



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP- 322527-25

Development	Retention of extension, attic conversion and porch. Permission for canopy, door extension and sub-division of site for construction of house.
Location	5 Rochford Green, Kill, Co. Kildare
Planning Authority	Kildare County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560182
Applicant(s)	Noel Rochford
Type of Application	Retention Permission and Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party vs Refusal
Appellant(s)	Noel Rochford
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	5
3.1. Decision	5
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	6
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	8
3.4. Third Party Observations	8
4.0 Planning History.....	8
5.0 Policy Context.....	9
5.1. National Guidance	9
5.2. Development Plan / Local Area Plan	10
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations	12
5.4. EIA Screening	12
5.5. Water Framework Directive.....	12
6.0 The Appeal	13
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	13
6.2. Planning Authority Response.....	14
6.3. Observations.....	14
7.0 Assessment.....	14
7.2. Principle of development.....	15
7.3. Accuracy of drawings submitted	16
7.4. Impact on residential and visual amenities	17
7.5. Dwelling Standards	18

7.6. Car Parking and Traffic Safety	19
7.7. Conclusion	19
8.0 AA Screening.....	20
9.0 Recommendation.....	21
10.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	21
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

The subject site is located within an established residential area situated to the eastern side of Kill Village (c. 350m off Main St - L201). The estate is noted by a mix of two-storey housing and apartment development. The subject site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with an existing porch extension to the front, a part two-storey, part single storey extension to the side and rear and a dormer extension at roof level to the rear. The property is bounded by a public road and footpath to the front (south-west) and side (south-east) boundary. The rear garden has been subdivided by a low wall and gateway.

The site visit clarifies that there is an additional single storey extension to rear of the original dwelling and several ancillary structures to the side and rear which includes a covered side passage, a pergola structure and a small garden shed, all of which are not indicated on the submitted plans or within the development description.

2.0 Proposed Development

The development subject to this appeal comprises:

- Retention permission for a two-storey extension to the side, a dormer extension at roof level to rear and porch extension to front.
- Permission for the subdivision of the property comprising the side two-storey extension for use as a two-bedroom two-storey house (5a Rochford Green). To facilitate the subdivision, it is proposed to construct a canopy structure and additional entrance to the front of the side extension and all associated works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Refuse Retention Permission and Permission for the following three reasons:

1. Having regard to the restricted nature and prominent location of this site and the established pattern of development in the surrounding neighbourhood, it is considered that the proposed subdivision of the existing

development would represent an inappropriate form of infill residential development and would be out of character with development in the vicinity. The proposed development would be therefore contrary to Policy HO P6 of the Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029 which seeks ‘to promote and support residential consolidation and sustainable intensification and regeneration through the consideration of applications for infill development, backland development, re- use/adaptation of existing housing stock and the use of upper floors, subject to the provision of good quality accommodation.’ In addition, it is considered that the development would seriously injure the amenities of the area and therefore contravene the zoning objective afforded to the site which seeks ‘to protect and improve existing residential amenity, to provide for appropriate infill residential development and to provide for new and improved ancillary services.’ Furthermore, the development would set an undesirable precedent for other similar developments, which would in themselves and cumulatively, be harmful to the residential amenities of the area and therefore would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Having regard to the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that the development of a side extension to the existing dwelling, is visually obtrusive and overbearing at this prominent location and contrary to the provisions of Section 15.4.12 of the Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029, and therefore would seriously injure the amenities, or depreciate the value, of property in the vicinity and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. The proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and the obstruction of road users and would interfere with the safety and free flowing nature of traffic on the road and therefore, would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planner’s report is summarised as follows:

- The constructed side/rear extension and dormer at roof level is considered to be visually obtrusive and overbearing at this prominent location and therefore contrary to provisions of Section 15.4.12 of the Development Plan.
- The restricted width of the subdivided dwelling is out of character with the existing dwellings in the estate, would be an inappropriate form of infill residential development, is contrary to Policy HO P6 and the zoning objective of the area and would set an undesirable precedent in the area.
- The proposal which includes 4no. car parking spaces to the front will result in vehicles reversing onto the public road causing a traffic hazard.
- The planning report noted the permitted development under Reg. Ref. 08/805 but considered the as constructed development as an intensification of the site with associated scale, bulk and mass.
- There is no requirement for appropriate assessment or environmental impact assessment.
- The planning report made a recommendation to refuse permission.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Transportation, Mobility and Open Spaces Section: Refuse Permission.

The addition of two parking spaces was considered to be inappropriate in close proximity to the junction in the estate.

