



2<sup>nd</sup> November 2021

For the Attention of: Ms Jackie Maguire, Chief Executive

Meath County Council,  
Buvinda House,  
Dublin Road,  
Navan,  
County Meath,  
C15 Y291

**Section 31 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended**  
**Notice of Intention to Issue a Direction to Meath County Council on the Meath County**  
**Development Plan 2021 - 2027**

Dear Jackie,

Consequent to a recommendation made to me by the Office of the Planning Regulator (the Office) on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2021 in connection with the Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027, as adopted by the elected members of Meath County Council on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2021, and pursuant to section 31 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) (the Act), I write to give notice of my intention to issue a direction to Meath County Council to take certain measures specified in this notice.

On consideration of the recommendation made to me by the Office, I have formed the opinion that:

- (i) Meath County Council has failed to implement recommendations made to it, as planning authority, by the Office, in June 2021, under section 31AM of the Act;
- (ii) The Plan, as made, fails to set out an overall strategy for the proper planning and sustainable development of the area;



- (iii) The Plan is not consistent with national and regional development objectives set out in the National Planning Framework and the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy; and
- (iv) The Plan, as made, is not in compliance with the requirements of the Act.

A draft of the Direction accompanies this notice and I request that you publish notice of this draft Direction, no later than two weeks after receipt of this notice. The reasons for the Direction are set out in the Statement of Reasons section of the attached draft Direction and further detail is provided in the Summary of Issues as set out below.

#### **PROCESS TO DATE**

The Draft Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 (the draft Plan) was on public display from 18<sup>th</sup> December 2019 until 6<sup>th</sup> March 2020. The Office made a submission on the draft Plan containing 17 no. recommendations and 13 no. observations (6<sup>th</sup> March 2020).

The elected members, having considered the draft Plan and the Chief Executive’s (CE’s) Report on submissions received, resolved to amend the Draft Meath Development Plan 2021 – 2027 over a series of Special Planning Meeting held from November 2020 to March 2021, with the final meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> March 2021. The material alterations to the draft Plan were on public display from Monday 31<sup>st</sup> of May to Tuesday 29<sup>th</sup> of June 2021.

The submission to Meath County Council from the Office at material amendment (MA) stage (dated 29<sup>th</sup> June 2021) set out 5 recommendations containing a number of sub-recommendations. The 5 recommendations at MA stage included the following:

- MA.1 Tiered approach to zoning;
- MA.2 Material alterations to zoning;
- MA. 3 Rural housing;
- MA.4 Flood risk management;
- MA.5 Proposed alteration 02 Dunshaughlin.



The planning authority was advised that the Office was of the view that a number of material alterations to the draft Plan, if adopted in their current form, would have the potential to lead to substantial breaches of strategic planning policies of the Minister.

A Chief Executive's report was prepared on the submissions received, including the submission made by the Office. It is noted that your report accepted the majority of recommendations and observations of the Office and recommended changes in response to the issues raised. The elected members of the planning authority did not accept a number of these recommendations.

The elected members of Meath County Council resolved to make the Development Plan on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2021.

Subsequently, in accordance with section 31AM(6), you as Chief Executive, issued a notice letter dated 24<sup>th</sup> September 2021 to the Office. The notice advised of the making of the Development Plan and further advised that a number of the recommendations issued by the Office at material amendment stage had not been complied with in full, specifically MA Recommendation 2 (including 9 sub-recommendations), MA Recommendation 3, MA Recommendation 4, and MA Recommendation 5.

Having reviewed your reports on the Draft Plan and material alterations to the Draft Plan, the notice of the making of the Development Plan and the reasons in the notice letter, the Office concluded that two of the recommendations from the Office were adequately responded to (3 and 5) in the reports and/or Notice under 31AM(6) from the Council and have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Office.

