistent with the adopted Core Strategy. The lands brought forward under this Variation have been prioritised having regard to the findings of a comprehensive Settlement Capacity Audit in line with the requirements of the *Development Plans Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2022)*. The request to include further lands, beyond those identified through the variation process, should be brought forward during the public consultation stage of the Draft County Development Plan or a subsequent Variation with a broader scope than that of Variation No.5.

Issues raised in relation to housing need, compact growth, transport accessibility, environmental considerations and site readiness are acknowledged as relevant planning considerations and formed part of the criteria for identifying suitable lands as set out in the Settlement Capacity Audit.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MC-C217-17: Buvinda Developments (Brady Hughes Consulting)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission is concentrated on the quantum and spatial distribution of residential lands identified in Draft Variation No. 5, with a particular focus on the Southern Environs of Drogheda. The submission acknowledges the intent of the Planning Authority to respond to the revised National Planning Framework (First Revision, 2025) and the accompanying NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines (July 2025), but contends that the Draft Variation adopts an overly short term and conservative approach.

The submission argues that Drogheda, as a designated Regional Growth Centre within the NPF and the Eastern and Midland Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy, has the capacity and strategic role to accommodate a significantly greater proportion of County Meath's revised housing target. It is asserted that the Southern Environs of Drogheda have under performed in terms of housing delivery since the adoption of the County Development Plan 2021–2027, particularly when compared with the Northern Environs in County Louth, and that this reflects a lack of suitably zoned and strategically identified lands rather than infrastructure deficiency.

The submission raises concerns regarding the focus on lands intended to deliver housing within the remaining lifetime of the current Development Plan, rather than identifying longer term Strategic Development Areas or Long Term Strategic and Sustainable Development Sites as advocated in national guidance. It is argued that this approach may undermine certainty for infrastructure providers, landowners and developers, and may necessitate repeated future variations. The submission requests that the Planning Authority either increase the quantum of lands zoned in the Southern Environs of Drogheda as part of Draft Variation No. 5 or, at a minimum, signal a clear long term intention to prioritise this area for growth.

The submission also suggests that there is a lack of clarity and transparency in relation to the site selection process and refers to the absence of a comprehensive settlement-based analysis.

## Part 3

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and welcomes the recognition of the role of Drogheda as a Regional Growth Centre within the national and regional spatial hierarchy. It is accepted that Drogheda will continue to perform a critical function in accommodating population and housing growth serving both County Meath and the wider Eastern and Midland Region.

However, Draft Variation No. 5 has been prepared within a clearly defined statutory and policy framework. The purpose of the Draft Variation is not to undertake a comprehensive redistribution of growth across all settlements or to identify long term strategic growth locations beyond the existing Development Plan horizon. Rather, it is intended to ensure that, within the remaining lifetime of the current Development Plan, sufficient serviced and deliverable residential lands are available to respond to the revised annual housing growth requirements set out in the NPF Implementation Guidelines.

The selection of lands proposed for rezoning under Draft Variation No. 5 is grounded in the Settlement Capacity Audit prepared by the Planning Authority, which applied a consistent methodology across settlements, including assessment of servicing, infrastructure availability, environmental considerations, sequencing, and deliverability within the plan period. The SCA also involved engagement with relevant utility providers and the Authority's Transportation Department to ensure that lands prioritised for rezoning fully complied with national guidance. While the Southern Environs of Drogheda clearly have long term growth potential, the broader restructuring of zoning in this area will be considered in the context of the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan and the Drogheda Joint Urban Area Plan prepared by both Meath and Louth County Councils. The Chief Executive also notes that national guidance distinguishes between short term plan led housing activation and longer term strategic growth planning. Draft Variation No. 5 responds to the former, while the latter will be fully addressed in the next Development Plan, which will be prepared with an expanded time horizon, updated evidence base and a county wide strategic context. In this regard, the matters raised in this submission will form an important input into that future plan making process.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

Submission No. MH-C217-18-MRP Investment & Development Ltd., ES Corella Creek (Declan Brassil & Co.)

### Summary of Submission:

This submission seeks the rezoning of approximately 5.9 hectares of lands at Kilmessan from White Lands to A2 – New Residential and requests inclusion of the settlement in the Core Strategy Supplementary Table. The submission places significant emphasis on the proposed Navan Rail Line and the potential for future transport oriented development associated with its delivery.

The submission contends that residential development on the subject lands would support sustainable settlement growth, assist in underpinning public transport investment and make

## Part 3

---

efficient use of existing and planned water and wastewater infrastructure. Reference is also made to national and regional policy objectives relating to compact growth and modal shift.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the strategic planning statements advanced in the submission and the potential longer term role of rail based development in shaping settlement patterns. However, Draft Variation No. 5 is explicitly focused on addressing housing delivery requirements within the remaining lifetime of the current Development Plan, rather than identifying longer term growth areas associated with infrastructure proposals that are not yet delivered.

Matters relating to the long term expansion of Kilmessan and the integration of future rail infrastructure are more appropriately addressed through the consultation process on the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan or subsequent Variation that may have a broader scope to that of Variation No.5.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-20: McGarrell Reilly (Genesis Planning Consultants)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission supports Proposed Amendment No. 1 under Draft Variation No. 5, which seeks to rezone lands at Silverstream Road, Stamullen to A2 – New Residential. The submission describes the lands as brownfield in character, immediately adjoining the existing built up area of the settlement and forming a logical extension of the established urban structure.

It is stated that the lands are capable of accommodating approximately 143 dwelling units and that key services, including road access, water supply and wastewater infrastructure, are available. The submission confirms that a design team has been appointed and that it is the landowner's intention to progress a Large Scale Residential Development application promptly following adoption of the Draft Variation.

Reference is made to the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines (July 2025), with the submission asserting that the proposed rezoning represents a compliant and deliverable response to national housing policy.

#### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive notes that the submission supports the zoning strategy proposed for Stamullen under Draft Variation No. 5 and aligns with the conclusions of the Settlement Capacity Audit. The subject lands have been identified as suitable for short term residential development within the lifetime of the current Development Plan, having regard to servicing, location and deliverability. The Chief Executive welcomes confirmation that the landowner intends to progress with a planning application once the Variation is adopted.

The submission does not raise matters that would necessitate modification of the Draft Variation as published.

## Part 3

---

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission. It is recommended to retain the PA 01 Stamullen rezoning as published

### Submission No. MH-C217-21: Cloncurry Homes (McCutcheon Halley Planning Consultants)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission relates to lands at Enfield, Co. Meath, comprising two landholdings referred to as Site 1 (c. 6 hectares) and Site 2 (c. 7 hectares). Both sites are located within the Enfield settlement boundary and are currently subject to a combination of A2 – New Residential (subject to A2 Phasing), Open Space, and a minor portion of B1 Town/Village Centre zoning.

The submission welcomes the Variation insofar as it recognises the need to activate additional lands within Enfield capable of contributing to housing delivery within the lifetime of the Development Plan. The submission specifically supports PA01 Enfield noting that this confirms the suitability of the location for residential development having regard to accessibility, proximity to the town centre, Enfield rail station, and existing services. However, it is contended that the extent of lands identified under the Variation is limited when considered in the context of the overall landholding. The submission argues that the balance of Site 2 shares the same characteristics as the portion proposed for activation and represents a logical and sequential extension of this approach.

In addition, the submission seeks the removal of A2 Phasing restrictions and reconsideration of zoning on Site 1, which adjoins existing residential development at Glen Abhainn and benefits from established road, footpath, water supply and wastewater infrastructure. The lands are described as sequential, accessible, and capable of supporting residential development within the plan period.

Considerable emphasis is placed on housing delivery and land availability in Enfield, noting that while a significant number of residential permissions have been granted since 2021, much of the available residential land is constrained by phasing provisions or extant permissions. The submission contends that this limits the availability of immediately developable land, notwithstanding strong demand within the settlement.

Infrastructure capacity is also addressed, with reference to ongoing and planned water supply investment by Uisce Éireann under the Growth and Development Programme, which the submission states will support future growth in the settlement. Environmental considerations are also examined, with the submission concluding that no significant constraints exist that would preclude development of Site 1 or Site 2, subject to standard assessments at planning application stage. The presence of a recorded monument within Site 2 is acknowledged and is argued to be capable of sensitive integration within a future residential scheme.

Overall, the submission contends that Site 1 and Site 2 constitute serviced, sequential and readily deliverable Tier 1 lands, consistent with national policy, and requests that Draft Variation No. 5 be

## Part 3

extended to facilitate a more comprehensive and coordinated activation of these lands in order to support housing delivery within Enfield over the remaining lifetime of the Development Plan.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive welcomes the detailed and comprehensive submission.

Draft Variation No. 5 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021–2027 has been prepared for the specific purpose of giving effect to the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines (2025). The scope of the Variation is limited to necessary amendments required to align the Development Plan with revised housing targets and the Core Strategy, and it does not constitute a full review of settlement strategies or land use zoning across the County.

The Chief Executive acknowledges that Enfield is a well-serviced settlement with strong public transport connectivity, with a demonstrated demand for housing. The inclusion of a portion of Site 2 (c. 0.8 hectares) within Draft Variation No. 5 is noted as a targeted response to the need to activate appropriately located lands capable of contributing to housing delivery within the remaining plan period. The lands are immediately contiguous to the town centre and represent the most logical and coherent location for the sustainable expansion of the settlement.

While the Chief Executive acknowledges the arguments made in relation to accessibility, infrastructure capacity, and the serviceability of the subject lands, it is noted that Draft Variation No. 5 already represents a proportionate response to the revised housing targets, based on a county-wide assessment of land supply and delivery potential and has demonstrated, as per the OPR’s submission, “an appropriate pipeline of housing delivery.”

The Chief Executive considers that the submission raises relevant planning issues which will be of assistance in informing the preparation of the next Meath County Development Plan, and any future statutory planning framework for Enfield, where the role, capacity and sequencing of lands within the settlement can be comprehensively evaluated in accordance with statutory requirements and national policy.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission. It is recommended to retain the PA 01 and PA02 Enfield rezonings as published

### Submission No. MH-C217-22: Greenwalk Homes Ltd (JSA Planning)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission strongly supports Draft Variation No. 5 and the proposed rezoning of lands at Tara Road from White Lands to A2 – New Residential. The submission provides extensive planning and policy justification, referencing the revised National Planning Framework, the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines (July 2025) and the strategic role of Laytown–Bettystown within East Meath.

While broadly supportive of the zoning proposal, the submission expresses concern in relation to the indicative unit yield attributed to the lands. It is contended that the site characteristics,

## Part 3

accessibility and surrounding urban context could support a higher density of development than indicated in Draft Variation No. 5.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive notes the submission and its support for the Draft Variation. The indicative unit yields set out in Draft Variation No. 5 are not intended to function as limitations on the quantum of housing that can be delivered on the lands nor to pre-empt the detailed assessment of future planning applications. Density and layout will continue to be assessed on a site specific basis at application stage, having regard to national guidance and local development plan standards.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission. It is recommended to retain the PA 01 East Meath rezoning as published

### Submission No. MH-C217-23: Solkerry Ventures Ltd (Brock McClure Planning)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission welcomes the rezoning of lands at PA01 Dunboyne from A2 Post 2027 to A2 – New Residential under Draft Variation No. 5 but raises concerns regarding the prescriptive nature of stated density and unit yields. The submissions highlights specific site constraints that may limit the development potential of the lands noting that the potential unit yield of 308no. units ascribed to the lands may not be achievable.

The submission also disputes the flood risk mapping applied, asserting that national indicative mapping overstates flood risk and that existing Development Plan maps should be retained.

#### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive notes that density figures included in Draft Variation No. 5 are indicative only and do not preclude consideration of alternative densities at planning application stage. Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has been carried out in accordance with national guidance, based on latest available information at the time of assessment.

#### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission. It is recommended to retain the PA 01 Dunboyne rezoning as published

### Submission No. MH-C217-24: Keystone Development Ltd (CEA Architects)

#### Summary of Submission:

The submission relates to lands at Loughsallagh, Clonee, extending to approximately 1.58 hectares, currently zoned RA – Rural Area under the Meath County Development Plan 2021–2027 and located outside the Dunboyne / Clonee / Pace settlement boundary. The submission seeks

the rezoning of the lands from RA – Rural Area – A2 – New Residential, together with an adjustment to the settlement boundary to incorporate the subject site.

It is contended that the significantly increased housing targets for Meath County, including the requirement to zone sufficient lands to provide headroom of up to 50% above baseline targets, necessitate the consideration of additional lands for residential development.

The lands are described as a relatively flat greenfield site located to the north of Clonee village, with direct access to the R147 and close proximity to the N3/M3 motorway, Clonee village centre, Dunboyne town centre, public transport services (rail and bus), schools and social and recreational facilities. The submission contends that these locational characteristics render the site suitable for residential development, including medium-density apartment development.

Considerable detail is provided on site characteristics, access, topography, and potential servicing arrangements. While it is acknowledged that certain services (including foul drainage and water supply) may require extension or upgrading, the submission contends that such infrastructure can be delivered within the lifetime of a future development plan. Reference is also made to recent and permitted residential developments within the wider Dunboyne / Clonee / Pace settlement area, including apartment schemes, which are cited as establishing a precedent for higher density development in the general area.

Environmental considerations are addressed, including flood risk, ecology, noise, archaeology and proximity to recorded monuments. The submission concludes that the site is not subject to prohibitive constraints and that any identified issues can be appropriately mitigated through design and assessment at planning application stage.

An indicative outline masterplan is provided to demonstrate the potential residential capacity of the site, which the submission states could yield up to approximately 140 units, together with open space, parking, and limited local services.

Overall, the submission contends that the rezoning of the subject lands would represent a logical response to national housing policy, contribute to meeting increased housing demand, and facilitate sustainable growth in the Clonee area.

### **Chief Executive Response**

The Chief Executive thanks and welcomes the detailed and comprehensive submission.

The subject lands at Loughsallagh, Clonee are currently zoned RA – Rural Area and are located outside the defined settlement boundary of the Dunboyne / Clonee / Pace settlement. As such, the lands were not included in the Settlement Capacity Audit underpinning Proposed Variation No. 5 and were not assessed as Tier 1 or Tier 2 residential lands capable of activation within the scope of the Variation.