The Section recommended refusal for the following reason:

The proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and the obstruction of road users and would interfere with the safety and free flowing nature of traffic on the road.

- Environment Section: No objections subject to conditions.
- Water Services Department: No objections subject to conditions.
- Fire Services: No objections.
- Heritage, Biodiversity and Conservation Unit: No objections.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Eireann: no report received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None

4.0 Planning History

ABP Ref. PL.09.231980 / PA Ref. 08/1637: Permission Refused by ABP for subdivision of existing site for construction of a 2-bedroom two storey house. The reasons for refusal were as follows:

- 1. Having regard to the restricted width of the site and the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that the proposed development would be out of character with the existing layout of the estate, would breach the established building line on Rochford Green and would be visually obtrusive. The proposed development would, therefore, seriously injure the amenities of the area and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. In deciding not to accept the Inspector's recommendation to grant permission, the Board concurred with the planning authority that the proposed development of an additional house on this site would not be acceptable for the foregoing reason and considered that the grant of permission for an extension of the existing house on the site does not create a precedent for granting permission for an additional house on the site.*

PA Ref. 08/805: Permission Granted for a two-storey extension to side and internal changes to the existing semi-detached house.

PA Ref. 06/1650: Permission Refused for sub-division of site and construction of a two bed two storey house to the side of the dwelling.

ABP Ref. PL09.214706 / PA. Ref. 05/1874: Permission Refused for sub-division of site and construction of a two bed two storey house to the side of the dwelling.

PA Ref. 04/2574: Permission Refused for sub-division of site and construction of two-storey dwelling to side and new entrance to side boundary.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Guidance

Public Consultation for Review of Exempted Development (July 2025)

The Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage undertook consultation (deadline 26th August 2025) as part of the review of exempted development regulations and has identified specific areas that need updating including domestic exemptions. Of relevance to the subject appeal, the review includes draft proposals for the subdivision of dwelling houses subject to certain criteria. It is intended that such subdivisions will allow for flexible measures to be taken to support continued living in situ by older people and other family members. *Among the issues to be considered are:*

- Number of subdivisions – should it be only one subdivision to allow for two units in order to take account of balancing flexibility with residential amenity?
- That any subdivided units should comply with minimum standards? In considering exemptions in relation to detached habitable dwellings and subdivision of dwellings, consideration will be given as to whether both can be availed of in respect of a dwelling unit to avoid cumulative impact and over development of a residential site.

National Planning Framework First Revision 2025

The following National Policy Objectives are relevant to the appeal:

- *National Policy Objective 7*
Deliver at least 40% of all new homes nationally, within the built-up footprint of existing settlements and ensure compact and sequential patterns of growth.
- *National Policy Objective 9*
Deliver at least 30% of all new homes that are targeted in settlements other than the five Cities and their suburbs, within their existing built-up footprints and ensure compact and sequential patterns of growth.

- *National Policy Objective 45*
Increase residential density in settlements, through a range of measures including reductions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration, increased building height and more compact forms of development

Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)

The Guidelines set out policy and guidance in relation to the planning and development of urban and rural settlements with a focus on compact growth in line with the NPF by encouraging infill development within serviced sites.

The relevant Strategic Planning Policy Requirements include SPPR 1 relating to separation distances, SPPR 2 relating to private open space and SPPR 3 relating to car parking.

Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes and Sustaining Communities (2007)

Section 5.3.2. and Table 5.1 of the Guidelines set out relevant quantitative standards for space provision and room sizes for typical dwellings.

5.2. Development Plan / Local Area Plan

Kildare County Development Plan 2023 – 2029

Relevant policies and objectives include:

- Objective HO O6: *Ensure a balance between the protection of existing residential amenities, the established character of the area and the need to provide for sustainable residential development is achieved in all new developments.*
- Policy HO P6: *Promote and support residential consolidation and sustainable intensification and regeneration through the consideration of applications for infill development, backland development, re- use/adaptation of existing housing stock and the use of upper floors, subject to the provision of good quality accommodation.*
- Objective HO O8: *Support new housing provision over the Plan period to deliver compact and sustainable growth in the towns and villages in the County, and supporting urban renewal, infill and brownfield site development*

and regeneration, to strengthen the roles and viability of the towns and villages, including the requirement that at least 30% of all new homes in settlements be delivered within the existing built- up footprint.

