



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-322438-25

Development	Retention of the existing boundary wall and vehicular entrance and permission to widen the vehicular entrance and all associated site works.
Location	88 Hazelmere, Naas, Co. Kildare
Planning Authority	Kildare County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560118
Applicant(s)	Adam Hanaphy
Type of Application	Retention Permission and Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party vs Condition
Appellant(s)	Adam Hanaphy
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	31 st July 2025
Inspector	David Freeland

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	5
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision.....	6
3.1. Decision.....	6
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	7
3.3. Prescribed Bodies.....	8
3.4. Third Party Observations	8
4.0 Planning History	8
5.0 Policy Context	8
5.1. National Guidance	8
5.2. Development Plan / Local Area Plan.....	9
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations	10
5.4. EIA Screening.....	10
5.5. Water Framework Directive	10
6.0 The Appeal.....	11
6.1. Grounds of Appeal.....	11
6.2. Planning Authority Response.....	12
6.3. Observations	13
7.0 Assessment.....	13
7.2. Principle of development, policy and precedent	13
7.3. Vehicular entrance width and visual amenity impact	15
8.0 AA Screening	19
9.0 Recommendation	19

10.0	Reasons and Considerations	20
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening		

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located within Hazelmere, an established residential area which is accessed off Ballycane Road, c. 700m east of Naas General Hospital.
- 1.2. The subject site (stated area of 0.024ha) comprises a single storey end-of-terrace dwelling (in a series of six terrace houses) located on a cul-de-sac within the Hazelmere estate. The estate is predominantly noted by single storey dwellings of a similar scale and design as the subject dwelling. The front boundaries to dwellings in the estate are characterised by a low boundary wall and vehicular entrances although it is noted that a number of properties have amended the treatment to front boundaries and increased the width of vehicular entrances. The site adjoins an area which would appear to be in use for informal on-street car parking to the south. I note that there is no existing public EV charging infrastructure within the vicinity.
- 1.3. The subject site has an existing vehicular entrance with a width of 2.8m with a front boundary wall with a height of 1.08m which increases in height to the south boundary where it also forms the boundary to the side and rear garden serving the dwelling. The existing vehicular entrance is served by a large area of dished public footpath. There are two street trees located to the front of the property either side of the extended dished area. The street tree to the north side is contained within a grass verge (width of c. 4.5m) which is partially positioned to the front of the subject property with the remainder extending to the front of the adjoining property, no. 89 Hazelmere.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development subject to this appeal comprises:

- Retention permission is sought for an existing front boundary wall (1.08m high) and vehicular entrance with a width of 2.8m (pillars to either side 1.4m high).

The drawings submitted at application stage indicate that the boundary wall of which retention is sought was constructed circa 15 years ago by the previous owner and replaced an original vehicular entrance (repositioning the entrance towards the south facing boundary).

- Permission is sought to widen the existing vehicular entrance from 2.8m to 8.62m to facilitate off-street car parking for two cars with associated EV charging point fixed to the front wall of the dwelling.

The site layout plans indicate that the area for car parking to the front of the dwelling has a depth of 5.87m. The driveway is proposed to be finished with a three course select brick at the point of the vehicular entrance with the remainder of the driveway to consist of compacted loose stone. The vehicular entrance will extend from the boundary line with adjoining property, no. 89 Hazelmere towards the south for a total width of 8.62m. Hedging is proposed for the full depth of the north boundary with no. 89.

The site plan indicates that no further dishing of the public footpath is proposed.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Grant Permission subject 7 no. conditions.

Condition 2(b) is being appealed. However condition 3 is also of relevance to the subject appeal.

2. This permission authorises:

- (a) The retention of the existing boundary wall and vehicular entrance, and*
- (b) Permission to widen the vehicular entrance to a maximum width of 3.5m only.*
- (c) This permission does not relate to any other development not subject of this application whether or not such development would otherwise constitute exempted development.*

Reason: To avoid any misunderstanding and in the interests of clarity.