While the Chief Executive acknowledges the site's proximity to Clonee village, Dunboyne town and strategic transport infrastructure, it is noted that Draft Variation No. 5 already represents a proportionate response to the revised housing targets, based on a county-wide assessment of land supply and delivery potential and has demonstrated, as per the OPR's submission, "an appropriate pipeline of housing delivery."

## Part 3

The Chief Executive notes the arguments advanced in relation to national housing policy, housing demand and potential residential yield. However, the Revised National Planning Framework and associated Section 28 Guidelines continue to emphasise a plan-led approach, prioritising compact growth within existing settlements, and the consolidation of zoned and serviced lands.

While the submission indicates that services could potentially be extended to the site, it is also noted that:

- The lands are not currently fully serviced;
- Upgrades to road infrastructure, drainage, water services and pedestrian/cycle facilities would be required; and
- A full environmental and infrastructural assessment at plan level would be necessary before such lands could be considered for residential zoning.

The Chief Executive notes that submissions advocating for the rezoning of these lands should be made during the consultation stage of the Draft County Development or any subsequent Variation that may have a broader scope to that of Variation No.5.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission. It is recommended to retain the PA 01 Dunboyne rezoning as published

### Submission No. MH-C217-26: Kells Anglers

#### Summary of Submission:

The submission relates to Proposed Amendment No. 3 – Athboy Land Use Zoning under Draft Variation No. 5. The submission raises concerns regarding the capacity, operation and regulatory compliance of Athboy Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) and contends that the zoning amendments proposed for Athboy are not supported by sufficient wastewater infrastructure capacity.

The submission references the Athboy WWTP Discharge Licence (D0124-01) and asserts that deficiencies exist in relation to population equivalent assessment, hydraulic loading, monitoring data, reporting consistency, and incident notification. It is contended that the 2024 Annual Environmental Report (AER) contains contradictions and omissions, including inconsistencies between reported capacity exceedances and conclusions of compliance.

The submission argues that these matters have not been adequately addressed in the SEA Screening Report and Appropriate Assessment Screening accompanying Draft Variation No. 5. Reference is made to the Planning Authority's obligations under the Habitats Directive, Water Framework Directive and Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive, and it is asserted that zoning should not proceed in advance of confirmed and operational wastewater upgrades.

#### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive welcomes the comments raised in the detailed submission.

Draft Variation No. 5 has been prepared to give effect to the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines (2025) by making targeted amendments to the Core Strategy

## Part 3

and settlement zoning framework. The Variation is informed by a Settlement Capacity Audit, which assesses settlements at a strategic level having regard to environmental constraints, infrastructure provision, and capacity. Uisce Éireann, as the statutory body responsible for public water and wastewater services in Ireland, were consulted during the preparation for the Settlement Capacity Audit. Recently published Water Supply and Wastewater Treatment Capacity Registers issued in April 2026 by Uisce Éireann also indicate that there is both capacity available in water supply and wastewater to serve Athboy. It should be noted that there is no proposed increase in the quantum of residential zoning in Athboy, rather a relocation of existing zonings to lands that will deliver housing in the short-term.

Issues relating to the operation, regulatory compliance and performance of wastewater treatment plants are acknowledged as matters of importance. However, the licensing, monitoring and enforcement of WWTPs are statutory functions carried out by Uisce Éireann and the Environmental Protection Agency, operating under separate legislative codes. Consequently, the funding of works and the upgrading of sewerage systems is outside the control of Meath County Council and is therefore outside the scope of Draft Variation No. 5.

A full SEA of the Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 was carried out during the review and preparation of the plan. Proposed Variation no. 5 has also been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment and Appropriate Assessment. Any development arising as a result of the Variation will be subject to its own environmental assessment and consenting process, incorporating the preparation of screening reports for Appropriate Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment including, if necessary, the preparation of a Natura Impact Statement (NIS) and/or Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR).

Planning applications for development on zoned lands will be required to demonstrate connection feasibility to ensure that adequate capacity is available at the Wastewater Treatment Plant and that development arising will not result in impact on water quality. These matters will be assessed through the development management process.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission

### Submission No. MH-C217-27: Kells Anglers

#### Summary of Submission:

The submission relates to zoning amendments for Carlanstown, served by Carlanstown WWTP (Licence D0488-01). The submission alleges that the plant has no remaining organic capacity, that required infrastructure upgrades have not been implemented, and that reporting deficiencies exist in recent AERs.

Concerns raised include storm water overflow compliance, incident reporting, priority substances assessment omissions, and failure to regularise additional infrastructure. The submission asserts that the proposed zoning amendments are not supported by adequate treatment capacity.

#### Chief Executive Response

## Part 3

The Chief Executive welcomes the comments raised in the detailed submission.

Draft Variation No. 5 has been prepared to give effect to the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines (2025) by making targeted amendments to the Core Strategy and settlement zoning framework. The Variation is informed by a Settlement Capacity Audit, which assesses settlements at a strategic level having regard to environmental constraints, infrastructure provision, and capacity. Uisce Éireann, as the statutory body responsible for public water and wastewater services in Ireland, and were consulted during the preparation for the Settlement Capacity Audit. Recently published Water Supply and Wastewater Treatment Capacity Registers issued in April 2026 by Uisce Éireann also indicate that there is both capacity available in water supply and wastewater to serve Carlanstown.

Issues relating to the operation, regulatory compliance and performance of wastewater treatment plants are acknowledged as matters of importance. However, the licensing, monitoring and enforcement of WWTPs are statutory functions carried out by Uisce Éireann and the Environmental Protection Agency, operating under separate legislative codes. Consequently, the funding of works and the upgrading of sewerage systems is outside the control of Meath County Council and is therefore outside the scope of Draft Variation No. 5.

A full SEA of the Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 was carried out during the review and preparation of the plan. Proposed Variation no. 5 has also been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment and Appropriate Assessment. Any development arising as a result of the Variation will be subject to its own environmental assessment and consenting process, incorporating the preparation of screening reports for Appropriate Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment including, if necessary, the preparation of a Natura Impact Statement (NIS) and/or Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR).

Planning applications for development on zoned lands will be required to ensure that adequate capacity is available at the Wastewater Treatment Plant and that development arising will not result in impact on water quality. These matters will be assessed through the development management process.

### **Chief Executive Recommendation**

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission

### Submission No. MH-C217-28: Kells Anglers

#### **Summary of Submission:**

The submission relates to zoning amendments within the Southern Environs of Drogheda, which are served by Drogheda WWTP (EPA Licence D0041). The submitters contend that the WWTP is experiencing systemic operational failures resulting in deterioration of the River Boyne and Estuary SAC/SPA.

The submission references alleged non-compliance with emission limit values, deficiencies in nutrient removal, incomplete storm water overflow monitoring, omission of required priority

## Part 3

substances assessments, and delayed implementation of corrective works. It is argued that the SEA Screening accompanying Draft Variation No. 5 does not adequately address these issues.

The submission asserts that future development facilitated by the Variation could exacerbate existing pressures on the receiving environment and that rezoning should be deferred pending demonstrable and operational infrastructure upgrades.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive welcomes the comments raised in the detailed submission.

Draft Variation No. 5 has been prepared to give effect to the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines (2025) by making targeted amendments to the Core Strategy and settlement zoning framework. The Variation is informed by a Settlement Capacity Audit, which assesses settlements at a strategic level having regard to environmental constraints, infrastructure provision, and capacity. Uisce Éireann, as the statutory body responsible for public water and waste water services in Ireland, were consulted during the preparation for the Settlement Capacity Audit. Recently published Water Supply and Wastewater Treatment Capacity Registers issued in April 2026 by Uisce Éireann also indicate that there is both potential capacity available in water supply and wastewater to serve the Southern Environs of Drogheda.

Issues relating to the operation, regulatory compliance and performance of wastewater treatment plants are acknowledged as matters of importance. However, the licensing, monitoring and enforcement of WWTPs are statutory functions carried out by Uisce Éireann and the Environmental Protection Agency, operating under separate legislative codes. Consequently, the funding of works and the upgrading of sewerage systems is outside the control of Meath County Council and is therefore outside the scope of Draft Variation No. 5.

A full SEA of the Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 was carried out during the review and preparation of the plan. Proposed Variation no. 5 has also been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment and Appropriate Assessment. Any development arising as a result of the Variation will be subject to its own environmental assessment and consenting process, incorporating the preparation of screening reports for Appropriate Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment including, if necessary, the preparation of a Natura Impact Statement (NIS) and/or Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR).

Planning applications for development on zoned lands will be required to ensure that adequate capacity is available at the Wastewater Treatment Plant and that development arising will not result in impact on water quality. These matters will be assessed through the development management process.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission

Submission No. MH-C217-29: Kells Anglers

### Summary of Submission:

## Part 3

The submission relates to proposed amendment No. 3: Bettystown-Laytown-Mornington East land use zoning and mirrors concerns raised in respect of the Southern Environs of Drogheda and relates to lands served by Drogheda WWTP. The submitters again reference alleged ongoing licence non-compliance, deficiencies in monitoring, nutrient removal failures, storm water overflow issues and reporting inconsistencies.

The submission contends that these matters undermine the robustness of SEA Screening conclusions and that zoning amendments should not proceed in advance of the confirmed resolution of wastewater treatment deficiencies.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive welcomes the comments raised in the detailed submission.

Draft Variation No. 5 has been prepared to give effect to the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines (2025) by making targeted amendments to the Core Strategy and settlement zoning framework. The Variation is informed by a Settlement Capacity Audit, which assesses settlements at a strategic level having regard to environmental constraints, infrastructure provision, and capacity. Uisce Éireann, as the statutory body responsible for public water and wastewater services in Ireland, were consulted during the preparation for the Settlement Capacity Audit. Recently published Water Supply and Wastewater Treatment Capacity Registers issued in April 2026 by Uisce Éireann also indicate that there is both potential capacity available in water supply and wastewater to serve the Southern Environs of Drogheda & : Bettystown-Laytown-Mornington East.

Issues relating to the operation, regulatory compliance and performance of wastewater treatment plants are acknowledged as matters of importance. However, the licensing, monitoring and enforcement of WWTPs are statutory functions carried out by Uisce Éireann and the Environmental Protection Agency, operating under separate legislative codes. Consequently, the funding of works and the upgrading of sewerage systems is outside the control of Meath County Council and is therefore outside the scope of Draft Variation No. 5.

A full SEA of the Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 was carried out during the review and preparation of the plan. Proposed Variation no. 5 has also been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment and Appropriate Assessment. Any development arising as a result of the Variation will be subject to its own environmental assessment and consenting process, incorporating the preparation of screening reports for Appropriate Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment including, if necessary, the preparation of a Natura Impact Statement (NIS) and/or Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR).

Planning applications for development on zoned lands will be required to ensure that adequate capacity is available at the Wastewater Treatment Plant and that development arising will not result in impact on water quality. These matters will be assessed through the development management process.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission

## Part 3

Submission No. MH-C217-30: Protect East Meath Ltd

### Summary of Submission:

The submission sets out a series of objections to Proposed Variation No. 5 to the Meath County Development Plan 2021–2027 (as varied). The submission focuses principally on the Southern Environs of Drogheda and Laytown–Bettystown–Mornington East–Donacarneay, and raises concerns under five headings:

- **Completeness / Evidence Base:** Alleged absence of a “full” Settlement Capacity Audit and up-to-date Core Strategy monitoring, and lack of aggregated cross-boundary data for Drogheda (Meath + Louth).
- **Southern Environs of Drogheda (Colpe):** Alleged inconsistency with the NPF and EMRA RSES; claims that the Colpe lands are “landlocked”, lack road/footpath/cycle access, require a new road across White Lands, and are therefore not Tier 1.
- **Donacarneay:** Alleged de facto extension of the settlement boundary and non-compliance with compact growth and the tiered approach.
- **RSES / Cross-Boundary Coordination:** Contends rezoning in Drogheda must be coordinated with Louth County Council and should be deferred pending a Joint Urban Area Plan (JUAP/UAP).
- **Climate Action Duty:** Asserts insufficiency of climate analysis in the SEA Environmental Report and contends the proposed zonings promote car-dependent sprawl contrary to Section 15(1) of the Climate Act and national transport decarbonisation measures.

The submission also references previous High Court litigation in relation to zoning in the Southern Environs of Drogheda and argues that infrastructure assessment must be undertaken before zoning decisions are adopted, not afterwards through a “subsidiary” plan process

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive welcomes the comments raised in the detailed submission.

The Chief Executive notes at the outset that Proposed Variation No. 5 is a statutory plan variation prepared pursuant to Section 58 of the Planning and Development Act 2024 (as amended), and its central purpose is to align the adopted Development Plan with the National Planning Framework (NPF) First Revision (April 2025) and the associated NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines (July 2025) issued under Section 28.

The Proposed Variation documentation explicitly states that the Guidelines require sufficient zoning in County Meath to deliver 2,942 units annually up to 2034, and that (under Section 43 of the 2024 Act) the County Development Plan must be consistent with the NPF and the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES).

The Variation is therefore a time-critical and bounded response to revised housing growth requirements with a view to identify suitable lands capable of accommodating additional growth over the remainder of the Plan period. The lands that are proposed to be rezoned under this Variation have been identified following a robust Settlement Capacity Audit of the county underpinned by a strong evidence base. In the interests of clarity, the Chief Executive’s response

to this submission has been prepared using the same summary headings of the issues contained within the submission as follows:

### **Settlement Capacity Audit /Core Strategy Monitoring**

The submission asserts that the material is incomplete and lacks a “full” Settlement Capacity Audit and Core Strategy monitoring. As required by section 3.0 of the NPF Housing Growth Requirement Guidelines, MCC carried out an assessment of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 and reviewed the core strategy and associated settlement strategy and zoning objectives against the objectives of the NPF Guidelines. In December 2025 having carried out the review, MCC presented the Elected Members with a detailed report ‘*Chief Executive Report on the National Planning Framework Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines*’, which sets out the development capacity of existing zoned lands, including detailed information on the serviced status and planning status of lands for the entire County. The Report was accompanied by four appendices consisting of a detailed planning history assessment for the entire county carried out during the period of August and early September 2025, an infrastructure assessment of remaining existing A2 residential lands, an assessment of post 2019 residential lands in Meath County Development Plan 2013-2019, and maps containing the outcomes of the settlement capacity audit carried out for the settlements where land is proposed to be bought forward as part of this variation.