Relevant sections in the Development Plan include:

15.2.2 Overlooking / Separation Distances

15.2.3 Overshadowing

15.4.12 Extensions to Dwellings

Adapting residential units through extensions can sustainably accommodate the changing needs of occupants subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities. A well-designed extension can provide extra space, personalise and enhance the appearance of a dwelling. It would not be practical to set out a prescriptive approach to the design of extensions that would cover every situation, nor is it desirable to inhibit innovation or individuality. The following basic principles shall be applied:

- The extension should be sensitive to the appearance and character of the house and the local area (urban or rural).*
- The extension shall have regard to the form and scale of the existing dwelling and should not adversely distort the scale or mass of the structure.*
- The design and scale should have regard to adjoining properties.*
- A flexible approach will be taken to the assessment of alternative design concepts and high-quality contemporary designs will be encouraged. A different approach may apply in the case of a Protected Structure, structures with significant heritage or within an Architectural Conservation Area.*
- In rural areas, the design of extensions should have regard to the Key Principles set out in Appendix 4 Rural House Design Guide.*
- The extension should not provide for new overlooking or loss of privacy below reasonable levels to the private area of an adjacent residence.*
- The cumulative impact of the existing extent of overlooking and the overlooking that would arise as a result of any proposed extension need to be considered.*

- *The extension should not have an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties. Large extensions, particularly if higher than one storey, should be moved away from neighbouring property boundaries.*
- *New extensions should not overshadow adjacent dwellings to the degree that there is a significant decrease in daylight or sunlight entering into the house.*
- *An adequate area of private open space, relative to the size of the dwelling should be retained, generally not less than 25sq.m.*
- *Where required, it will be necessary to demonstrate that the existing on-site wastewater treatment system serving the main dwelling can facilitate the additional loading from the proposed extension. Where this cannot be demonstrated, it will be necessary for the on-site wastewater treatment system to be upgraded as part of the development proposal*

The Development Plan does not include prescriptive policy or criteria for subdivision of dwellings or dwellings in side gardens.

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 Painestown IE_EA_09P010400. The subject site is located to the south-west of the Rochford estate, c. 55m from the River Waterbody.

The development to be retained comprises an attic and porch conversion and permission for extension and sub-division of the house.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

I have assessed the proposed development to be retained 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 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 against the Planning Authority's decision to refuse permission. The main grounds of appeal are summarised as follows:

- In response to the first reason for refusal, the appellant contends that the site is not restrictive in nature and complies with all relevant development management standards within the Development Plan. The appellant argues that there is no minimum width for a rear garden space and consider the planning authority refusal as subjective. The appellant highlights that the

development has been in place for 15 years with no reported issues from neighbouring properties.

- In response to the second reason for refusal, the appellant contends that the ground floor element which extends beyond the rear building line is not overbearing in appearance on the basis that it cannot be seen from any public viewpoint. The appellant acknowledges that the rear dormer window could be considered as overbearing and visually obtrusive and has proposed to remove the dormer window to ensure consistency with the pattern of development in the area.
- In response to the third reason for refusal, the appellant indicates they do not have a requirement for four cars as the subdivided dwelling will serve immediate family. It is disproportionate to conclude that the development will be a traffic hazard. The appellant has suggested an appropriate condition may be applied relating to the number of car parking spaces.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

In a letter dated 09/06/2025, the planning authority confirmed its decision and referred to the issues raised in the Planning Authority's report, technical departments and prescribed bodies.

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 substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Accuracy of drawings submitted

- Impact on residential and visual amenities
- Housing Standards
- Car Parking and Traffic Safety

7.2. Principle of development

- 7.2.1. The site contains a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with an existing side two storey extension and part single, part two-storey extension to the rear. The dwelling also has a porch extension to the front and a rear dormer extension.
- 7.2.2. The site visit indicated that the submitted drawings and public notices have not included other existing structures within the site which comprises a single storey flat roof extension to the rear of the original dwelling, a covered side passage, a pergola to the rear and a small shed within the rear garden. The rear garden is currently subdivided by a low wall with a connecting gate. The planning status of these structures is unclear.
- 7.2.3. The development description states that the application is for retention of the two-storey extension to the side, the rear dormer extension and porch extension to the front. It is further proposed to subdivide the property which includes the side two-storey extension for use as a separate two-bedroom two storey house (suggested as 5a Rochford Green). As part of this, a front canopy and porch extension is proposed which will facilitate the sub-division. The submitted plans indicate that the development is intended as a standalone dwelling for the applicant's daughter and family.
- 7.2.4. The site has been the subject of several applications for sub-division of the site which have been refused permission for reasons relating to the restricted nature of the site, the impacts on character and layout of the estate, the overbearing and obtrusive appearance and subsequent impact on the amenities of the area. A two-storey extension to the side was permitted under Reg. Ref. 08/805 which aligned with the primary front and rear building line.
- 7.2.5. The appellants indicate that the as constructed development (which is contrary to above permission) has been in-situ more than 15 years with no complaint. This would correlate with a review of historic satellite imagery.