On 20<sup>th</sup> October 2021, in accordance to section 31AM(8) the Office notified the Minister for Local Government and Planning that the Meath County Development Plan 2021-27 had not been made in a manner consistent with the recommendations of the Office, which required specific changes to the Development Plan to ensure consistency with:



- i. The Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (November 2009) published by the Minister under Section 28 of the Act, specifically that in relation to particular material amendments to the draft development plan adopted by the elected members, the Development Plan zones land for development in areas of flood risk without application of the sequential approach and the Justification Test; and
- ii. the national policy objectives (NPOs) of Project Ireland 2040 National Planning Framework (the NPF) and the regional policy objectives (RPOs) of the Eastern and Midland Regional Assembly Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (the RSES), specifically that in relation to particular material amendments to the draft development plan adopted by the elected members, the Development Plan does not support compact growth of certain towns and villages; and

As a consequence of the above, it is the opinion of the Office that the Development Plan, as made by Meath County Council, fails to set out an overall strategy for the proper planning and sustainable development of the area concerned, which is a breach of the requirements of the Act.

## **SUMMARY OF ISSUES**

### **MA Recommendation 2 – Material alterations to zoning**

The elected members voted to adopt the Plan in accordance with your recommendations as set out in the Chief Executive's Report in respect of 3 material amendments i.e. omitting the zoning objectives, but contrary to the CE Report recommendation in respect of 9 material amendments. Having considered all reports and the reasons given by the elected members, it is deemed that 5 of the material amendments as adopted, are inconsistent with national and regional policy for the following reasons:



(1) Ashbourne MA 08 – Reinstates the zoning of the subject land, located adjacent to the motorway, to that of the draft Plan i.e. the land reverts to Rural Area (RA) from New Residential (A2). The land zoned as Community Infrastructure within this same-titled amendment heading (lands to the east of Churchfields) is not the subject of this Direction and is to remain as adopted.

This land use zoning objective A2 New Residential is located within a peripheral location and is inconsistent with NPO 3c and RPO 3.2, compact growth. Based on the Core Strategy Table in the adopted Plan (table 2.11) Ashbourne is not projected to fully achieve the target of 30% of new homes within the existing built-up footprint but is instead projected to achieve c.26% and sufficient lands have been zoned for residential use in Ashbourne to meet the core strategy population in the adopted Plan (table 2.11).

(2) Athboy MA 03 - reinstates this land use zoning to that of the draft Plan i.e. the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA) from Community Infrastructure (G1).

The reasons given by elected members refer to the intended use of the lands for a nursing home. The G1 Community zoning would, however, accommodate a range of uses, including group housing, residential / sheltered housing, retirement home / residential institution / retirement village and community services. The additional zoned area is located in a peripheral location, detached from the small settlement, c.500m from the existing built up area as defined by the CSO, without pedestrian footpaths or public street lighting. There is no information on availability of other essential infrastructure for this site.

The site is also located within Flood Zone B and under the Ministerial Flood Risk Management Guidelines 2009 the plan-making Justification Test must be satisfied before it is zoned for highly vulnerable uses such as a nursing home (Table 3.2 FRMG). No plan-making Justification Test has been carried out.



Furthermore, the reasons provided for not complying with the Office's recommendation do not address the Office's recommendation that the Plan be made without Athboy MA No.3 due to its location relative to a designated European Site (River Boyne and Blackwater SPA).

The Appropriate Assessment and the SEA Environmental Report<sup>1</sup> of the proposed material amendments, in respect of this specific amendment noted that '*This area is very vulnerable to development*'. The Appropriate Assessment mitigation measures included the incorporation of a 25m buffer space / open space zoning in between the SAC and SPA boundary and the zoning. The adopted plan was made without the buffer.

The SEA also refers to the Appropriate Assessment (Table 3.1), and under SEA 'mitigation/recommendation' states "Retain Draft Plan zoning. Alternatively provide for minimum 25m setback buffer / open space between SAC / SPA boundary and zoning change. Open space uses only within Flood Zone A/B."