The Chief Executive notes that the published SCA sets out that it is an audit “of the lands associated with Proposed Variation No. 5” and that it was prepared “to inform the Council in respect of the land use strategy and application of the ‘Tiered Approach to Zoning’” required by Section 10 of the NPF and Section 2.4 of the Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines. The SCA also states that it includes “Accompanying maps that identify Tier 1 and Tier 2 lands or sites with potential for residential development in individual settlements”

Accordingly, while the SCA is clearly structured around the lands relevant to the Variation and those being advanced for rezoning, it is confirmed that a full audit of the county was undertaken in preparation of the Variation.

The submission also contests there is insufficient “settlement level monitoring” and that settlement written statement tables have not been updated with completed/committed units.

The Chief Executive notes that the Proposed Variation documentation itself includes countywide evidence used in the assessment, including: permitted but uncompleted units, remaining undeveloped zoned lands, live applications and predicted one-off rural housing; and it sets out that those datasets informed the identification of additional lands required for a deliverable pipeline.

Furthermore, the OPR’s submission accepts that the overall quantum of lands provides an appropriate pipeline for housing delivery but requests greater clarity in the presentation of Core Strategy capacity, i.e. clearer articulation of land quantum, density assumptions and yields within the Core Strategy table. This indicates that the issue is primarily one of clarity and transparency of presentation, not the absence of an evidence base which can be addressed through improved explanatory text.

## Part 3

It should also be noted that annual monitoring of the core strategy is published annually on Meath County Councils website providing detailed information on units granted, units completed, dwelling size/mix, LRDs, Part 8 housing applications and rural housing.

### **Southern Environs of Drogheda – Lands at Colpe**

The submissions contends that lands at Colpe proposed to be rezoned have “no road, footpath or cycling access”, is “landlocked by white land”, requires a new road across white lands, and therefore cannot be Tier 1, making the rezoning unjustified.

The SCA explicitly defines the tiering approach and the rule that any outstanding critical infrastructure deficiency means a site cannot be Tier 1 and must be Tier 2. The SCA further states that “All lands proposed to be zoned for residential development as part of Variation No. 5 are located within ... sites classified as Tier 1 – Serviced lands” and identifies “Southern Environs of Drogheda (PA1)” and “Southern Environs of Drogheda (PA2)” within the tiered assessment results.

The Chief Executive would also like to clarify that the PA01 lands at Colpe will be accessible via a new spine road to the south of the Educate Together school which has commenced construction, and is in situ as far as the school. The consented planning application (reference number: LB180620) involves road infrastructure including a link street approximately 720m in length, including 3 no. roundabout junctions. It is also proposed to extend a 230m long spur of the link street to the east to facilitate a connection to the existing school on Mill Road (Gaelscoil an Bhradain Feasa), the realignment of a section of Colpe Road and the southern section of Mill Road together with cycle lanes and footpaths. The section of the Road that serves the school is in situ, the remainder is permitted and all in one ownership.

It is also noted that Variation No. 5 is specifically intended as a focused statutory response to revised housing growth requirements, rather than a full strategic reappraisal of the Drogheda settlement. In this context, the OPR confirms that the zoning objectives within the Variation are generally well located and aligned with national and regional policy. The Chief Executive would also like to highlight that the consented development (Reg. Ref: 212412) at Colpe West for 95no. residential units, childcare facility, outdoor play space and associated road infrastructure, currently subject to a High Court Stay, which can be considered by An Coimisiún Pleanála once the lands are zoned for residential use. Paragraph 22(vi) of the relevant High Court Judgement in the case between Protect East Meath Limited and Meath County Council notes that the order includes:

*“22(vi) a stay on any current or future planning applications or appeals (including, for the avoidance of doubt, planning appeals numbers 313190-22, 313187-22 and 314352-22) that are affected by the order of certiorari, until a variation to the plan made in the light of the order of the court comes into force, or pending further order of the court in the meantime, with liberty to apply, in lieu of the stay granted to at para. 84(iv)(b) of the judgment of 17th February, 2023;”*

These lands are in single ownership, fully accessible and capable of immediate activation (as confirmed by the landowner’s submission on Proposed Draft Variation No.5 (reference MH-C217-11) which align fully with the recommendations of the NPF Housing Target Guidelines for lands

that are suitable for rezoning to residential use and will deliver housing within the remaining lifetime of the County Development Plan.

### **Donacarney Zoning**

The submission alleges that the Donacarney rezoning “in effect extends the settlement boundary” and is inconsistent with compact growth and the tiered approach to zoning.

The Proposed Variation documentation explicitly states that it is proposed to amend development/settlement boundaries where necessary so that lands identified for development within the lifetime of the Plan fall within the relevant development boundary.

The Settlement Capacity Audit includes East Meath (Donacarney – PA1) within the tiered assessment table and notes that the tiering assessment includes road access, footpath/cycle, public lighting, water and wastewater — with consultation inputs from Uisce Éireann and the Council’s Transportation Department reaffirming their suitability to accommodate additional growth and immediate activation potential. The lands are fully serviced, are effectively brownfield in nature and as confirmed by the landowner’s submission will be activated for housing delivery within the lifetime of the Development Plan.

Accordingly, the Planning Authority’s evidence base shows that the Donacarney lands were considered through the same tiered infrastructure evaluation framework applied across the Variation’s rezoning proposals. As with other sites, any individual development will remain subject to project-level assessment and compliance with relevant development management standards and environmental requirements.

### **Drogheda and Coordination with Louth County Council**

The submission asserts that any land use zoning for Drogheda must be coordinated with Louth County Council due to Drogheda’s status as a Regional Growth Centre under the RSES. The submission further attests that the lack of a JUAP/UAP creates a “missing jigsaw piece”, and that rezoning should be deferred pending joint plan-making and consolidated cross-boundary monitoring data.

The Chief Executive notes that Louth County Council made a submission to the Draft Variation no.5 supporting the continued collaboration between both Local Authorities to ensure Drogheda operates as a single functional urban area. In their submission Louth County Council noted the rezoning of two parcels of White Lands to A2 in the southern environs (totalling 20.66ha) and raised no objection to the proposed rezonings.

The Chief Executive agrees that Drogheda is strategically significant and that long-term growth should be guided by a coherent framework integrating land use and transport planning. It is not considered that it is legally necessary to defer all rezoning in the Southern Environs pending completion of the JUAP/UAP. Proposed Variation No. 5 is a statutory response to revised housing growth requirements under Section 28 Guidelines and is supported by a Settlement Capacity Audit and SEA/AA reports.

Furthermore, the High Court order referenced above explicitly states applications on the Colpe lands can commence once the lands are rezoned by way of a Variation to the Development Plan.

The Chief Executive notes that the Council, in collaboration with Louth County Council is progressing a Joint Urban Area Plan for Drogheda. This addresses the submission's concern about the absence of a coordinated framework by confirming that the appropriate mechanism is being advanced in parallel, while the Variation addresses immediate statutory housing-growth requirements within the current plan period.

### **SEA and Climate Change Obligations**

The submission alleges that the SEA environmental report lacks detail on climate change and fails to demonstrate compliance with Section 15(1) of the Climate Act. The submission also states that the Drogheda and Donacorney zonings promote car-dependent sprawl inconsistent with climate measures.

Climatic factors are comprehensively addressed throughout the SEA Environmental Report, in accordance with Directive 2001/42/EC and S.I. No. 456 of 2025. Climate change mitigation and adaptation are considered at a strategic level having regard to the nature and scope of Variation No. 5, which is limited to targeted amendments to the Core Strategy, settlement strategies and associated land use zonings. The SEA includes a detailed environmental baseline for air, climate and greenhouse gas emissions (Section 5), explicitly references national climate policy including the Climate Action Plan 2025, the National Adaptation Framework and sectoral adaptation strategies, and assesses the interrelationship between land use, population distribution, transport patterns and emissions. The SEA also recognises Ireland's State of the Environment Report (2024), identifies climate as a key environmental challenge, and embeds climate considerations within the Strategic Environmental Objectives (SEOs) and the assessment of effects (Sections 6 and 8).

In addition, the SEA is explicitly tiered with, and read alongside, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and the Appropriate Assessment/Natura Impact Report, both of which address climate-related risks such as increased flood frequency, surface water management, and resilience of sensitive environments. Specific mitigation and adaptation measures are integrated into the Draft Variation, including new and updated objectives relating to flood risk management, protection of surface waters, and the avoidance of inappropriate development in flood-prone areas. These measures are reinforced through the SEA mitigation and monitoring framework (Sections 9 and 10), ensuring climate considerations are carried forward to lower-tier plans and project-level assessment, where more detailed, site-specific climate analysis is most appropriately undertaken. Taken together, the SEA provides a proportionate, policy-consistent and legally robust assessment of climate change in line with the requirements of plan-level environmental assessment.

In regard to the concerns raised on the proposed zonings resulting in car-dependency, in relation to the PA 01 lands at Drogheda, it should be noted that the lands are classified as Tier 1 serviced lands and benefit from direct accessibility via a new spine road to the south of the Educate Together school which has commenced construction and is in situ as far as the school. A Local Transport Plan is being prepared for the area, and any redevelopment of the lands will be compliant with the requirements of the LTP. The lands are also serviced by existing/permitted footpath and cycle paths and the Drogheda Bus Service in addition to the Matthews Bus service.

In relation to PA 01 lands in Bettystown-Laytown, the lands are classified as Tier 1 serviced lands and having regard to consistency with the key principles of Transport Orientated Development,

## Part 3

the proposed land is within walking distance to both primary and secondary education facilities, the town centre of both Laytown and Bettystown, and Laytown train station. Recent development of road infrastructure has resulted in the proposed lands now being serviced by road and footpath infrastructure. The lands are also serviced by existing cycle paths on Tara Road and the Drogheda Bus Service in addition to Matthews Bus service.

In relation to PA 02 lands in Donacarney, the lands are also classified as being Tier 1. The proposed land is within walking distance to the primary school and the village centre. The lands are brownfield in nature and is capable of providing housing units within the remaining lifetime of the CDP which would help address the current housing availability gap in the area. The lands are also serviced by existing footpath and cycle paths and the Drogheda Bus Service in addition to Matthews Bus service.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendments to the land use zoning adjustments proposed under this Variation are required in response to this submission. It is recommended that additional explanatory text be added to the Core Strategy Table and Supplementary Tables to further clarify quanta of residential lands, density assumptions and associated housing yields attributable to the settlements that are impacted by this Variation.

### Submission No. MH-C217-31: Kells Anglers

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission mirrors concerns raised in respect of Duleek and relates to lands served by Duleek WWTP. The submission argues that Draft Variation No. 5 fails to adequately consider existing infrastructure deficiencies and environmental constraints in supporting additional residential zoning in the settlement.

The submission provides a critique of the 2024 Annual Environmental Report (AER) for the WWTP, identifying a series of perceived inconsistencies and omissions. These include a discrepancy between reported compliance with emission limit values and observed deterioration in downstream water quality, evidence of hydraulic overloading exceeding plant capacity, and the absence of appropriate improvement measures or monitoring of storm water overflows. The submission further highlights conflicting statements in relation to Water Framework Directive status and the categorisation of the WWTP as a pressure on receiving waters.

The submission contends that these deficiencies undermine confidence in the ability of the plant to accommodate additional wastewater loads and that the environmental implications of increased development have not been adequately assessed within the SEA Screening process.

#### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive welcomes the comments raised in the detailed submission.

Draft Variation No. 5 has been prepared to give effect to the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines (2025) by making targeted amendments to the Core Strategy and settlement zoning framework. The Variation is informed by a Settlement Capacity Audit,

## Part 3

which assesses settlements at a strategic level having regard to environmental constraints, infrastructure provision, and capacity. Uisce Éireann, as the statutory body responsible for public water and wastewater services in Ireland, were consulted during the preparation for the Settlement Capacity Audit. Recently published Water Supply and Wastewater Treatment Capacity Registers issued in April 2026 by Uisce Éireann also indicate that there is both potential capacity available in water supply and wastewater to serve Duleek. It should also be noted that the proposal is to relocate existing residential zoning within Duleek rather than add additional new zoning. The relocated zoning has been informed by an RZLT submission which confirmed that housing on existing A2 zoned lands would not be delivered by the landowner.

Issues relating to the operation, regulatory compliance and performance of wastewater treatment plants are acknowledged as matters of importance. However, the licensing, monitoring and enforcement of WWTPs are statutory functions carried out by Uisce Éireann and the Environmental Protection Agency, operating under separate legislative codes. Consequently, the funding of works and the upgrading of sewerage systems is outside the control of Meath County Council and is therefore outside the scope of Draft Variation No. 5.

A full SEA of the Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 was carried out during the review and preparation of the plan. Proposed Variation no. 5 has also been subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment and Appropriate Assessment. Any development arising as a result of the Variation will be subject to its own environmental assessment and consenting process, incorporating the preparation of screening reports for Appropriate Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment including, if necessary, the preparation of a Natura Impact Statement (NIS) and/or Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR).

Planning applications for development on zoned lands will be required to ensure that adequate capacity is available at the Wastewater Treatment Plan and that development arising will not result in impact on water quality. These matters will be assessed through the development management process.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission

Submission No. MH-C217-32: Kevin and Dermot Cassidy (Hendrik W van der Kamp, Town Planner)

### Summary of Submission:

This submission focuses on the implications of Draft Variation No. 5 for Athboy, and specifically the proposed zoning changes arising under Amendments Nos. 2 and 3. The submission identifies that, notwithstanding an increase in the Core Strategy household allocation for Athboy, the Variation results in a net reduction in A2 – New Residential lands due to the rezoning of centrally located lands for community uses.