3. The vehicular entrance shall be a maximum width of 3.5 metres. Prior to commencement of development, revised site layout plans to be submitted clearly indicating:

- (a) A 3.5m vehicular entrance.*

(b) A low boundary wall, the height and design of which shall match the height and design of the front boundary wall of the adjoining property at no. 89 Hazelmere shall be submitted to the Kildare County Council Planning Department for placement on Register File.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring that on-street parking arrangements are provided, in the interests of placemaking and quality streetscape and in the interests of clarity.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planner's report, is summarised as follows:

- The principle of the proposed development is acceptable although concerns are expressed that the widening of the entrance is not in-keeping with the site's zoning (B- Existing Residential / Infill) which has an accompanying objective '*To protect and enhance the amenity of established residential communities and promote sustainable intensification*'.
- The proposed widening (from 2.8m to 8.62m) would result in the removal of a low wall boundary treatment which is a general character feature of the area and would create a significant area of hard landscaping impacting the existing streetscape which would be contrary to Policy Objectives TM P8, TM 105 and UD P1. It is also suggested that the entrance would indirectly remove informal on-street parking arrangements.
- It is recommended that a condition be applied limiting the width of the vehicular access to a maximum of 3.5m to protect the character of the subject property and properties in the area and secure the availability of on-street parking.
- There is no requirement for appropriate assessment or environmental impact assessment.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Transportation Section: No objections subject to conditions.

- Environment Section: No objections subject to conditions.
- Water Services Department: No objections subject to conditions.
- Fire Services: No objections.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

Uisce Eireann: no report received.

Waterways Ireland: no report received.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

None

4.0 **Planning History**

No record of planning history relating to the subject site.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **National Guidance**

Climate Action Plan 2025

The document provides a roadmap of actions to achieve a 51% reduction in emissions to 2030 and to achieve climate neutrality by 2050. Of relevance to the appeal, the Plan emphasises the importance of transport decarbonisation including the roll out of electric vehicles and associated charging infrastructure as part of Ireland meeting transport sectional emission reductions by 2030.

Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS)

DMURS is relevant to the assessment of vehicular entrances, particularly in suburban residential areas, as it addresses the interface between public and private and emphasises the need to avoid layouts where car parking dominates the street frontage (Section 4.2.3). DMURS also highlights the benefits of on-street parking as part of providing safe and walkable streets.

5.2. Development Plan / Local Area Plan

Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029

Chapter 5 Sustainable Mobility & Transport

Objective TM 017: *Support and facilitate the provision of electric vehicles including Battery Electric Vehicles (BEV) and Plugin Hybrid Electric Vehicles (PHEV) including electric cars, bikes and scooters as a more sustainable low carbon option to the conventional private motor vehicle. The support of e-scooters will be subject to the enactment of legislation to regulate and legalise e-scooters.*

Section 5.9 Road and Street Design

Policy TM P8: *Ensure that streets and roads within the county are designed to balance placemaking and movement to prioritise sustainable modes of transport and to provide a safe traffic calmed street environment in accordance with the principles set out in the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2019) while meeting the needs of road users of all ages and abilities.*

Objective TM 105: *Ensure that all streets and street networks are designed considering the hierarchy of users in Figure 5.9 above and includes the provision of high-quality walking and cycling infrastructure and traffic calming measures which may include speed ramps.*

Section 5.11 Parking

Policy TM P10: *Balance the demand for parking against the need to promote more sustainable forms of transport, to limit traffic congestion and to protect the quality of the public realm from the physical impact of parking, while meeting the needs of businesses and communities.*

Objective TM O110: *Design car parking layouts in accordance with the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2019) and ensure that car parking, including the provision of fully accessible EV charging facilities, do not detract from the comfort and safety of pedestrians and cyclists or the attractiveness of the landscape.*

Chapter 14 – Urban Design, Placemaking & Regeneration

Section 14.4.4 Urban Design and Placemaking Policy

Policy UD P1: *Apply the principles of people-centred urban design and healthy placemaking as an effective growth management tool to ensure the realisation of more sustainable, inclusive, and well-designed settlements resilient to the effects of climate change and adapted to meet the changing needs of growing populations including aging and disabled persons.*

Chapter 15: Development Management Standards

Section 15.7.8 Car Parking

Naas Local Area Plan 2021 – 2027

The site is zoned B - Existing Residential / Infill within the Naas Local Area Plan 2021 – 2027 with the accompanying objective '*To protect and enhance the amenity of established residential communities and promote sustainable intensification*'.

5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

Not relevant.

5.4. **EIA Screening**

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

5.5. **Water Framework Directive**

The subject site is located in an established residential area which adjoins the River Waterbody IE_EA_09L011500. The subject site is positioned centrally within the Hazelmere estate, c. 155m from the River Waterbody.

The proposed development comprises the retention of an existing front boundary and widening of a vehicular entrance serving a single storey dwelling.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

I have assessed the proposed retention of the front boundary and proposed widening of the vehicular entrance and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of works e.g. small scale and nature of the development

Conclusion

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal has been submitted of which the main grounds of appeal relate to condition 2(b) only. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- It is stated that the proposed widening is for the ease of access of two vehicles (including the increased security of off-street parking) and to facilitate transitioning to EV cars with associated charging point for economic and environmental reasons.
- The subject property has a shallow front garden (5.87m) which would mean that it would not be possible or practical for vehicles to park independently and would be difficult to manoeuvre a second car into place given an opening width of 3.5m.