- 3) East Meath MA 05 – reinstate this land use zoning to that of the draft Plan i.e. the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA) from Tourism (D1). This site is primarily located in Flood Zone A, with the remainder of the site in Flood Zone B. The reasons given by the members state that flood issues can be addressed as part of the development management process with mitigation measures. These reasons did not address the substantive issue, that is the zoning for development that includes highly vulnerable uses such as B&B/Guesthouse, caravan park, hotel, motel, hostel, and childcare facility within Flood Zones A and B, and less vulnerable uses, such as community facility, craft centre/shop, restaurant/ café within Flood Zone A, without carrying out a plan-making Justification Test, as required by the Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009), as revised.



The SEA also refers to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, and under SEA ‘mitigation/ recommendation’ states *“Retain Draft Plan zoning. No development within open space zoned lands. Proposed development to be limited to water compatible uses.”*

- 4) Moynalty MA 01 – reinstate this land use zoning on lands located outside of the settlement boundary to the southeast of Moynalty, to that of the draft Plan i.e. the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA) from New Residential (A2).

To note the land zoned as A1 Existing Residential within this amendment (backland lands within the settlement) is not the subject of this Direction and is to remain as adopted.

The reasons given do not address the substantive issue in the recommendation concerning this amendment, which was in respect of the peripheral location of the land and inconsistency with NPO 3c and RPO 3.2, compact growth. The additional A2 New Residential zoning is at a remove from the general fabric of the village, and is not therefore consistent with compact growth. The SEA also states that *“Zoning would lead to unnecessary residential development in rural setting with potential negative environmental effects on landscape and material assets, and loss of habitat”*. The ‘mitigation/ recommendation’ states *‘Retain Draft Plan zoning’*.

- (5) Slane MA 04 – reinstate this land use zoning to that of the draft Plan i.e. the subject land reverts to High Amenity (H1) from Tourism (D1).

The site is partially located within Flood Zone A, partially in Flood Zone B and the remainder of the site is not subject to flood risk (Flood Zone C). The reasons given by the members did not address the substantive issue, that is the zoning of land for highly vulnerable/ less vulnerable uses, including B&B/Guesthouse, Caravan park, hotel etc., within a flood zone, without the application of the plan-making Justification Test, contrary



to The Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009), as revised.

Furthermore, the members did not address the Office's recommendation that the Plan be made without Slane MA No.4 due to the location relative to the River Boyne and River Blackwater Special Area of Conservation (site no.002299) and the River Boyne and River Blackwater Special Protection Areas (site no.004232).

The Appropriate Assessment and the SEA Environmental Report of the proposed material amendments noted that Slane MA No.04 *'is adjacent to the Boyne Valley includes the River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC and SPA, as well as leading to the Boyne Coast and Estuary SAC, Boyne Estuary SPA, River Nanny Estuary and Shore SPA. This area is very vulnerable to development.'*

The Appropriate Assessment mitigation measures included the following: *'Zoning should remain as open space. Area is narrow so that a 25m buffer space / open space between SAC boundary and land parcel would probably result in much of the land parcel being subsumed by the buffer.'*

The SEA also refers to the SFRA and Appropriate Assessment (Table 3.1), and under SEA 'mitigation/ recommendation' states *"Retain Draft Plan zoning"*.

#### **MA Recommendation 4 – Flood Risk Management**

Having considered the reasons given by the elected members, the Office is of the view that the following 4 material amendments comprise inappropriate zoning for development where at least part of the lands are identified as Flood Risk A or B in the SFRA. These material amendments include 3 identified by the Office in connection with MA Recommendation 4, and an additional material amendment identified by the OPW in its submission to the Planning Authority (Ratoath MA 03) and recommended to be subject to a minor modification in the CE report.





- (1) Dunshaughlin MA No 2 - the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA). This amends part of the zoning objective General Enterprise and Employment, which is within Flood Zone A/B (northern section of the site) to that of the draft Plan Rural Area RA.
- (2) Summerhill MA No 2 – the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA). This amends part of the zoning objective – Community Infrastructure which is within Flood Zone A/B to that of the draft Plan Rural Area RA.
- (3) Trim MA No 6 - the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA). This amends part of the zoning objective – within the Tourism zoning which is within Flood Zone A/B (along the eastern boundary) to that of the draft Plan Rural Area RA.
- (4) Ratoath MA 03 - the subject land reverts to Open Space (F1). This amends part of the zoning objective Commercial/Town or Village Centre (B1), which is within Flood Zone A/B to that of the draft Plan Open Space.