The submission contends that this outcome is inconsistent with the intent of the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines, which require planning authorities to increase the supply of residentially zoned land. Concern is raised that Athboy is the only

## Part 3

---

settlement among those amended under the Variation that experiences a net loss in residential zoning, notwithstanding increased housing targets.

The submission raises concerns regarding the location of replacement residential lands, which are situated on the western edge of the town, arguing that this represents a less sustainable location compared to the centrally located lands lost to community zoning. It is argued that this may exacerbate existing traffic congestion issues and undermine the environmental quality of the town centre, while limiting opportunities for compact and infill development.

The submission states that the proposed zoning approach fails to provide an adequate or appropriately located land bank for residential development and urges reconsideration of both the quantum and spatial distribution of residential lands in Athboy.

### **Chief Executive Response**

The Chief Executive acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the quantum and distribution of residentially zoned lands in Athboy under Draft Variation No. 5. It is accepted that the Variation results in a reconfiguration of zoned lands within the settlement, including the reclassification of lands previously zoned for residential use to community uses, reflecting their established function and importance within the town.

During the review of all A2 Residential land use zonings in the county as part of the preparation for the Variation, Athboy was found to contain two anomalies, whereby two land parcels containing sporting facilities - a GAA Pitch and Basketball Court were zoned A2 New Residential. These are recognised as essential facilities for the community, and it is therefore acknowledged that these lands would be more appropriately zoned for 'Community Use.' While this results in a very minor reduction in gross residential zoning, the overall capacity within the settlement remains adequate when assessed on a holistic basis.

The purpose of Draft Variation No. 5 is to ensure that sufficient lands are available to accommodate housing delivery within the lifetime of the current Development Plan, having regard to both existing zoned lands and extant planning permissions. In the case of Athboy, the Settlement Capacity Audit identifies that the combined capacity of existing zoned lands, unbuilt permissions and town centre development opportunities is sufficient to meet the revised housing allocation for the settlement.

In relation to the location of additional residential lands, the Chief Executive notes that the lands identified form a logical extension of the existing built footprint and are consistent with the sequential development approach. Matters relating to traffic management and urban form will be addressed at planning application stage through detailed design and transport assessment.

### **Chief Executive Recommendation**

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission. It is recommended to retain the Athboy rezonings as published.

## Part 3

Submission No. MH-C217-33: Irene Sands (Brady Hughes Consulting)

### Summary of Submission:

The submission welcomes the intent of the Variation to align the County Development Plan with the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines (July 2025) but raises concerns regarding the methodology, transparency of decision-making and the short planning horizon to 2027.

The submission states that the scope of the Variation regarding additional/new zonings not being considered should not prevent public scrutiny of whether the Variation is sufficient to meet its stated purpose. The submission contends that it is legitimate to question the quantum and location of lands brought forward, the settlements chosen, and the evidence supporting these decisions.

The submission identifies lands outside the settlement of Donacarney as being strategically located and argues they should be recognised within a longer-term strategy for growth. It references previous submissions to the County Development Plan and to the Drogheda Joint LAP Issues Paper, including support for a strategic reserve, a transport-oriented development approach and the potential for additional rail station / DART infrastructure serving the corridor.

The submission requests that the Planning Authority adopt a more transparent settlement-based capacity analysis, improve clarity in site selection, and plan beyond the current plan period. It also calls for a coordinated strategic framework for how East Meath growth interacts with Drogheda, including management of potential coalescence and future public transport investment.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and notes the strategic issues raised regarding the evidential basis of Draft Variation No. 5, including transparency of site selection and the relationship between short-term land activation and longer-term settlement strategy.

Draft Variation No. 5 is a targeted statutory response to the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines (July 2025) and is focused on identifying lands capable of contributing to housing delivery within the remaining lifetime of the current Development Plan. In that context, the Variation is not intended to operate as a full Development Plan review, nor as a substitute for longer-term strategic planning processes such as the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan and statutory planning for the wider Drogheda functional area including the preparation of a Joint Urban Area Plan in collaboration with Louth County Council.

To the extent that the submission seeks the rezoning of lands not included in the Draft Variation as published, such requests should be made during the public consultation stage of the Draft County Development Plan (or a subsequent variation process not limited to the 11 settlements and specific land parcels of Variation No. 5). It should be clarified that the lands being brought forward have been prioritised following a full and comprehensive Settlement Capacity Audit carried out in full compliance with the Development Plans Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2022.

Notwithstanding the above, the strategic matters raised regarding longer-term coordination between Drogheda and the East Meath settlements, transport-oriented development

## Part 3

---

opportunities and the need for settlement-level clarity are noted and will inform future plan-making, including the emerging strategic planning framework for the wider Drogheda area

### **Chief Executive Recommendation**

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-34: Smith Family (Brady Hughes Consulting)

#### **Summary of Submission:**

The submission welcomes the purpose of the Variation to implement the revised NPF housing targets but raises concerns regarding the methodology, transparency, and limited time horizon adopted.

The submission identifies the Smith Family landholding at Colpe as strategically located at the edge of Drogheda, located either side of the Dublin–Belfast rail line and adjacent to lands zoned White Lands. It refers to earlier engagement through the Drogheda Joint LAP process, advocating a strategic approach to housing and population growth, a transit-oriented development framework, and the potential delivery of additional rail/DART stations in the South Drogheda corridor.

The submission contends that Draft Variation No. 5 represents a short-term county-wide “top-up” that does not provide the settlement-based clarity advocated by the OPR. It argues that the Variation does not sufficiently demonstrate why specific lands were chosen, what alternatives were considered, and how settlement-level capacity and infrastructure constraints were balanced in deciding the zoning proposals.

The submission seeks a longer planning horizon to at least 2034/2035, improved settlement-level analysis and transparency in site selection, and designation of longer-term strategic development areas that provide certainty for coordinated infrastructure delivery. It also requests a strategic framework for managing the evolving relationship between Drogheda and East Meath settlements, including coalescence risk.

#### **Chief Executive Response**

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the strategic issues raised regarding longer-term planning for Drogheda’s southern environs and the wider Dublin–Belfast rail corridor. The Chief Executive also notes the submission’s references to earlier plan-making processes and the continuing interest of landowners in ensuring that growth is planned in a coordinated and evidence-led manner.

Draft Variation No. 5 is a targeted statutory variation intended to address revised housing growth requirements within the remaining lifetime of the current County Development Plan. It is not intended to establish a long-term settlement strategy for Drogheda or to designate long-term strategic development areas beyond the current plan period. Such matters are appropriately addressed through the statutory review and replacement of the County Development Plan and through strategic planning processes for the wider Drogheda functional area.

## Part 3

Submissions seeking additional/new rezoning should be made during the public consultation stage of the Draft County Development Plan (or a subsequent variation process not limited to the 11 settlements and defined land parcels of Variation No. 5). It should be clarified that the lands being brought forward have been prioritised following a full and comprehensive Settlement Capacity Audit carried out in full compliance with the Development Plans Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2022.

Notwithstanding the above, the Chief Executive notes the strategic matters raised (settlement-level clarity, planning horizon, transparency in site selection and transport-oriented planning) and confirms that these will be relevant considerations in future plan-making, including the next County Development Plan and coordinated planning for Drogheda.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-35: Burke Family (Brady Hughes Consulting)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission welcomes the Variation's general intent to align with the revised NPF housing growth requirements but contends that the quantum of land zoned in South Drogheda remains insufficient to meet the revised targets.

The submission identifies the Burke Family landholding within the Southern Environs of Drogheda (Bryanstown masterplan area) and states that the lands are serviceable and ready for development, with access and services available via adjoining residential development and existing networks. It notes that the lands were previously zoned for development prior to the 2023 High Court Order and seeks that residential zoning be restored in line with earlier zoning maps.

The submission identifies an imbalance between north and south of Drogheda stating that South Drogheda has under-delivered due to lack of appropriately located zoned lands and uncertainty arising from recent legal challenges. The submission argues that the current approach of limited short-term zoning may not provide sufficient certainty to unlock investment and delivery at scale.

The submission also raises issues relating to reliance on unclear delivery assumptions, insufficient settlement-level analysis and transparency in site selection, a short planning horizon to 2027, and the absence of long-term strategic development site identification. It requests a longer-term approach and prioritisation of South Drogheda for growth.

#### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and notes the concerns raised regarding the quantum of lands available for delivery in South Drogheda and the impacts of recent plan-making and legal context on delivery confidence.

Draft Variation No. 5 is a focused statutory response to revised national housing growth requirements, intended to identify a defined set of lands capable of contributing to housing

## Part 3

delivery within the remaining lifetime of the current Development Plan. It is not intended to operate as a wholesale rezoning exercise for South Drogheda or as a substitute for the strategic planning framework required for Drogheda as a Regional Growth Centre.

Submissions seeking additional/new rezonings should be made during the public consultation stage of the Draft County Development Plan (or a subsequent variation not limited to the 11 settlements and defined land parcels of Variation No. 5). It should be clarified that the lands being brought forward have been prioritised following a full and comprehensive Settlement Capacity Audit carried out in full compliance with the Development Plans Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2022.

Notwithstanding the above, the Chief Executive notes the submission's broader strategic points regarding delivery confidence, the need for longer-term certainty and the importance of coordinated planning for South Drogheda. These matters will be relevant to the preparation of the next County Development Plan and associated strategic planning for Drogheda.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-36: John Levins (Brady Hughes Consulting)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission welcomes the overall purpose of the Variation to align with the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines but argues that insufficient land is being brought forward in South Drogheda to meet the revised housing growth requirements.

The submission identifies the landholding as located within the existing settlement boundary of Drogheda and notes that it is currently largely zoned E2 – General Enterprise and Employment, with parts adjacent to existing residential development (including the Avourwen scheme). The submission proposes that a portion of these employment-zoned lands, particularly those contiguous with established residential areas, could be more appropriately rezoned for residential development in the short term.

It is contended that the existing employment designation may not be deliverable in the medium term because delivery of industrial/employment uses is linked to major road infrastructure (including a southern link road) which the submitter considers unlikely to progress in the near term. The submission asserts that residential development could proceed sooner and more sustainably, leveraging existing access and service networks and improving local road conditions.

The submission raises other issues in relation to short planning horizon to 2027, lack of settlement-level transparency, unclear delivery assumptions and absence of long-term strategic site identification. It requests a longer-term approach and a stronger focus on South Drogheda.

#### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and notes the site-specific issue raised regarding land currently zoned for employment uses adjoining established residential

## Part 3

development in South Drogheda. The Chief Executive also notes the broader strategic commentary concerning land supply, deliverability and the planning horizon of Draft Variation No. 5.

Draft Variation No. 5 is a targeted statutory response to revised housing growth requirements and is confined to the specific land parcels and amendments identified in the published draft. It is not intended to reassess or reconfigure employment land designations at settlement level, nor to identify new additional residential zonings beyond those included in the Draft Variation.

The appropriate mechanism for advancing submissions on lands outside of those that are the subject to this Variation is through the public consultation on the Draft County Development Plan (or a subsequent variation not limited to the 11 settlements and defined land parcels of Variation No. 5). It should be clarified that the lands being brought forward have been prioritised following a full and comprehensive Settlement Capacity Audit carried out in full compliance with the Development Plans Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2022.

Notwithstanding the above, the Chief Executive notes that the issues raised regarding land-use compatibility, deliverability and the relationship between employment zoning, infrastructure delivery and residential demand are relevant considerations for future plan-making and will be considered in that context.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-37: McNeece Family (Brady Hughes Consulting)

#### Summary of Submission:

The submission raises concerns regarding the methodology, transparency and strategic approach underpinning Draft Variation No. 5, with particular emphasis on South Drogheda. While the overall objective of the Variation to align with revised national housing targets is supported, the submission contends that the approach adopted is overly limited in scope and insufficient to meet long-term housing delivery requirements.

The submission highlights the significant landholding of the McNeece family within the Southern Environs of Drogheda, noting that these lands are contiguous with areas identified for residential zoning within the Variation and are similarly serviceable and capable of delivery. It is argued that the Variation fails to identify a sufficient quantum of lands in South Drogheda and does not adequately leverage the strategic role of Drogheda as a Regional Growth Centre.

A series of broader concerns are raised in relation to the evidential basis for the Settlement Capacity Audit, including reliance on delivery assumptions, lack of settlement-level analysis and absence of transparency in site selection. The submission also criticises the short-term planning horizon adopted, arguing that the failure to identify longer-term strategic development sites undermines certainty and investment.

#### Chief Executive Response

## Part 3

The Chief Executive acknowledges the strategic nature of the issues raised and the importance of Drogheda as a Regional Growth Centre within the settlement hierarchy. It is recognised that South Drogheda has significant potential to contribute to housing delivery over the medium to long term.

Draft Variation No. 5 is explicitly focused on addressing revised housing requirements within the remaining lifetime of the current Development Plan. The identification of lands is informed by the Settlement Capacity Audit, which applies a consistent, county-wide methodology emphasising short-term deliverability, infrastructure capacity and sequencing. The appropriate mechanism for advancing submissions on lands outside of those that are the subject to this Variation is through the public consultation on the Draft County Development Plan (or a subsequent variation not limited to the 11 settlements and defined land parcels of Variation No. 5).

The Variation does not represent a full review of development capacity in Drogheda, nor does it seek to identify all potential development lands within the settlement. Rather, it provides a targeted response to immediate delivery requirements. Broader issues relating to spatial strategy, settlement expansion and long-term development lands will be considered in the context of the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan and the Drogheda Joint Urban Area Plan.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-38: McGarrell Reilly Homes (McCutcheon Halley Planning Consultants)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission is made on behalf of McGarrell Reilly Homes and relates to Draft Variation No. 5 insofar as it applies to the settlement of Kilcock, and in particular the proposed activation of lands at Millerstown.

The submission welcomes and supports the proposed rezoning of approximately 6.81 hectares of land from A2 (Post-2027 / Phasing) to A2 New Residential. It is argued that this represents an appropriate, plan-led response to the revised housing requirements set out in the National Planning Framework First Revision and the associated Section 28 Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines.

The submissions raises concerns that the actual delivery capacity of the lands identified in Draft Variation No. 5 is overstated, due to constraints that are not fully reflected in the Settlement Capacity Audit. In particular, it is highlighted that a significant portion of the subject lands (circa 1.5ha) is required for surface water attenuation and flood storage, thereby reducing the net developable area and resulting housing yield compared to that assumed on a gross area basis.