- The appellant argues that the removal of a vehicle from the public road to an off-street space would enhance the amenity of the established residential community by reducing on-street clutter. Reference is made to other applications within Co. Kildare where the planning authority highlighted the positive impact of in-curtilage car parking.
- The assessment of KCC has not taken into consideration the specific location of the subject site on a quiet cul-de-sac which already has an underutilisation of existing off-street parking and has additional overflow on-street spaces adjacent to the subject site.
- Concerns are raised about the inconsistency in decision making with the appellant referencing fifteen permissions for vehicular entrances of great width than that permitted under condition 2(b) which are in areas with similar zoning objectives. It is contended that there is no clear rationale for a more restrictive approach in this case.
- In response to the reason for condition 2(b) which refers to placemaking and quality streetscape, it is contended that the removal of the front boundary would have minimal visual impact given that many properties in the estate have already amended front boundaries/vehicular entrances.
- The policies/objectives referred to by the planning authority (TM P8, TM 105 and UD P1) are ambiguous and not clearly prohibitive relating to widening of vehicular entrances.
- A revised proposal has been submitted as part of the appeal, which includes a reduced vehicular entrance width of 6.62m with construction of a low boundary wall (in-keeping with the design of the adjoining property, no. 89 Hazelmere).

6.2. Planning Authority Response

Kildare County Council made a submission to the Commission regarding the issues raised in the First Party appeal. A summary of the submission is as follows:

- The new access would be 8.62m which is considered to be extensive and unnecessary.

- The proposal would result in a boundary treatment, which is generally a character feature of the existing area.
- The excessive proposed entrance would indirectly remove informal on-street parking arrangements and create a significant hard landscaping, thereby diminishing the existing streetscape and would be contrary to Policy Objectives TM P8, TM 105 and UD P1.
- The condition to create a vehicular entrance with a maximum width of 3.5m is considered sufficient especially having regard to the 5.87m distance between the front boundary wall and the front building line of the dwelling.

6.3. **Observations**

None

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the development to be retained and proposed are acceptable in principle. I therefore consider it appropriate to treat the appeal under S139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), as an appeal against a condition.

7.2. **Principle of development, policy and precedent**

- 7.2.1. The site contains a single-storey end-of-terrace dwelling (in a series of six houses) located on a cul-de-sac within the Hazelmere estate. The estate comprises houses of similar scale and design which typically have a low front boundary wall and vehicular entrance.
- 7.2.2. The site visit indicated that a number of properties have widened their vehicular entrances ranging in width from a modest increase to the full removal of the front boundary. These alterations would not appear to have been undertaken with the benefit of planning permission. Examples include no. 82 & 83 Hazelmere which are

located to the opposing side of the street from the subject dwelling and have removed the full front boundary to facilitate car parking.

- 7.2.3. It does not appear that any of the adjoining terrace properties (no.'s 89 – 93 Hazelmere) have amended their front boundaries and vehicular entrances save for the subject site.
- 7.2.4. The original application included for retention permission of the existing front boundary wall (1.08m high) and vehicular entrance with a width of 2.8m (pillars to either side 1.4m high). The planning authority did not indicate any objection to the proposed retention. The appellant has not raised any further issues relating to the retention aspect. I do not consider that the existing boundary and vehicular entrance has any adverse impacts on the amenities of the area and have no objection to a grant of retention.
- 7.2.5. The appeal site is zoned 'B – Existing Residential / Infill' under the Naas Local Area Plan 2021–2027, the objective of which is “to protect and enhance the amenity of established residential communities and promote sustainable intensification”. I consider that the proposed widening of a vehicular entrance to the front of the subject property is acceptable in principle subject to consistency with relevant policies and objectives of the Development Plan.
- 7.2.6. The Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029 does not include a prescriptive maximum width for vehicular entrances in existing residential areas. I consider that there are relevant qualitative policies/objectives within the Development Plan which provide the framework for assessing boundary alterations and access provision in residential areas (see section 5.1 above) which address sustainable transport and car parking, placemaking and public realm, street hierarchy and compliance with DMURS.
- 7.2.7. While the Development Plan recognises the importance of supporting electric vehicles (Objective TM017), I note that Figure 5.9 of the Development Plan outlines a hierarchy to consider during the design and construction of roads and streets which places walking/wheeling and cycling above electric vehicles.
- 7.2.8. Of relevance, Section 4.2.3 of the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS) also advises that “scenarios where parking dominates the interface between the building and the footway should be avoided.”