### **Summary Overview**

It is the opinion of the Minister that provisions of the development plan as made are inconsistent with National Planning Objective NPO3(c), Regional Policy Objective RPO 3.2, and section 28 *The Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009)* and that the inclusion of such provisions, individually and cumulatively means the plan as made fails to set out an overall strategy for the proper planning and development of the area because such amendments:

- enable development in locations at risk of flooding and/or contrary to the statutory guidelines on flood risk;
- facilitate development at locations disconnected from nearby towns and villages and infrastructure required for such development;



- zone land for development inconsistent with the appropriate assessment of the likely significant effects of such development on designated European sites and the strategic environmental assessment of the likely significant effects on the environment; and
- encourage a pattern of development in particular locations not in accordance with the proper planning and development of such areas, planned and sequential development and the wider provisions of the Core Strategy of the development plan.

The factors taken into account in forming this opinion are as follows:

- i. The Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009) which:

*“require the planning system at national, regional and local levels to:*

*Avoid development in areas at risk of flooding, particularly floodplains, unless there are proven wider sustainability grounds that justify appropriate development and where the flood risk can be reduced or managed to an acceptable level without increasing flood risk elsewhere;*

*Adopt a sequential approach to flood risk management when assessing the location for new development based on avoidance, reduction and mitigation of flood risk;”*

- ii. 92/43/EEC The Habitats Directive.
- iii. Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament and Council of 27 June 2001 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment,
- iv. National Policy Objective NPO3(c) and Regional Policy Objective 3.2 which state:  
**NPO3(c)**  
Deliver at least 30% of all homes that are targets in settlements other than the five Cities and the suburbs, within existing built-up footprints.



### **RPO 3.2**

Local authorities, in their core strategies shall set out measures to achieve compact urban development targets of at least 50% of all new homes within or contiguous to the built up area of Dublin city and suburbs and a target of at least 30% for other urban areas.

- v. The Core Strategy population in Table 2.11 of the adopted Development Plan.
- vi. The Chief Executive's reports on submissions on the draft Development Plan and material alterations to the draft Development Plan.
- vii. The requirements of section 12(18) and section 28(1) and 28(1A) of the Act.

### **DRAFT DIRECTION**

Accordingly, having considered the recommendation of the Office, I am issuing a draft direction pursuant to section 31 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), to direct Meath County Council with regard to the Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027.

The Planning Authority is hereby directed to take the following steps within the Development Plan:

- a. Reinstate the following zoning objectives to that of the draft Plan, consistent with the recommendation of the Chief Executive report on Submissions on the Proposed Material Alterations to the Draft Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027:
  - i. Ashbourne MA 08 – Reinstate the zoning of the subject land, located adjacent to the motorway, to that of the draft Plan i.e. the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA) from New Residential (A2).
  - ii. Athboy MA 03 - reinstate the land use zoning to that of the draft Plan i.e. the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA) from Community Infrastructure (G1).



- iii. East Meath MA 05 – reinstate the land use zoning to that of the draft Plan i.e. the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA) from Tourism (D1) and Open Space (F1).
  - iv. Moynalty MA 01 – reinstate this land use zoning on lands located outside of the settlement boundary to the southeast of Moynalty, to that of the draft Plan i.e. the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA) from New Residential (A2).
  - v. Slane MA 04 – reinstate this land use zoning to that of the draft Plan i.e. the subject land reverts to High Amenity (H1) from Tourism (D1).
- b. Amend the following zoning objectives to exclude land identified as Flood Zone A or B in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, and reinstate the zoning objective for that part of the land to that of the draft Plan:
- i. Dunshaughlin MA No 2 - the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA). This amends part of the zoning objective General Enterprise and Employment (E2), which is within Flood Zone A/B (northern section of the site) to that of the draft Plan Rural Area RA.
  - ii. Summerhill MA No 2 - the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA). This amends part of the zoning objective – Community Infrastructure (G1) which is within Flood Zone A/B to that of the draft Plan Rural Area RA.
  - iii. Trim MA No 6 - the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA). This amends part of the zoning objective – within the Tourism zoning (D1) which is within Flood Zone A/B (along the eastern boundary) to that of the draft Plan Rural Area RA.