The submission further argues that this issue is not unique to the Millerstown lands and reflects a broader limitation in the methodology of the Settlement Capacity Audit, which is perceived to rely on high-level gross land assumptions without adequately accounting for site-specific constraints, infrastructure requirements and net developable capacity.

## Part 3

In response, the submission proposes that additional lands within the wider Millerstown landholding be included for rezoning to A2 New Residential. It is stated that these lands are contiguous, in single ownership, serviced or serviceable, and demonstrably meet Tier 1 criteria under the Development Plan Guidelines and the NPF Implementation Guidelines. The submission also references an agreed Flood Risk Masterplan, confirming that significant additional areas fall within Flood Zone C and are therefore suitable for residential development.

The submission concludes that the inclusion of these additional lands would not alter the strategic direction of the Variation but would instead ensure that housing delivery targets for Kilcock can be achieved in practice, providing necessary flexibility (“headroom”) in line with Section 28 guidance.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive welcomes the submission’s support for the proposed rezoning of lands at Millerstown, Kilcock, and acknowledges the detailed and technically grounded nature of the issues raised.

The submission raises important considerations regarding the distinction between gross zoned land area and net developable capacity, and the extent to which site-specific constraints, including flood risk management infrastructure and drainage requirements, may reduce achievable housing yields. These issues are recognised as inherent to the planning and development process and are appropriately addressed at planning application stage, where detailed design, layout, infrastructure provision and site-specific Flood Risk Assessment are undertaken in accordance with national guidance.

Draft Variation No. 5 is informed by a Settlement Capacity Audit, which provides a high-level, strategic assessment of land supply across the county. As is standard practice in national guidance, such assessments are undertaken on a broad, comparative basis and are not intended to replicate the detailed, site-specific analysis that forms part of development management processes. The Section 28 Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines explicitly recognise that delivery assumptions will vary across sites and that not all zoned lands will be delivered in full.

In this context, the Chief Executive notes that the Variation has incorporated an appropriate level of flexibility (“headroom”) in the overall housing land supply framework, consistent with national guidance, to account for uncertainties relating to site activation and delivery. The projected housing yields identified in the variation are indicative only and not intended to be restrictive but more so to provide a guide to the development potential of lands. When calculating potential unit yields, gross:net site area ratio of 80:20 was applied to account for areas of land that are not developable.

With regard to the request to include additional lands within the wider Millerstown landholding, it is noted that such lands were not identified through the Settlement Capacity Audit process that underpins Draft Variation No. 5. The request to rezone additional lands outside of those proposed under this Variation should be made during the public consultation on the Draft County Development Plan (or a subsequent variation not limited to the 11 settlements and defined land parcels of Variation No. 5).

### Chief Executive Recommendation

## Part 3

---

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

Submission No. MH-C217-39: Jimmy Carroll (JSA Planning)

### Summary of Submission:

This submission relates to lands at Brownstown, Kentstown, extending to approximately 5.1 hectares. The submission seeks the rezoning of lands currently zoned “E2 General Enterprise and Employment” to “A2 New Residential” as part of Draft Variation No. 5.

The submission states that the existing E2 zoning is no longer appropriate or deliverable in the context of the subject site. The submission references a recent refusal of a commercial/enterprise development on the lands, in which the Planning Authority identified significant issues relating to traffic safety, road capacity and surface water management, arising from the scale and intensity of employment uses at this location.

It is argued that these constraints are inherently linked to the nature of employment uses and would not arise, or would arise to a significantly lesser extent, in the case of lower-intensity residential development. The submission contends that residential use would represent a more compatible and sustainable use of the lands, given their proximity to existing housing, village services and infrastructure.

The submission further emphasises that the lands are located within the settlement boundary of Kentstown, are in close proximity to the village centre, and are capable of delivering sequential, compact growth in line with national and regional planning policy. It is also stated that the lands are in single ownership and are available for development in the short term, thereby contributing to housing delivery within the lifetime of the Development Plan.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the applicant’s rationale for seeking the rezoning of lands at Kentstown from employment to residential use.

The submission raises site-specific issues regarding the appropriateness and deliverability of the current E2 employment zoning, particularly in light of the refusal of a recent planning application and the constraints identified therein. These matters are noted. However, Draft Variation No. 5 has been prepared within a clearly defined statutory and procedural framework.

The Variation is specifically intended to address identified housing land supply requirements through targeted amendments to the Development Plan, based on the findings of the Settlement Capacity Audit. Employment-zoned lands form a critical component of the Development Plan’s overall land use strategy, supporting economic development, job creation and balanced settlement growth. Any reassessment of the role, distribution or quantum of such lands requires a plan-wide strategic review, including consideration of employment needs, economic policy objectives and settlement hierarchy.

Notwithstanding the above, the Chief Executive acknowledges that the lands are located within the settlement boundary and that the issues raised regarding land-use compatibility and deliverability are relevant to future plan-making. These matters can be appropriately considered

## Part 3

through the forthcoming review of the County Development Plan, where a comprehensive reassessment of settlement zoning, including both residential and employment lands, will be undertaken.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-41: Julianstown & District Community Association

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission is made by the Julianstown & District Community Association and relates to the proposed rezoning of lands within East Meath and South Drogheda under Draft Variation No. 5.

The submission raises significant concerns regarding existing traffic congestion in Julianstown, which is described as already operating under severe pressure, with in excess of 23,000 vehicles passing through the village daily. It is argued that this level of traffic has resulted in ongoing environmental and amenity impacts, including increased noise, air pollution and degradation of the village environment.

The submission acknowledges that proposals exist for a bypass of Julianstown but emphasises that there is no confirmed delivery timeline and that progress has been slow despite the issue being longstanding. On this basis, the submission asserts that the zoning of additional residential lands in East Meath and South Drogheda will exacerbate existing traffic congestion and associated environmental impacts.

#### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the concerns raised in relation to traffic congestion in Julianstown and the potential cumulative impact of additional residential development on the local and regional road network.

Transport infrastructure capacity and congestion are recognised as critical considerations in the planning and development process, particularly in areas experiencing sustained population growth. The issues raised in relation to Julianstown reflect long-standing infrastructural challenges, which are being addressed through ongoing national, regional and local transport planning processes, including proposals for strategic road improvements.

Draft Variation No. 5 has been prepared having regard to the Settlement Capacity Audit and Tiered Approach to Zoning, which consider infrastructure capacity at a strategic level in identifying lands capable of contributing to housing delivery within the lifetime of the Development Plan. It is not within the scope of the Variation to sequence or defer zoning contingent on the delivery of individual infrastructure projects, such as specific bypasses, nor to impose a moratorium on development within particular geographical areas.

The Chief Executive notes that transport impacts arising from development proposals will be subject to robust assessment at planning application stage, including Traffic and Transport Assessments and, where appropriate, Environmental Impact Assessment. Such assessments will

## Part 3

ensure that development is appropriately phased and that mitigation measures are implemented to address traffic impacts.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-43: Gem Construction (JSA Planning)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission relates to lands at Dunshaughlin, comprising approximately 7.72 hectares currently zoned F1 – Open Space, located to the south-eastern edge of the town adjoining the Dunshaughlin Outer Relief Road and the recently developed Willows / Dunshaughlin East residential area. The primary request of the submission is to rezone the subject lands from F1 – Open Space to A2 – New Residential, on the basis that the lands are sequential, serviced and available for development in the short term.

The submission highlights that the lands:

- are contiguous with existing and permitted residential development, including The Willows and the Dunshaughlin East SHD/LRD scheme;
- benefit from significant prior infrastructure investment, including the delivery of the Dunshaughlin Outer Relief Road and associated services;
- are in the ownership of an active housebuilder with a demonstrable track record of delivery;
- are well served by public transport and social infrastructure, including schools, childcare, retail and community facilities; and
- are capable of delivering housing within the lifetime of the current Development Plan, contributing to increased housing targets under the NPF Implementation Guidelines.

A key argument advanced is that the existing F1 zoning is no longer appropriate, as the lands are considered surplus to open space requirements, given the extensive provision of parks, playing pitches and recreational facilities already delivered within the surrounding area. It is contended that retaining the lands as open space would result in the under-utilisation of a strategically located site within an established growth area.

The submission also raises broader issues regarding Draft Variation No. 5, including:

- that the Settlement Capacity Audit does not sufficiently consider all available serviced lands, focusing instead on sites already identified;
- that the current zoning proposals in Dunshaughlin are insufficient to meet housing demand and delivery requirements;
- that the approach to prohibiting new zoning submissions is overly restrictive and not consistent with national policy intent; and
- that planning authorities are required under the Section 28 Guidelines to consider the zoning of alternative lands where existing zoned lands may not come forward during the plan period.

## Part 3

The submission concludes that the subject lands represent a logical extension of the existing urban area, meet the criteria for Tier 1 serviced lands, and should be rezoned to facilitate housing delivery in accordance with national policy objectives.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the detailed planning rationale provided in support of the proposed rezoning of lands at Dunshaughlin.

The submission identifies characteristics of the subject lands, including their location within the settlement boundary, adjacency to existing residential development, and availability of infrastructure, which are relevant considerations in assessing land suitability for development. The Chief Executive also acknowledges the role of the applicant as an active developer in the area and the contribution of recent development to housing delivery within Dunshaughlin.

However, Draft Variation No. 5 has been prepared within a defined statutory framework and is based on a Settlement Capacity Audit (SCA) which applies a consistent, county-wide methodology to identify lands suitable for activation within the remaining lifetime of the Development Plan in line with national guidance.

The Chief Executive notes the submission's reference to the Section 28 Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines, including the requirement to consider deliverability and the potential need to identify alternative lands where existing zoned lands may not be activated. These matters have been addressed at a strategic level through the Settlement Capacity Audit, which underpins the Draft Variation.

The request to include additional lands beyond those identified in Variation 5 for rezoning should be made during the public consultation stage of the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan or any potential subsequent variation that may have a broader scope to that of Variation No.5

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-44: Eileen Kelly (Brady Hughes Consulting)

#### Summary of Submission:

The submission identifies a landholding of approximately 8.5 hectares at Donacarney, which is described as strategically located adjacent to the existing settlement and within the Drogheda–East Meath functional urban area. It emphasises the long-standing engagement of the landowner in the plan-making process and highlights previous submissions seeking recognition of the strategic growth potential of the East Meath area.

The submission raises concerns that the Variation:

- relies on unclear delivery assumptions,
- does not provide a comprehensive settlement-level analysis,
- lacks transparency in site selection,

## Part 3

- adopts a short-term planning horizon to 2027, and
- fails to identify long-term strategic development lands.

The submission states that the Drogheda–East Meath functional area should be planned as an integrated growth area, particularly in light of its strategic location and potential future rail investment.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the longstanding interest of the landowner in the planning and development of Donacarney and the wider East Meath area.

Draft Variation No. 5 is a targeted statutory response to revised national housing growth requirements and is focused on identifying lands capable of contributing to housing delivery within the remaining lifetime of the current Development Plan.

To the extent that the submission seeks the rezoning of lands not included within Draft Variation No. 5 as published, such proposals should be made during the consultation stage of the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan. The lands proposed to be rezoned under Variation No. 5 have been identified following a comprehensive county wide Settlement Capacity Audit prioritising serviced lands in full compliance with the requirements of national guidelines.

Notwithstanding this, the Chief Executive acknowledges that the strategic issues raised regarding the planning of Drogheda and East Meath as a functional urban area are valid considerations and will be addressed through future plan-making processes, including the next County Development Plan and any relevant strategic planning frameworks including the forthcoming Joint Urban Area Plan for Drogheda.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-45: Eileen Kelly (Brady Hughes Consulting)

#### Summary of Submission:

This second submission on behalf of Eileen Kelly reiterates and expands upon the strategic planning concerns raised in Submission MH-C217-44, with a particular emphasis on the quantum and distribution of residential zoning and the need for a more transparent and long-term approach.

The submission identifies a larger landholding (circa 23ha) linking Donacarney and Bettystown, and argues that the Variation fails to adequately recognise the capacity of the East Meath area to accommodate additional growth.

It raises concerns including:

- reliance on high-level delivery assumptions,
- absence of settlement-level analysis,
- lack of transparency in site selection,
- short-term planning horizon,

## Part 3

- and failure to identify long-term strategic development sites.

The submission also advocates for a “call for sites” approach, improved engagement, and a coordinated strategic framework for Drogheda–East Meath, including transport-oriented development linked to rail infrastructure.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and notes that it expands upon the strategic concerns raised in the earlier submission, including issues relating to transparency, methodology and long-term planning.

As previously set out, Draft Variation No. 5 is focused on short-term land activation within the current Development Plan period and does not seek to identify all potential lands capable of contributing to longer-term growth, nor to redesign the spatial strategy for the Drogheda–East Meath area. To the extent that the submission seeks the rezoning of lands not included within Draft Variation No. 5 as published, such proposals should be made during the consultation stage of the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan.

The Settlement Capacity Audit provides a consistent county-wide methodology for identifying lands suitable for zoning within the scope of the Variation. The inclusion of additional lands at this stage would extend the Variation beyond that defined scope.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-46: Margaret Joyce (Local Traveller Community Group)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission is made on behalf of a local community group in Navan and relates to Proposed Amendment No. 3 (Navan Land Use Zoning Map Sheets), with particular reference to the proposed approach to higher residential densities in Navan, including lands adjacent to future rail stations and lands to be released post-2027.

The submission objects to the introduction of increased high-density zoning in Navan, expressing concern that the approach to compact growth and densities of approximately 50 dwellings per hectare would facilitate an increased prevalence of 3–5 storey apartment blocks, duplexes and multi-storey building forms. It is argued that this development pattern would not adequately reflect the needs of local communities and would reduce the availability of family housing formats.

A central concern raised is that higher density housing typologies may not provide sufficiently for households with specific accommodation needs, including older persons, persons with disabilities and families who require ground floor accommodation. The submission requests that development planning in Navan should ensure provision for a mix of housing types, including ground-floor units and family homes, rather than an over-reliance on apartments.