- 7.2.9. Based on the policy context, I consider that the original proposed width of 8.62m would both result in the loss of a large proportion of the front boundary and the creation of an overly wide opening that would appear visually incongruous in the streetscape and would set an undesirable precedent for the area. I will deal with this in detail under section 7.3 below.
- 7.2.10. The appellant cites fifteen other permissions within County Kildare in which vehicular entrances of greater width have been permitted. Having reviewed the examples provided and wider planning applications for vehicular entrances in County Kildare, I am of the view that the Council's approach varies depending on site context and location within the County. As the Commission is aware, all applications are dealt with on their merits and I consider in this instance, the appropriate width is dependent on-site specific considerations. As indicated above, there are no examples of planning permissions for vehicular widening in the Hazelmere estate.
- 7.2.11. There is additional policy supporting the provision of EV parking. I will consider this in the in the context of the proposal in the next section below.

7.3. Vehicular entrance width and visual amenity impact

- 7.3.1. The subject dwelling has a front garden and driveway with a depth of 5.87m and an existing vehicular entrance of 2.8m width (across a frontage of c.10m). The entrance is served by a large area of dished footpath to the front boundary of the property which extends across a large proportion of the frontage to the dwelling. There are two small street trees located to the front of the property.
- 7.3.2. The appellant contends that the permitted 3.5m width vehicular entrance would result in cumbersome parking and limited manoeuvrability for two vehicles. They reference a transition to electric vehicles (EVs) and associated off-street charging point as a rationale for increased width. They also contend that a wider opening would reduce on-street parking demand and enhance local amenity. The appeal has proposed an alternative reduced width of 6.62m with provision of a 2m boundary wall aligning with the existing boundary to adjoining property, no. 89 Hazelmere.
- 7.3.3. The planning authority considered the original 8.62m vehicular entrance width to be excessive and out of character with the established boundary treatments in the estate. They noted that the proposal would indirectly remove informal on-street

parking arrangements and create a significant area of hard landscaping diminishing the streetscape quality.

- 7.3.4. While the roads department did not object on safety grounds, the planning authority recommended a maximum entrance width of 3.5 metres in the interests of ensuring that on-street parking arrangements are provided and in the interests of placemaking and quality streetscape.
- 7.3.5. The planning authority's response to the 1st Party Appeal reiterated the majority of the original assessment, although placed an emphasis in their consideration that a maximum width of 3.5m is sufficient having regard to the 5.87m depth between the front boundary wall and front building line of the dwelling.
- 7.3.6. The Roads, Transportation and Public Safety Department of Kildare County Council raised no objection to the proposal subject to inclusion of conditions relating to the construction stage of the development and road drainage for the operational development. I am satisfied, having regard to the nature of the estate road and the limited traffic speeds, that the development would not result in any adverse impact upon pedestrian or traffic safety.
- 7.3.7. I consider that the existing width (2.8m) would be unlikely to allow for the parking of two cars and in the interests of meeting the practical needs and requirements of the appellant I am satisfied that the widening of the vehicular entrance is warranted.
- 7.3.8. Based on the site visit, it is accepted that the driveway depth of 5.87m is modest and that two vehicles would likely have to park at angles with a reduced entrance width and would not be able to park independently. I further note that the submitted site plan does not include the existing projecting porch, a feature of the dwellings in the estate. This would further limit manoeuvrability, making car parking problematic with a narrower entrance.
- 7.3.9. I note that the permitted width of 3.5m is the approximate width that is commonly considered to be sufficient in order to ensure adequate vehicular access and to protect visual amenity within suburban contexts across a number of planning authorities. However, I am not satisfied that this standard is most appropriate to the site context and location in this instance.

- 7.3.10. I note that the planning authority assessment had limited regard relating to the facilitation of EV parking and charging infrastructure. I note that there is no existing public on-street EV charging points in the vicinity and I do not consider that it is practical or in the interests of traffic and pedestrian safety for private infrastructure such as cross pavement solutions serve on-street EV parking in the absence of policy/regulation.
- 7.3.11. Having regard to the Climate Action and Low Carbon Development (Amendment) Act 2021 and the objectives set out within the Climate Action Plan 2025, there is a clear national policy commitment to reduce emissions and transition towards a climate resilient economy. The shift to more sustainable modes of travel including the transition from fossil fuel cars to EV's is indicated as a key component of achieving the above national policy. I note that the Development Plan also recognises the role of sustainable transport including EV's in achieving a transition to a Net Zero carbon emissions (section 5.4 and Objective TM O17). Having regard to national policy and in the absence of public EV charging points in the vicinity or policy/regulation for facilitation of private on-street charging infrastructure, I consider, where appropriate, EV parking with associated charging infrastructure for residential use within the curtilage of the dwelling should be facilitated.
- 7.3.12. I note that the planning authority did not object to the parking of two cars within the subject site and the limitation of 3.5m relates to the visual impact and loss of on-street parking. While I acknowledge the Development Plan policies in placemaking, public realm and sustainable transport, I am of the view, based on the housing typology and location, it is reasonable to consider that two car parking spaces are warranted.
- 7.3.13. On-street parking is not formally demarcated in this location, although it was noted during the site visit that cars were parked informally on the street. As indicated, almost the entirety of the footpath to the front of the property has been dished, assumedly due to the location of the original and revised vehicular entrances serving the dwelling. No further dishing is proposed and the existing grass verge and kerb which partially extends across the frontage to the subject site and the adjoining property, no. 89 will be retained.