- iv. Ratoath MA 03 – the subject land reverts to Open Space (F1) from Commercial/Town or Village Centre (B1).

Please note that in accordance with Section 31(4) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, those parts of the Meath County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 Plan referred to in this notice shall be taken not to have not come into effect, been made or amended.

#### **NEXT STEPS - PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS**

I wish to draw your attention to the public consultation obligations under section 31 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), and the initial requirement as Chief Executive, under section 31(7) to publish notice of the draft Direction no later than 2 weeks after receipt of this notice, stating that the draft direction may be inspected as specified in the notice, for a period of not more than 2 weeks.

The notice must also state that written submissions or observations in respect of the draft direction may be made to the planning authority during the consultation period and that they shall be taken into consideration by me, as Minister, before any final direction.

Also in line with statutory requirements, a Chief Executive's report is to be prepared on the public consultation period under section 31(8), and must be furnished to the Office, the elected members and myself as Minister, no later than 4 weeks after the public consultation process is completed, for further consideration.

The report of the Chief Executive must:-

- (a) summarise the views of any person who made submissions or observations to the planning authority;
- (b) summarise the views of and recommendations (if any) made by the elected members of the planning authority;



- (c) summarise the views of and recommendations (if any) made by the regional assembly;
- (d) make recommendations in relation to the best manner in which to give effect to the draft direction.

In addition, the elected members of the planning authority may make a submission to the Office of the Planning Regulator at any time up to the conclusion of the 2 week public consultation period referred to above and must also send any such submissions to me, as Minister.

The Office will then consider the Chief Executive's report together with any submissions made and will make a further recommendation to me, as Minister, regarding whether the Direction is to be issued with or without minor amendments, or not issued. Where I am in agreement with the further recommendation, I may issue the final direction.

Where the Office is of the opinion that a material amendment to the Draft Direction is required, or further investigation is necessary, or it is necessary for another reason, then the Office may appoint an inspector no later than 3 weeks after receipt of the Chief Executive's report, prior to making a final recommendation to me.

My officials are available to assist you, as necessary, in complying with the foregoing process now underway. Should you have any queries please contact Laura Courtney, Planning Adviser at [laura.courtney@housing.gov.ie](mailto:laura.courtney@housing.gov.ie).

Yours sincerely,

**Peter Burke, T.D.,**

**Minister for Local Government and Planning**



Copied to:

- Cathaoirleach, Meath County Council, Buvinda House, Dublin Road, Navan, Co. Meath, C15 Y291.
- Mr. Jim Conway, Director, Eastern and Midland Regional Assembly, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor North, Ballymun Civic Centre, Main Street, Ballymun, Dublin 9, DO9 C8P5.
- Office of the Planning Regulator, Fourth Floor (West Wing) Park House, Grangegorman, 191-193A North Circular Road, Dublin 7, D07 EWW4.

**DRAFT DIRECTION IN THE MATTER OF SECTION 31  
OF THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT 2000 (as amended)  
Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027**

“Development Plan” means the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027

“Planning Authority” means Meath County Council

**WHEREAS** the powers and duties of the Minister for Housing, Local Government and Heritage under the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), other than the power to prosecute an offence, have been delegated to the Minister of State for Local Government and Planning pursuant to the Housing, Planning and Local Government (Delegation of Ministerial Functions) (No. 2) Order 2017 (S.I. 352 of 2017).

**WHEREAS** the Minister of State at the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage in exercise of the powers conferred on him by section 31 of the Act 2000, and consequent to a recommendation made to him by the Office of the Planning Regulator under section 31AM(8) of the Act hereby directs as follows:

- (1) This Direction may be cited as the Planning and Development (Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027) Direction 2021.
- (2) The Planning Authority is hereby directed to take the following steps:
  - a. Reinstate the following zoning objectives to that of the draft Plan, consistent with the recommendation of the Chief Executive report on Submissions on the Proposed Material Alterations to the Draft Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027:
    - i. Ashbourne MA 08 – Reinstate the zoning of the subject land, located adjacent to the motorway, to that of the draft Plan i.e. the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA) from New Residential (A2).