### Chief Executive Response

## Part 3

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the concerns raised regarding housing typology, housing mix and the suitability of different dwelling formats to meet diverse household needs within Navan.

Draft Variation No. 5 has been prepared to implement revised housing growth requirements and to ensure that sufficient serviced and deliverable lands are available within the lifetime of the current Development Plan. The approach to residential density within Navan is intended to support compact growth and the efficient use of serviced lands in accessible locations, consistent with national and regional planning policy.

It is important to clarify that the identification of higher density ranges or compact growth locations does not mandate a single housing type (e.g., apartments only). Development Plan policies and objectives are intended to enable an appropriate mix of typologies—houses, duplexes, apartments and specialist accommodation—depending on site context, design, infrastructure and housing need within a particular settlement or catchment area of a proposed development site. The delivery of a balanced housing mix, including accessible and adaptable homes, is addressed through the Development Plan’s wider housing and placemaking policy framework and through development management at planning application stage.

Accordingly, while the submission’s concerns are noted, the Chief Executive is satisfied that the Development Plan which includes a suite of detailed development management standards in line with national planning policy and guidelines provides the appropriate mechanisms to ensure that new residential development in Navan delivers a suitable mix of unit types and provides for accessibility needs, while also meeting compact growth objectives in appropriate locations.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

Submission No. MH-C217-47: Anthony Donnelly (on behalf of Proudstown Landowners) Jim Flood, Andrew Flood, Tadhg Donnelly

### Summary of Submission:

This submission is made on behalf of landowners at Proudstown, Navan and relates to Draft Variation No. 5, in particular the Core Strategy update and Navan zoning proposals. The submission welcomes the overall intent of the Variation, including alignment with the National Planning Framework First Revision, updated housing targets and the bringing forward of A2 Post-2027 lands.

The submission raises a concern in relation to the assumption of a 70% delivery rate for extant planning permissions on A2 zoned lands, which underpins the housing capacity calculations. The submission contends that this assumption may be overly optimistic and suggests that historic completion rates are likely closer to 40–50%, and that a more evidence-based approach should be applied to ensure an accurate assessment of housing supply.

In relation to Navan, the submission welcomes the proposal to bring forward 26.37 hectares of residential lands but highlights the need to consider longer-term strategic land requirements beyond the current plan period. In this regard, the lands at Proudstown are identified as a

## Part 3

strategically located landholding contiguous to existing and emerging development, including SDZ lands.

The submission seeks ongoing engagement with the Planning Authority regarding the future strategic planning role of lands at Proudstown, particularly in the context of longer-term growth and post-2027 land supply.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and welcomes its support for the overall objectives of Draft Variation No. 5.

In relation to the assumption of a 70% completion rate for extant permissions, this figure forms part of the strategic methodology applied within the Settlement Capacity Audit informed by an independent study undertaken by JSA Planning and is intended to provide a reasonable and consistent basis for assessing likely delivery across all settlements. The Chief Executive notes the submission's suggestion that lower historic completion rates may apply in certain circumstances.

It is further noted that the Variation incorporates an element of additional headroom in line with the Section 28 Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines, which provides a degree of flexibility to account for variability in delivery rates.

With regard to the identification of lands at Proudstown, Draft Variation No. 5 is a targeted intervention focused on the activation of lands within the existing Development Plan framework, rather than the identification of new long-term strategic growth areas. The inclusion of additional lands beyond those identified in the Variation should be proposed during the public consultation stage of the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan or subsequent Variation that may have a broader scope to that of Variation No.5.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-49: Glenveagh Homes Ltd (JSA Planning)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission relates to Proposed Amendment No. 2 concerning lands within the Southern Environs of Drogheda, specifically the proposed rezoning of lands at Rathmullan Road.

The submission welcomes Draft Variation No. 5, including the increase in Core Strategy housing targets and the zoning of additional lands to support delivery in the short term. The submission supports the proposal to rezone approximately 4.5 hectares of 'White Lands' to A2 – New Residential, noting that these lands:

- are contiguous with existing residential development,
- are located within a highly accessible and serviced urban area, and
- are capable of delivering housing in the short term.

## Part 3

It is stated that the lands are Tier 1 serviced lands and that Glenveagh Homes is actively progressing an LRD planning application which would facilitate early delivery of housing on the site.

The submission also supports the broader Core Strategy revisions, including the application of a 50% headroom allowance, and welcomes the identification of additional lands in the southern environs of Drogheda to meet increased housing demand.

The submission requests that the Planning Authority retain the proposed rezoning of these lands in the final Variation, noting their importance in contributing to housing delivery within the lifetime of the Development Plan.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and welcomes its support for Draft Variation No. 5, including the proposed rezoning of lands within the Southern Environs of Drogheda.

The proposed rezoning of lands at Rathmullan Road from 'White Lands' to A2 – New Residential forms part of the strategic response of Draft Variation No. 5 to revised housing growth requirements, having regard to the Settlement Capacity Audit, the tiered approach to zoning and the need to identify lands capable of delivering housing within the plan period.

The Chief Executive notes the submission's support for the inclusion of these lands and the intention of the applicant to bring forward development in the short term. The deliverability of lands, including landownership and development activity, is a relevant consideration in identifying sites suitable for activation.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

## Submission No. MH-C217-50: Cairn Homes Properties Ltd (Declan Brassil)

### Summary of Submission:

This submission relates to Proposed Amendments Nos. 01, 02 and 03 Navan, including the Masterplan areas MP8 and MP13.

The submission welcomes Draft Variation No. 5, and in particular the proposal to redesignate 26.37 hectares of lands from Phase 2 (Post-2027) to A2 – New Residential, which is considered critical in facilitating housing delivery at pace and scale. The submission outlines the significant level of development already delivered or underway by Cairn Homes within Navan and highlights the potential for substantial additional housing yield on their landholdings.

A key element of the submission is the request to further amend the zoning boundaries of the proposed amendments, based on updated Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) mapping. It is argued that revised hydraulic modelling of the River Swan system indicates that certain lands currently zoned F1 – Open Space fall within Flood Zone C, and are therefore suitable for residential development.

## Part 3

The submission proposes that additional lands (circa 5 hectares) be rezoned to residential, which could deliver additional housing yield, while maintaining appropriate flood risk management and riparian buffers.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and welcomes its support for Draft Variation No. 5.

The submission raises detailed technical matters regarding flood risk assessment and zoning boundary refinement, based on updated modelling undertaken on behalf of the applicant. The Chief Executive notes the significance of ensuring that land use zoning is fully aligned with the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and the principles of the Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines.

Draft Variation No. 5 is informed by an updated SFRA prepared to support the Variation, and zoning boundaries have been defined having regard to a precautionary approach to flood risk, including the application of the sequential approach and the avoidance of inappropriate development within areas at risk.

While the submission identifies potential opportunities to reconfigure zoning boundaries based on site-specific modelling, the Chief Executive is satisfied, as confirmed in the OPR's submission, that the proposed zonings will ensure an adequate and robust housing supply pipeline. The retention of the F1 zoning is fundamental to ensure that future communities have access to high quality and functional public open space in line with the principles of good placemaking. As such, no further zoning adjustments to the Variation lands is not required.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-51: Paul Morrin (Avison Young)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission provides a detailed strategic assessment of Draft Variation No. 5, with a particular focus on the approach to accommodating increased housing growth requirements in Dunshaughlin.

The submission supports the overall intent of the Variation but raises concerns regarding its scope and effectiveness, particularly in relation to the scale and spatial distribution of lands identified for residential development. It is argued that the Variation relies primarily on the activation of previously zoned lands and does not identify sufficient additional lands to meet the scale of population growth now envisaged.

The submission emphasises the importance of an infrastructure-led and transport-oriented approach to development, with particular reference to the proposed Navan rail line and associated infrastructure. It identifies the south-western quadrant of Dunshaughlin as a strategically optimal location for future growth, having regard to accessibility, infrastructure capacity and the potential for compact, sustainable development

## Part 3

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the detailed strategic analysis provided.

The issues raised in the submission, including the relationship between land use zoning and infrastructure provision, the role of transport-oriented development, and the identification of optimal growth areas within Dunshaughlin, are noted as important considerations in long-term spatial and land use planning.

Draft Variation No. 5 is, however, focused on prioritising lands capable of immediate delivery over the remainder of the Plan period and that are serviced or serviceable. The broader strategic matters raised in the submission, including the identification of additional lands and the alignment of development with planned infrastructure such as the rail line and distributor road, will be more appropriately considered as part of the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan..

The Chief Executive notes that the analysis provided in the submission represents a useful contribution to the evidence base and will be taken into consideration in informing future plan-making processes.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-52: Alanna Homes

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission, made by Alanna Homes, relates to lands at Bonestown, located to the north of Dunshaughlin, and seeks a change in zoning from RA (Rural Area) to a mixed-use zoning comprising residential, employment and community uses.

The submission sets out a rationale based on the proximity of the lands to the existing built-up area of the town and their accessibility to existing transport infrastructure. It is contended that the lands represent a logical extension of the settlement and are suitable for development in accordance with the sequential approach.

The submission further promotes a “live-work” development model, whereby residential and employment uses would be co-located to reduce commuting demand and support sustainable patterns of development. It is also suggested that the lands could facilitate the provision of supporting infrastructure, including public open space and road connections, thereby contributing positively to the development of the town.

The submission requests that the lands be rezoned accordingly as part of Draft Variation No. 5.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the detailed proposal for the development of the subject lands.

## Part 3

Draft Variation No. 5 is underpinned by the Settlement Capacity Audit and is focused on prioritising the activation of lands that are already zoned or identified within the existing Development Plan.

The submission proposes the rezoning of lands currently zoned RA – Rural Area to A2 – New Residential and Employment which would be more appropriately considered in the context of the next County Development Plan review, which will provide an opportunity for a full reassessment of settlement boundaries and zoning strategy over a longer-term horizon.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-53: Morrin Family (TPA Planning Consultants)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission relates to lands at Cooksland, Dunshaughlin, comprising approximately 11.6 hectares, and seeks their rezoning from RA (Rural Area) to A2 (New Residential) to facilitate the delivery of a substantial residential scheme.

The submission sets out a detailed planning rationale, emphasising the proximity of the lands to the town centre, their accessibility and their potential to deliver a significant number of residential units in support of increased housing targets. It is contended that the lands represent a natural and sequential extension of the settlement and are not subject to significant environmental or infrastructural constraints.

The submission further argues that the Settlement Capacity Audit underpinning Draft Variation No. 5 is overly restrictive in its scope and does not adequately consider alternative lands within Dunshaughlin. It is submitted that insufficient lands have been identified for residential zoning to meet revised housing targets and that additional lands, including the subject site, should be brought forward.

#### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the comprehensive planning analysis provided.

Draft Variation No. 5 has been prepared in accordance with national policy requirements and is focused on facilitating housing delivery within the remaining lifetime of the current Development Plan. The approach adopted is based on the activation of existing zoned lands and is informed by the Settlement Capacity Audit, which provides a consistent framework for assessing land suitability across all settlements.

In relation to the issues raised regarding the scope of the Settlement Capacity Audit and the adequacy of land supply, the Chief Executive notes that the SCA was carried out in full compliance with the requirements of national guidance and analysed all available lands across the county. As confirmed by the OPR's submission, the Variation will ensure a robust and adequate housing pipeline. The Chief Executive further acknowledges that the subject lands may form part of the

## Part 3

---

longer-term development potential of Dunshaughlin; however, their consideration should be addressed through the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan.

### **Chief Executive Recommendation**

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-54: Patricia Thorpe

#### **Summary of Submission:**

This submission relates to lands at Kilcarn, Navan and seeks their rezoning from RA Rural Area to A2 New Residential as part of Draft Variation No. 5. The submission emphasises the strategic role of Navan as a Key Town within the Core Region, noting its function as a major employment, service and growth centre within County Meath and the wider Dublin Metropolitan hinterland.

The submission sets out a number of general planning principles which, it is argued, should underpin residential zoning, including the requirement that lands are sequentially located, capable of being serviced, proximate to social and physical infrastructure, and capable of supporting sustainable movement patterns. It is submitted that the subject lands satisfy these criteria and represent a suitable and logical location for residential expansion of the town.

Accordingly, it is requested that the Planning Authority give consideration to the zoning of the lands for residential development having regard to the need to accommodate population growth and support sustainable urban development in Navan.

#### **Chief Executive Response**

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the supporting commentary regarding the strategic role of Navan as a Key Town within the settlement hierarchy.

Draft Variation No. 5 has been prepared as a targeted variation to the Meath County Development Plan in response to updated housing growth requirements arising from the National Planning Framework Implementation Guidelines. The variation is informed by a Settlement Capacity Audit, which applies a consistent and evidence-based methodology to identify lands capable of contributing to housing delivery within the remaining lifetime of the current Development Plan.

In this context, the approach adopted in the Draft Variation is focused on the activation of lands already identified within the Development Plan framework, including the bringing forward of lands previously subject to phasing restrictions. Collectively, the proposed variation lands will ensure an adequate housing delivery pipeline and additional lands are therefore not required over the remainder of the Plan Period. Proposals seeking rezoning of additional lands should be raised during the consultation period of the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan or a subsequent variation that may have a broader scope than that of this Variation.

Notwithstanding this, the Chief Executive acknowledges that the subject lands may form part of the longer-term growth strategy for Navan. These matters will be more appropriately considered in the context of the forthcoming review of the County Development Plan, where a

## Part 3

---

comprehensive reassessment of zoning, settlement capacity and infrastructure provision will be undertaken.

### **Chief Executive Recommendation**

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

Submission No. MH-C217-55: Margaret Joyce

### **Summary of Submission:**

This submission raises concerns regarding the potential impact of increased residential density and compact growth policies on local communities.

The submission highlights perceived negative implications associated with higher-density development, including potential impacts on quality of life, housing suitability, social equity and community cohesion. It is argued that insufficient consideration is being given to the needs of existing communities, including families, older persons and persons with disabilities.

The submission emphasises the need for a balanced approach to zoning and density, and calls for greater consideration of community needs, housing mix and fairness in the allocation and distribution of housing.