- 7.2.6. The appeal site is zoned 'B – Existing Residential / Infill' under the Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029 with the accompanying land-use zoning objective 'to protect and improve existing residential amenity, to provide for appropriate infill residential development and to provide for new and improved ancillary services'. Having regard to the site's zoning, Section 15.4.12, and Policy HO P6 of the Development Plan and wider national policy and guidance which promotes compact growth by encouraging infill development, I consider that the extension to the dwelling to be retained and the proposed sub-division for provision of an additional dwelling are acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of the impacts upon the amenities of the area.
- 7.2.7. I note the recent public consultation for exempted development which includes the potential for subdivision of dwelling houses. The draft exempted development provision suggests potential for subdivision of a dwelling to facilitate family members subject to complying with minimum standards. It is unclear at this stage as to whether potential subdivision of a dwelling will allow for additional extensions to dwellings. While the conditions/limitations and timing of any forthcoming legislation is uncertain, it may reflect a policy direction towards greater flexibility of such accommodation although it should not be determinative in the context of the subject appeal.

7.3. Accuracy of drawings submitted

- 7.3.1. I consider that the single storey extension to rear of the original dwelling and the other additional structures not indicated on submitted drawings or public notices are material in the consideration of the subject appeal. Their omission from the drawings undermines clarity and prevents a full cumulative assessment rendering the application as deficient.
- 7.3.2. I am of the view that it would be inappropriate to grant permission for only part of the built form while other undocumented development remains outside of the scope of the application.
- 7.3.3. I note that the inaccurate drawings and public notices which do not include these material elements is a new issue in the context of this appeal. The Commission may wish to inform the first party that this may constitute a reason for refusal. The

Commission could seek drawings and new public notices to this effect having regard to the procedures under Section 137 of the Act. However, having regard to other substantive reasons for refusal set out below, it may not be considered necessary to pursue the matter.

7.4. Impact on residential and visual amenities

- 7.4.1. The planning authority considered the side/rear extension and dormer as an intensification of the site which is visually obtrusive and overbearing at this prominent location by way of its associated scale, bulk and mass. Having regard to the subdivision, the planning authority noted the restricted nature of the site and considered that the subdivision would be out of character with the existing dwellings in the estate, would be an inappropriate form of infill residential development which would set an undesirable precedent for the area.
- 7.4.2. The appellant acknowledged that the provision of the rear dormer may be considered as overbearing and visually obtrusive and proposed removing the dormer structure.
- 7.4.3. I would generally concur that the site is prominent with the side (south) boundary adjoining the public realm and positioning of the dwelling being forwards of the building line to the south-east with subsequent views of the rear of the dwelling.
- 7.4.4. Notwithstanding the prominence of the site, I am of the view that the part single and part two-storey extension to the side and rear which will form the sub-divided dwelling (when considered independently), is not overly obtrusive or overbearing in appearance when viewed on approach from the south-east or from neighbouring dwellings. However, I consider that the scale and positioning of the dormer in combination with the rear two-storey extension results in a visually discordant appearance which is injurious to the visual amenity of the street and would set an undesirable precedent for the area. I consider that it is appropriate for the dormer extension to be omitted.
- 7.4.5. The porch to the front of the dwelling (proposed for retention) and the as constructed side extension aligns with the design and character of the existing and neighbouring dwellings. As part of the proposed sub-division, a canopy structure and separate entrance is proposed to the front. I am satisfied that these alterations and

subsequent subdivision do not have any significant or negative impact on the character and visual amenity of the area.

- 7.4.6. Having regard to the positioning of the part single, part two-storey extension to the south of the site (proposed for retention), its set-back and separation distance to neighbouring dwellings, namely no. 4 & 6 Rochford Green, I am satisfied that the development will not significantly impact the residential amenity of neighbouring properties by way reducing daylight/sunlight or by having an overbearing appearance. The first-floor level windows to the rear extension will not directly oppose any upper floor windows serving habitable rooms or overlook private open space to neighbouring properties.
- 7.4.7. The more significant issue relates to the cumulative impact of the development to be retained and proposed with the other existing extension and structures within the site which are not indicated on site plans or within the development description. On the basis that the structures have not been included as part of the application or within submitted drawings, I do not consider that these elements may be conditioned for removal as part of any grant of permission. I consider that these structures contribute towards a cluttered and haphazard form of development. Taken together, the cumulative impact of the extensions and structures would detract from the residential character of the estate and would injure the visual and residential amenities of the area.