- ii. Athboy MA 03 - reinstate the land use zoning to that of the draft Plan i.e. the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA) from Community Infrastructure (G1).
  - iii. East Meath MA 05 – reinstate the land use zoning to that of the draft Plan i.e. the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA) from Tourism (D1) and Open Space (F1).
  - iv. Moynalty MA 01 – reinstate this land use zoning on lands located outside of the settlement boundary to the southeast of Moynalty, to that of the draft Plan i.e. the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA) from New Residential (A2).
  - v. Slane MA 04 – reinstate this land use zoning to that of the draft Plan i.e. the subject land reverts to High Amenity (H1) from Tourism (D1).
- b. Amend the following zoning objectives to exclude land identified as Flood Zone A or B in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, and reinstate the zoning objective for that part of the land to that of the draft Plan:
- i. Dunshaughlin MA No 2 - the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA). This amends part of the zoning objective General Enterprise and Employment (E2), which is within Flood Zone A/B (northern section of the site) to that of the draft Plan Rural Area RA.
  - ii. Summerhill MA No 2 - the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA). This amends part of the zoning objective – Community Infrastructure (G1) which is within Flood Zone A/B to that of the draft Plan Rural Area RA.
  - iii. Trim MA No 6 - the subject land reverts to Rural Area (RA). This amends part of the zoning objective – within the Tourism zoning (D1) which is within Flood Zone A/B (along the eastern boundary) to that of the draft Plan Rural Area RA.
  - iv. Ratoath MA 03 – the subject land reverts to Open Space (F1) from Commercial/Town or Village Centre (B1).

## STATEMENT OF REASONS

- I. The Development Plan as made is inconsistent with Ministerial Guidelines issued under Section 28 of the Act, specifically The Planning System and Flood Risk Management, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009) which require Planning Authorities to avoid development within areas at risk of flooding and to only consider development within areas at risk where it passes the provisions of the sequential approach and plan-making Justification Test detailed in the Guidelines.
  
- II. The Development Plan as made includes material amendments to the draft Plan, that are inconsistent with the Appropriate Assessment and the 'mitigation/recommendation' of the Strategic Environmental Assessment and which individually and cumulatively are not consistent with the Core Strategy, national and regional planning policy, and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, including:
  - a. Land for development located in peripheral locations detached from the existing settlement, inconsistent with the requirements for compact growth in NPO 3c and RPO 3.2. (Ashbourne MA 08; Moynalty MA 01).
  
  - b. Land for development in excess of that needed to meet the core strategy population in the adopted Plan (Table 2.11) and which would further undermine the achievement of brownfield development targets. (Ashbourne MA 08).
  
  - c. Land proposed for development despite the fact that the mitigation measures upon which the Appropriate Assessment Conclusion was based included the omission of Slane MA 04 and the provision of a 25m buffer for Athboy MA No. 3, and where no reason for rejecting these mitigation measures or reasoning to support the AA Conclusion without such measures has been given.
  
  - d. Land proposed for development despite the fact that the mitigation/recommendation of the Strategic Environmental Assessment included the omission of Athboy MA 03, East Meath MA 05, Moynalty MA 01,

Slane MA 04 (with the exception of Athboy MA03 where an alternative buffer is provided for).

- e. Land zoned for development vulnerable to flood risk in areas known to be at risk of flooding contrary to the statutory guidelines of the Minister entitled “The Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities” (2009), as revised. (Athboy MA 03, East Meath MA 05, Slane MA 04).
- III. The Development Plan has therefore not been made in a manner consistent with the recommendations of the Office of the Planning Regulator under Section 31 AM and fails to set out an overall strategy for the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

GIVEN under my hand,

Minister for Housing, Local Government and Heritage

day of November, 2021.