### **Chief Executive Response**

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the concerns raised regarding housing typology, housing mix and the suitability of different dwelling formats to meet diverse household needs of communities.

Draft Variation No. 5 has been prepared to implement revised housing growth requirements and to ensure that sufficient serviced and deliverable lands are available within the lifetime of the current Development Plan. The approach to residential density is intended to support compact growth and the efficient use of serviced lands in accessible locations, consistent with national and regional planning policy.

It is important to clarify that the identification of higher density ranges or compact growth locations does not mandate a single housing type (e.g., apartments only). The delivery of a balanced housing mix, including accessible and adaptable homes, is addressed through the Development Plan's wider housing and placemaking policy framework and through development management at planning application stage.

Accordingly, while the submission's concerns are noted, the Chief Executive is satisfied that the Development Plan which includes a suite of detailed development management standards in line with national planning policy and guidelines provides the appropriate mechanisms to ensure that new residential development delivers a suitable mix of unit types and provides for accessibility needs, while also meeting compact growth objectives in appropriate locations.

### **Chief Executive Recommendation**

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

## Part 3

---

Submission No. MH-C217-56: Withdrawn

Submission No. MH-C217-57: Margaret Joyce

### Summary of Submission:

This submission is made in respect of Draft Variation No. 5 and is framed as a countywide observation on the proposed rezoning objectives across the settlements identified in the Variation. The submission acknowledges the policy basis for compact growth and the need to respond to the National Planning Framework's updated housing targets but raises concerns about the potential impacts of higher density zoning on existing communities and quality of life.

The submission emphasises the importance of "balance" in the implementation of compact growth and argues that higher density living may not suit all household types and community circumstances. It expresses concern that zoning decisions can influence fairness and accessibility, including who can live in particular areas, and raises issues relating to social equity, housing suitability and potential downstream impacts on community cohesion.

The submission requests that, while implementing national objectives for compact growth and increased housing delivery, the Planning Authority should have greater regard to the needs of established communities and ensure that density policies do not result in exclusion or unintended social impacts. It also references proposed text changes to the Development Plan's compact growth section to reflect national policy objectives.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the concerns expressed regarding the relationship between compact growth policies, density, housing mix, and community well-being.

Draft Variation No. 5 seeks to ensure that the County Development Plan is aligned with revised national housing growth requirements and the associated emphasis on compact, sequential development patterns. The national policy framework underpinning this Variation places strong weight on making efficient use of serviced lands and directing growth to accessible locations within existing settlements.

It is important to note that development management standards that are contained within the Development Plan are intended to support the delivery of an appropriate mix of dwelling types, subject to site context, design standards and the objective of creating high-quality, liveable neighbourhoods. Matters relating to the detailed housing mix, unit type distribution, accessibility, and residential amenity are addressed through the Development Plan's wider policy framework and are assessed at development management stage.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

## Part 3

Submission No. MH-C217-58: Castlethorn (SLA Planning)

### Summary of Submission:

This submission is made on behalf of Castlethorn and relates to lands at Dunshaughlin. The submission supports the removal of the Phase II – Post 2027 designation on two parcels of lands in Dunshaughlin as proposed under Draft Variation No. 5, but seeks additional amendments in respect of further lands under Castlethorn’s control.

In particular, the submission requests that a residual “island” of A2 – New Residential zoned lands (referred to as Plot A) located between the two parcels being brought forward should also have the Phase II – Post 2027 restriction removed, to avoid a disjointed pattern of development and to allow for a comprehensive and coherent expansion of the urban area. The submission also seeks reinstatement of A2 – New Residential zoning on additional lands (Plot B) which it states were previously zoned residential in an earlier plan period but subsequently downzoned.

A technical note prepared by Waterman Moylan accompanies the submission and focuses on serviceability and flood risk matters. The technical note asserts that Plot A and Plot B are readily serviceable (roads, foul and surface drainage, and water supply) and notes that flood mapping has been updated in the Variation SFRA such that Plot A is no longer shown to be subject to flooding, which the submission contends removes the basis for retaining open space zoning in parts of the landholding.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and notes its support for the proposed activation of lands in Dunshaughlin under Draft Variation No. 5, including the removal of Phase II – Post 2027 restrictions on certain parcels.

The submission seeks additional changes beyond those published in the Draft Variation, including (i) removal of Phase II – Post 2027 restrictions on further lands (Plot A) and (ii) the reinstatement of residential zoning on lands previously downzoned (Plot B).

Draft Variation No. 5 is a targeted statutory response, informed by the Settlement Capacity Audit process, and is confined to the lands identified through that assessment methodology. While the submission advances arguments relating to serviceability, planning history and deliverability, the inclusion of additional lands outside the Draft Variation should be brought forward during the public consultation stage of the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan or a subsequent variation that may have a broader scope to that of Variation No.5.

The Chief Executive notes the technical matters raised regarding serviceability and flood mapping. The Variation’s supporting environmental documentation, including the SFRA, provides the strategic basis for zoning proposals within the Draft Variation. The submission’s supporting technical documentation will be noted; however, detailed site-specific design, servicing and flood risk matters are appropriately addressed through the development management process, including site-specific Flood Risk Assessment where required.

Notwithstanding the above, the Chief Executive acknowledges that the issues raised regarding phasing, sequencing and delivery potential in Dunshaughlin are relevant to future plan-making,

## Part 3

and can be considered as part of the next County Development Plan review where a broader and longer-term assessment of settlement growth and land supply will be undertaken.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-59: Manley Construction Ltd

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission relates to lands at The Spires, Duleek, extending to approximately 5.57 hectares and welcomes the rezoning of PA01 Duleek. The submission notes that the lands were previously zoned A2 residential but were de-zoned in a prior plan cycle to open space, and requests that the entire landholding be rezoned to A2 – New Residential as part of Draft Variation No. 5.

The submission states that only a portion of the landholding is proposed to be rezoned under the Draft Variation and argues that PA01 Duleek should be extended to incorporate the full site. It outlines a development concept including 142no. housing units, a crèche, a public park, community garden and recreational facilities, and indicates that preparatory engagement has previously occurred in the context of SHD discussions.

The submission contends that the lands constitute Tier 1 serviced lands, being within the development footprint of Duleek and contiguous to established housing, with access to services. It emphasises the need to optimise serviced lands to address housing demand and to support compact growth within an established urban settlement.

#### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the request that the full landholding at Duleek be rezoned to A2 – New Residential.

Draft Variation No. 5 has been prepared based on a Settlement Capacity Audit and associated strategic assessment of lands capable of contributing to housing delivery within the remaining lifetime of the current Development Plan. The rezoning proposals contained within the Draft Variation reflect the outcome of that assessment process.

The submission seeks an amendment to expand the extent of lands proposed for rezoning beyond what is included in the Draft Variation as published. As reaffirmed by the OPR in their submission, the Proposed Variation lands will ensure a robust and adequate housing supply pipeline and as such additional lands are not required at this juncture.

The Chief Executive notes the submission's stated intention to progress development and the general principle of prioritising serviced and sequential lands. However, the Draft Variation is confined to the lands identified through the detailed SCA assessment process. The broader question of additional land supply in Duleek, and any reconsideration of previous de-zonings, is more appropriately addressed through the next County Development Plan review.

#### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

## Part 3

---

Submission No. MH-C217-60: Grange Rath CLG

### Summary of Submission:

This submission is made by Grange Rath CLG in relation to the proposed rezoning of a particular parcel of land. The submission acknowledges that, in principle, residential development may align with national and regional policy objectives, but objects to the rezoning of PA01 Southern Environs of Drogheda.

The submission asserts that the site selection appears unsupported by transparent methodology and requests clarification regarding the criteria applied, alternative sites considered, and the evidence demonstrating the need for additional housing at that location. It further contends that insufficient assessment has been presented regarding physical and social infrastructure capacity, including roads, active travel, schools, community facilities, utilities and flood risk.

The submission also raises concerns that the rezoning may conflict with compact growth principles by facilitating peripheral expansion, and argues that more sustainable alternative sites (including infill or centrally located lands) should be prioritised. Additional concerns are raised regarding adjacency to railway infrastructure and the absence of referenced consultation with Iarnród Éireann.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the concerns raised regarding transparency of site selection, infrastructure capacity and alignment with compact growth and sequential development principles.

Draft Variation No. 5 is informed by a fully robust and comprehensive Settlement Capacity Audit that was carried out in line with national guidance and involved consultation with relevant utility providers. The Draft Variation identifies lands considered suitable for activation within the plan period having regard to servicing, deliverability and settlement strategy considerations at a strategic level. Detailed project-level matters, including site-specific transport assessment, infrastructure delivery and interface with railway infrastructure, are addressed through development management processes and statutory consultation requirements at planning application stage.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

Submission No. MH-C217-62: Loughcrew Developments (JSA Planning)

### Summary of Submission:

This submission relates to lands at Connaught Street, Athboy. It seeks (i) the rezoning of approximately 3.3 hectares of lands from F1 Open Space to A2 New Residential, and (ii) the

## Part 3

extension of the settlement boundary to include a further 5.9 hectares to be zoned as Strategic Reserve.

The submission argues that the lands are well located, contiguous to the existing built-up area, and either serviced or serviceable, and therefore represent Tier 1 and Tier 2 lands capable of contributing to both short-term and longer-term housing supply.

It is further contended that the Settlement Capacity Audit underpinning Draft Variation No. 5 has not fully considered all available lands within Athboy and that a broader assessment is required to ensure adequate land supply over both the current and future plan periods.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the request to rezone lands and extend the settlement boundary at Connaught Street, Athboy.

Draft Variation No. 5 is a targeted variation aimed at addressing housing supply within the lifetime of the current Development Plan. The approach adopted is based on a Settlement Capacity Audit process, which provides a consistent framework for identifying lands capable of contributing to housing delivery. The SCA is a countywide audit that was carried out in line with the recommendations of national guidance.

The submission proposes additional zoning and an extension of the settlement boundary, which should be raised during the public consultation period of the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan or subsequent Variation that may have a broader scope to that of Proposed Variation No.5.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-63: Michael Ryan (KPMG Planning)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission, prepared by KPMG Planning on behalf of Mr. Michael Ryan, relates to lands at Maydenhayes, Donacarney Little, Mornington, within the East Meath settlement cluster. It supports the zoning approach set out in Draft Variation No. 5, which proposes a combination of residential and community infrastructure zoning for the subject lands.

The submission highlights the established planning history of the lands, noting that they form part of a larger phased residential development where earlier phases have been constructed and occupied, and where enabling infrastructure (including drainage, water supply and internal road network) was designed and delivered on a comprehensive basis to serve the overall landholding.

It is argued that the subject lands represent a logical and sequential continuation of an existing residential neighbourhood, rather than an isolated greenfield site, and that they are well positioned in terms of access, servicing and integration with the surrounding settlement structure. The submission also emphasises the deliverability of the lands, stating that they are capable of

## Part 3

being brought forward in the short term and align with the Variation's objective of identifying lands that can contribute to housing delivery within the plan period.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and its support for the zoning approach set out in Draft Variation No. 5 in respect of the subject lands.

The Draft Variation has been informed by a Settlement Capacity Audit and associated strategic assessment, with a focus on identifying lands that are serviced or serviceable and capable of contributing to housing delivery within the lifetime of the current Development Plan.

The lands at Maydenhayes form part of an established and partially developed residential area and are proposed for a combination of residential and community infrastructure uses under the Variation. The Chief Executive notes the submission's emphasis on the planning history, infrastructure provision and deliverability of the lands, which are consistent with the criteria applied in the selection of lands under the Variation.

The inclusion of land for community infrastructure alongside residential zoning reflects the need to ensure that supporting facilities are provided in tandem with residential growth, in line with sustainable community objectives.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-66: Paul Murray (Shay Scanlon Architect)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission, prepared on behalf of Mr. Paul Murray, seeks the rezoning of circa 5.6 hectares of land at Sheephouse, Donore, within the Southern Environs of Drogheda, from E1 Strategic Employment to A2 Residential. The lands are located to the immediate south east of PA02.

The submission contends that the lands have remained undeveloped for employment use for a prolonged period and that there is limited prospect of such development occurring. It argues that the lands are well located, serviced or serviceable, and contiguous to lands proposed for residential rezoning under Draft Variation No. 5, thereby representing a logical and sequential extension of the settlement.

It is further argued that the rezoning would support compact growth, improve housing supply, and address a perceived shortfall in deliverable residential land within the Southern Environs of Drogheda, particularly in light of recent planning and legal developments affecting land availability.

#### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the request to rezone lands at Sheephouse from E1 Strategic Employment to A2 New Residential.

## Part 3

Draft Variation No. 5 is based on a Settlement Capacity Audit which identifies lands capable of contributing to housing delivery within the plan period. The Variation does not provide for the consideration of additional or alternative lands outside those assessed and identified through this process.

The submission proposes a change in zoning of lands currently designated for employment purposes. Such a change would have wider implications for the land use balance, employment provision and spatial planning strategy for the Southern Environs of Drogheda, and would require comprehensive assessment beyond the scope of the current Variation. Such proposals should be brought forward during the public consultation period of the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan or subsequent Variation that may have a broader scope to that of Proposed Variation No.5.

### **Chief Executive Recommendation**

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-67: Melvin Properties Ltd (Corr & Associates)

#### **Summary of Submission:**

This submission, prepared by Corr & Associates on behalf of Melvin Properties Ltd., is framed as a strategic policy submission in relation to Draft Variation No. 5 and does not seek to promote or oppose any specific landholding.

The submission emphasises the importance of compact growth and the integration of land use and transport, consistent with national planning policy. It highlights the role of transport-oriented development (TOD) as an appropriate framework to support sustainable settlement patterns, noting that the effectiveness of such an approach is closely linked to the availability of high-quality public transport infrastructure.

The submission further advocates for a more integrated land use approach, whereby residential development is aligned with infrastructure capacity and accessibility, particularly in locations well served by public transport. The submission recommends that the spatial distribution and sequencing of lands under the Variation should continue to reflect these principles in order to optimise sustainable growth outcomes.

#### **Chief Executive Response**

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and its focus on the importance of aligning spatial planning with transport infrastructure and sustainable development principles.