7.5. Dwelling Standards

- 7.5.1. The development proposes to sub-divide the property to provide for a 2-bedroom dwelling (stated area of 114sq.m). The parent dwelling will retain 3no. bedrooms. I note that the proposed 2-bedroom dwelling complies and exceeds in certain instances with the minimum standards for houses set out within Table 5.1 and Section 5.3.2 of the 'Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities' (2007). I am satisfied that the subdivided dwelling will be of a sufficient standard and amenity for future occupants.
- 7.5.2. Based on the plans provided, the sub-divided dwelling will have c. 66sq.m of private open space to rear and a width of 5.3m while the parent dwelling, will retain c. 77sq.m of private open space (with omitted rear single storey extension included)

and a width of 5.6m. The proposed private open space serving both dwellings comply with SPPR 2 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines and I consider the rear gardens to be of sufficient width.

- 7.5.3. I am satisfied that the proposed dwelling to the side with associated private open space to the rear complies with all relevant standards and will provide for good quality accommodation.

7.6. Car Parking and Traffic Safety

- 7.6.1. The site layout plan indicates that it is intended to provide for four car parking spaces to the front. The front garden and driveway has an approximate depth of 7m and width of 11m.
- 7.6.2. The planning authority considered that the development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and obstruction of road users. The appellant suggests that four car parking spaces is not required and that it may be appropriate to attach a condition relating to car parking provision.
- 7.6.3. During the site visit, I observed three cars parked to the front of the property, one of which was entirely obstructing the public footpath. I also noted that there was informal car parking on the street, particularly to the roadway adjoining to the south-east. This would indicate a demand for parking in the area.
- 7.6.4. SPPR 3 Compact Settlement Guidelines (2024) indicate that the maximum rate of car parking (within intermediate and peripheral locations) is 2no. spaces per dwelling. Having regard to the scale of the proposed dwelling (2-bedrooms) and area of the front garden, I consider that it is reasonable to provide a total of 3no. spaces serving the parent and sub-divided dwelling subject to appropriate limitation on vehicular entrance width and retention of the front boundary in so far as possible in the interests of visual amenity and traffic safety.

7.7. Conclusion

- 7.7.1. Having regard to the zoning of the site and relevant national and Development Plan policy context, I consider that there is potential in principle to regularise the development and to provide for the subdivision of the property. The proposed

dwelling meets the quantitative standards and when considered in isolation, could be considered to be consistent with Development Plan and national policy and guidance relating to compact growth.

- 7.7.2. However, I consider that the existing built context within the site which includes a single storey extension to rear and ancillary structures within the side and rear garden are material to the consideration of the appeal. On the basis that they have not been included as part of the application or indicated on submitted drawings, I do not consider it to be proper planning to remove these structures by way of condition in the event of a grant of permission. In this context, the cumulative impact of the undocumented development, together with the development for retention and proposed subdivision would be a haphazard form of development, would detract from the character of the estate and would seriously injure the residential and visual amenities of the area.

8.0 AA Screening

The development to be retained comprises a part single part two-storey extension to the side and rear, a porch extension to the front and a dormer extension to the rear. The proposed development comprises the sub-division of the property to provide for a two-bedroom dwelling (within side extension) with provision of a canopy structure and entrance to the front.

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 direct linkages 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

I recommend that permission be refused for the development for the reasons and considerations set out below.

I reiterate to the Commission that the concerns relating to inaccuracies in the submitted drawings and public notices is a new issue in the context of this appeal and the Commission may wish to consider issuing a s.137 notice in this regard.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The development proposed to be retained and the proposed development are not accurately shown on the plans and particulars submitted and are not referred to within the public notices and are therefore inadequate. It is considered that it would be inappropriate to grant planning permission under these circumstances.
2. Having regard to the zoning objective for the site under the Kildare County Development Plan 2023 - 2029, the provisions of Section 15.4.12 of the Plan relating to extensions to dwellings and Policy HO P6 which promotes residential consolidation subject to good quality accommodation, the development proposed to be retained and the proposed development, by reason of the scale of the development alongside other structures within the site (not indicated on submitted drawings or public notices), would represent a haphazard form of development which would detract from the character of the area and seriously injure the residential and visual amenities of the area. The development proposed to be retained and the proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proposed 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

4th September 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference		
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of extension, attic conversion and porch. Permission for canopy, door extension and sub-division of site for construction of house.	
Development Address	5 Rochford Green, Kill, 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: _____