- 7.3.14. While I accept that excessively wide driveways can reduce the potential for on-street parking, I am of the view that the existing dished footpath already limits the potential for on-street parking to the front of the subject dwelling. I further consider that the proposed development will ensure that the potential for parking adjacent to the grass verge is retained, particularly if it is considered that a reduced width to 6.62m is appropriate. I therefore do not consider that the development will result in the loss of on-street parking, and I do not consider that this is a justifiable reason to limit the vehicular entrance to a width of 3.5m.
- 7.3.15. The appeal submission proposes a reduction in width of the vehicular entrance to 6.62m with provision of a 2m wide low boundary wall aligning with the neighbouring property, no. 89 and wider area. This proposal will retain c. 3.4m of front boundary as well as the south boundary to the side/rear garden. I further note that the applicant has also proposed a landscaped strip along the full length of the boundary with no. 89, which will soften the appearance of parked cars.
- 7.3.16. The submitted plans indicate the location of the existing two street trees to either side of the existing dish which is to be retained as existing. The plans would suggest that the trunk of the street trees will be a minimum distance of 2.2m from the proposed works to the front boundary. Having regard to the juvenile nature of the street trees and separation distance, I am satisfied that the development will not have a negative impact on the trees, in particular the root zone.
- 7.3.17. On the basis of the above assessment, I consider that the revised proposal to widen the vehicular entrance to 6.62m is acceptable. I am satisfied that a sufficient scale of the front boundary will be retained, and that inclusion of additional landscaping will mitigate visual impacts. I consider that the increased width is warranted to enable practical and functional off-street car parking for two vehicles within a shallow front garden and would not adversely affect traffic and pedestrian safety. In my view, I do not consider that the proposal will significantly detract from the character and visual amenity of the area.
- 7.3.18. Accordingly, I recommend that Condition 2(b) and Condition 3 be altered and that the Commission permit an increased width of the vehicular entrance to a maximum of 6.6m.

8.0 AA Screening

The proposed development comprises a domestic vehicular entrance in an established suburban area. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project, and taking account of the screening determination of the planning authority, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site.

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

9.0 Recommendation

Having regard to the nature of the conditions that are the subject of the appeal, I am satisfied that the determination by the Board, of the relevant application as if it had been made to it in the first instance, with attachment of said conditions, would not be warranted and based on the reasons and considerations set out below, I recommend that the Board direct the Planning Authority under subsection (1) of section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, to:

Amend condition 2(b) as follows:

2. (b) Permission to widen the vehicular entrance to a maximum width of 6.6m.

Amend Condition 3 as follows:

3. The vehicular entrance shall be a maximum width of 6.6 metres. Prior to commencement of development, revised site layout plans to be submitted clearly indicating:

(a) A vehicular entrance with a maximum width of 6.6m, measured from the south pier extending northwards.

(b) A low boundary wall, the height and design of which shall match the height and design of the front boundary wall of the adjoining property at no. 89 Hazelmere shall

be submitted to the Kildare County Council Planning Department for placement on Register File.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the residential land use zoning of the site, the policies and objectives within the Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029, the location and scale of the development and the pattern of development in the area, the limited depth of the driveway and the appropriateness of providing for EV charging privately where no public infrastructure is available, it is considered that the proposed retention of the existing vehicular entrance and boundary wall and the proposed widening of the vehicular entrance would not result in a loss of an on-street car parking space, would not seriously injure the amenities of the area and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

David Freeland
Planning Inspector

7th August 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference		
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of the existing boundary wall and vehicular entrance and permission to widen the vehicular entrance and all associated site works.	
Development Address	88 Hazelmere, Naas, Co. Kildare	
		In all cases check box blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?		
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.		State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3		
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required		State the Class and state the relevant threshold

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
--	---

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____