Draft Variation No. 5 is underpinned by national planning policy, including the National Planning Framework and associated guidelines, which emphasise compact growth, the efficient use of serviced land, and the integration of land use and transport. The principles highlighted in the submission, including the promotion of transport-oriented development and the prioritisation of accessible and well-served locations, are reflected in the overall strategy of the Development Plan and the methodology applied in the preparation of the Variation.

## Part 3

---

The Chief Executive notes that the Settlement Capacity Audit and associated assessment process have informed the identification of lands capable of contributing to housing delivery within the plan period, taking into account factors such as servicing, accessibility and deliverability.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-68: Patrick Cosgrove (Shay Scanlon Architect)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission seeks the introduction of a specific 'Spot Objective' for a circa 25-acre landholding at Kilcarn, Navan, currently zoned for community infrastructure (G1).

The proposed objective is to support the development of a continuum of housing options including a care facility for older persons, incorporating independent and assisted living, step-down healthcare accommodation, and associated community and healthcare facilities, while retaining the overall community function of the lands.

The submission sets out a demographic and policy justification for the proposal, referencing population ageing trends, increasing demand for age-appropriate housing, and the potential benefits of facilitating downsizing, including the release of under-occupied housing stock. It also highlights alignment with national health policy and local age-friendly initiatives.

It is argued that the proposed 'Spot Objective' would provide clarity in the Development Plan regarding permissible uses within G1 zoning and support a coordinated, master planned approach to development on the site.

#### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the proposal to introduce a site-specific 'Spot Objective' for lands at Kilcarn, Navan.

Draft Variation No. 5 is a targeted variation prepared to address revised housing growth requirements and associated amendments to the Core Strategy and zoning framework. The introduction of new site-specific objectives, including those relating to the detailed use or development of particular sites, falls outside the scope of the current Variation.

The Chief Executive notes that lands zoned for community infrastructure under the Development Plan already provide for a range of community-related uses, subject to detailed consideration at planning application stage and compliance with the Development Plan's policy framework.

#### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

## Part 3

Submission No. MH-C217-69: Albert Developments Ltd (JSA Planning)

### Summary of Submission:

This submission relates to lands at Athlumney, Navan, which are currently zoned A2 New Residential but subject to a “Phase 2 / Post 2027” designation.

The submission does not seek rezoning but requests the removal of the Phase 2 restriction, arguing that the lands are now serviced and capable of being brought forward for development within the plan period.

It highlights the strategic location of Navan as a Key Town, recent infrastructure investment (including the LIHAF-funded road), and the active involvement of the landowner in delivering housing in the area. The submission contends that retaining the phasing restriction would unnecessarily delay housing delivery and undermine the momentum of development within the Athlumney area.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the request to remove the Phase 2 / Post 2027 restriction from lands at Athlumney, Navan.

Draft Variation No. 5 includes provisions to activate certain lands previously subject to phasing restrictions, based on the findings of the Settlement Capacity Audit and the overall housing supply requirements within the plan period. As reaffirmed by the OPR’s submission, Proposed Variation No.5 will ensure a robust and adequate housing supply pipeline over the remainder of the Plan period.

The Chief Executive notes the submission’s emphasis on deliverability and infrastructure provision. These factors will be considered in the context of the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan, where a comprehensive assessment of phasing and land activation across Navan will be undertaken.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

Submission No. MH-C217-70: Hemeryck Family (PD Lane Associates)

### Summary of Submission:

This submission, seeks the rezoning of approximately 7.26 hectares of land at Jamestown, Ratoath to the east of MP35 and outside the settlement boundary from RA – Rural Area to A2 – New Residential.

The submission outlines that the lands are strategically located adjacent to the Ratoath Outer Relief Road (RORR), with proximity to existing residential development, educational facilities and community infrastructure. It highlights recent infrastructural improvements in the area, including

## Part 3

upgrades to drainage and wastewater infrastructure, and notes that the subject lands would form part of a broader emerging development area within Jamestown.

The submission emphasises the sustainability credentials of the site, referencing its accessibility to Ratoath Town Centre, proximity to public transport connections including rail (via Dunboyne/M3 Parkway), and alignment with national and regional planning policy, including the National Planning Framework and Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy.

It is contended that the lands represent a logical extension to the settlement of Ratoath and would support the town's role as a self-sustaining settlement by contributing to increased population and critical mass in tandem with infrastructure and service provision.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the request to include additional lands at Jamestown, Ratoath for residential zoning.

Draft Variation No. 5 is a targeted variation informed by a Settlement Capacity Audit and associated evidence-based assessment process, which identifies lands capable of contributing to housing delivery within the lifetime of the current Development Plan. The approach adopted ensures consistency with national policy, including the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirement Guidelines, and focuses on lands that can be demonstrated to be serviced or serviceable and deliverable within the plan period.

The submission proposes the inclusion of additional lands beyond those identified in the Draft Variation. Such proposals should be brought forward during the public consultation period of the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan or subsequent Variation that may have a broader scope to that of Proposed Variation No.5.

The Chief Executive notes the submission's references to infrastructure provision, accessibility and policy alignment. These matters will be considered further in the context of the next County Development Plan review, where a comprehensive reassessment of settlement boundaries, zoning and growth strategy will be undertaken.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-71: Castlethorn (SLA Planning)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission relates to lands south of Dunboyne and Clonee within the Dublin Metropolitan Area of Meath and seeks the designation of lands at Dunboyne South as suitable for Transport Oriented Development (TOD) status through a UAP or UDZ process.

The submission argues that Draft Variation No. 5 does not adequately provide for a sufficient pipeline of zoned land to meet housing demand beyond the immediate plan period to 2027. It contends that the Variation underestimates future land requirements and fails to align with

## Part 3

national policy guidance, particularly the NPF Implementation Housing Growth Requirement Guidelines, which require planning for medium to long-term supply horizons.

It promotes the subject lands as a strategic opportunity for Transport Oriented Development (TOD), given their proximity to the existing and planned DART+ West rail corridor, and highlights their potential to deliver large-scale residential communities supported by high-capacity public transport and associated infrastructure.

The submission also advocates for the designation of long-term strategic development lands to provide clarity for infrastructure planning and ensure continuity of housing supply beyond the current Development Plan period.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the strategic issues raised in relation to housing supply, land availability and the identification of Transport Oriented Development opportunities within the Metropolitan Area.

Draft Variation No. 5 has been prepared as a targeted response to revised housing growth requirements within the lifetime of the current Development Plan to 2027. The Variation is informed by a Settlement Capacity Audit and focuses on lands capable of being activated to contribute to housing delivery within this timeframe.

The submission raises broader strategic considerations relating to longer-term housing supply, including the identification of additional land to support development beyond the current plan period and the potential for large-scale TOD at Dunboyne South. While these issues are noted, they extend beyond the scope of the current Variation.

The Chief Executive acknowledges the importance of ensuring a robust pipeline of development land in the medium to long term and the role of transport-oriented development in achieving sustainable growth. These matters will be addressed through the forthcoming County Development Plan review process, which will provide the appropriate statutory framework for the consideration of strategic landbanks and longer-term growth scenarios.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-72: Balgeeth Holdings Unlimited (Downey Planning)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission supports the proposed rezoning of lands at Donacarney as set out in Draft Variation No. 5, including the rezoning of lands from Rural Area (RA) to A2 Residential and G1 Community Infrastructure.

The submission provides a detailed demographic and policy context, highlighting significant population growth in Donacarney and County Meath generally, and the implications of updated national housing targets under the NPF Implementation Guidelines. It emphasises that

## Part 3

settlements such as Donacarney, with strong growth trends and access to infrastructure and services, are well placed to accommodate additional residential development.

The submission supports the proposed zoning approach within the Variation and further highlights the importance of ensuring that future growth in Donacarney is managed in a coordinated manner, with particular regard to infrastructure provision, active travel, and traffic management, especially within the village centre.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and welcomes the support expressed for the proposed rezoning of lands at Donacarney under Draft Variation No. 5.

The Draft Variation is informed by a Settlement Capacity Audit and seeks to identify lands capable of supporting sustainable and deliverable residential development within the plan period. The inclusion of lands at Donacarney reflects their suitability in terms of location, infrastructure availability and ability to contribute to housing delivery.

The Chief Executive notes the submission's observations regarding the importance of integrated infrastructure provision, active travel measures and traffic management in accommodating future growth. These matters are addressed through the Development Plan's wider policy framework and will continue to be assessed at project level through the development management process.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-73: Brian Delaney (Manahan Planners)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission, prepared by Manahan Planners on behalf of the owner of the Ballygarth Castle estate, seeks the consideration of lands at Julianstown for additional zoning to support a mixed-use development including residential and tourism development.

The submission notes that no additional zoning has been proposed for Julianstown under Draft Variation No. 5 and contends that lands associated with the Ballygarth estate represent a viable opportunity for development in the context of the revised housing growth requirements.

A concept development strategy is outlined, including the adaptive reuse of Ballygarth Castle for tourism/hospitality purposes, the reuse of outbuildings for commercial and community uses, the provision of a greenway/cycleway along the River Nanny, and the inclusion of residential development in parts of the estate, including new housing adjoining existing development.

The submission argues that this approach would support both housing delivery and wider economic and tourism objectives in a coordinated manner.

### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the proposal to include lands at Ballygarth Castle, Julianstown for mixed-use and residential development.

## Part 3

Draft Variation No. 5 is a targeted variation focused on addressing housing supply within the existing Development Plan framework. The Variation is based on a structured assessment process which identifies specific lands capable of delivering housing within the plan period, in accordance with national policy and statutory requirements. As reaffirmed by the OPR's submission the Proposed Variation will ensure an adequate housing supply pipeline over the remainder of the Plan period.

The submission proposes both new zoning and the introduction of a site-specific framework for lands at Julianstown. Such proposals should be brought forward during the public consultation period of the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan or subsequent Variation that may have a broader scope to that of Proposed Variation No.5.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-76: Navan RFC (Gaffney & Cullivan Architects Ltd)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission relates to lands associated with Navan RFC and relates to lands to the northeast of MP10.

The submission sets out the role of Navan RFC as an established community-based sporting organisation with significant membership and use, providing facilities for a wide range of community activities.

The specific request relates to a triangular parcel of land located to the south-west of the club grounds, which is currently zoned as "Rail Corridor." The submission contends that:

- The current zoning follows a field boundary rather than a defined infrastructure requirement
- The extent of the rail reservation may be excessive or inaccurately defined
- The existing zoning effectively sterilises the lands from development

It is requested that the zoning of this parcel be amended to align with adjoining land uses and that the rail corridor designation be revised to reflect an appropriate and accurate reservation width.

#### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the request to amend the zoning of lands at Navan RFC currently identified as "Rail Corridor."

Draft Variation No. 5 includes amendments to land use zoning maps in specific locations identified through a structured assessment process, having regard to housing growth requirements, infrastructure capacity and national policy objectives.

## Part 3

The lands referenced in the submission are currently identified as part of a rail corridor designation, which reflects long-standing strategic transport objectives, including the safeguarding of infrastructure corridors for potential future rail development. The retention of such corridors is consistent with national and regional policy, including the protection of strategic transport routes to support sustainable mobility and long-term infrastructure delivery.

The submission raises issues regarding the precise alignment and extent of the rail corridor. Any modification to the extent of this designation would require detailed technical assessment in consultation with relevant transport agencies and infrastructure providers and would need to consider long-term strategic transport requirements.

The Chief Executive acknowledges the concerns raised regarding land use compatibility and the potential sterilisation of lands. These matters may be more appropriately considered during the public consultation period of the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan or subsequent Variation that may have a broader scope to that of Proposed Variation No.5.

### Chief Executive Recommendation

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

### Submission No. MH-C217-78: Pat Clarke (Gaffney & Cullivan Architects Ltd)

#### Summary of Submission:

This submission relates to lands at Julianstown (c. 27.5 hectares) to the west of the settlement boundary and seeks a rezoning from RA – Rural Area to A2 – New Residential and F1 – Open Space to facilitate the delivery of a mixed use development.

The submission references Proposed Amendments No. 1 and No. 2 of the Variation, noting their purpose in updating the Core Strategy and Written Statements to reflect revised housing growth requirements. The submission does not object to these amendments but uses the opportunity to highlight a specific landholding in Julianstown as suitable for future development consideration.

It is submitted that the lands:

- Are well located adjacent to the existing settlement of Julianstown
- Benefit from access via multiple road frontages
- Are proximate to established services including water, wastewater and telecommunications
- Adjoin community and amenity infrastructure, including schools and recreational facilities

The submission contends that the lands represent an opportunity for comprehensive development including residential, community, amenity and open space uses, in a coordinated and integrated manner.

#### Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive acknowledges the submission and the observations made in respect of lands at Julianstown.

## Part 3

---

Draft Variation No. 5 is a targeted variation prepared to address revised housing growth requirements within the lifetime of the current Development Plan. The Variation is informed by a Settlement Capacity Audit and associated evidence-based assessment, which identifies specific lands capable of contributing to housing delivery within this defined timeframe.

The submission does not object to the proposed amendments but seeks to promote additional lands for potential development. The inclusion of new lands for zoning or development consideration would be more appropriately considered during the public consultation period of the forthcoming Draft County Development Plan or subsequent Variation that may have a broader scope to that of Proposed Variation No.5.

### **Chief Executive Recommendation**

No amendment to the Variation is required in response to this submission.

## Part 4

---

### **Part 4: SEA Screening for Draft Variation No. 3 Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027, as varied**

A submission has been received from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) MH-C217-42. The EPA submission focuses on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) requirements, including the integration of environmental considerations into the plan-making process, implementation of mitigation measures, monitoring of environmental effects and preparation of an SEA Statement following adoption. The EPA note that their functions do not include approving or enforcing SEAs or plan and emphasises the importance of alignment with higher-level plans and programmes.

The Chief Executive notes the submission from the Environmental Protection Agency. SEA Screening of the Proposed Variation No.5 to the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027, as varied has been carried out in consultation with the Environmental Authorities. MCC will ensure the recommendations outlined are incorporated into the final SEA Determination.

The prepared Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Report accompanied Proposed Variation No. 5 during the public display period.