



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-500521-KE-25

Development	Extension to garden shed / garage to rear, change of use of part of garage from residential to hair salon, provision of roof lights to attic store / stairs area and widening of vehicular access
Location	90 Leixlip Park, Leixlip, County Kildare
Planning Authority	Kildare County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2556
Applicants	Jason Doyle and Siobhan Maher
Type of Application	Retention permission
Planning Authority Decision	Split decision
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellants	Jason Doyle and Siobhan Maher
Observers)	None
Date of Site Inspection	2 nd April 2026
Inspector	Trevor Rue

Table of Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	7
6.0 EIA Screening.....	10
7.0 The Appeal	10
8.0 Assessment	12
9.0 AA Screening.....	14
10.0 Water Framework Directive	15
11.0 Recommendation	15
12.0 Reasons and Considerations	15
13.0 Conditions	16
Appendix A: Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening	19

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The application site is in a residential area about 600 metres to the west of the town centre of Leixlip. It has a stated area of 0.02815 hectares and comprises a two-storey three-bedroom end-of-terrace house. There is a vehicular access to the front of the property where there is space for car parking. The house has a single-storey rear extension and a small back garden. A garage/shed at the rear of the property abuts, and is accessed directly from, a back laneway.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Retention permission is sought for:

- an extension to the garage/shed comprising 12.91 square metres, increasing its total floor area to 30.91 square metres;
- the use of the extended area as a hair salon;
- two roof windows to the front and two to the rear of the attic; and
- the widening of the vehicular access to take in the full site frontage and facilitate the parking of a second car in front of the property.

2.2. **Further information** was provided about the hair salon in response to a formal request from the planning authority:

- Opening hours range between 10am or 11am and 6pm to 8pm on Wednesdays to Fridays and from 9am to approximately 2pm on Saturdays. The salon is not open on the other days.
- Siobhan Maher is the sole trader with no employees. Due to family medical circumstances, she needs to be close to home. (Details are on the file.)
- Pedestrian access is via a side gate using a code.
- Clients are seen by appointment only. Typically, there is only one client on site at any given time. Due to unforeseen delays or early arrivals, on rare occasions two may be present as a maximum. No waiting area is provided.
- One parking space is reserved for clients and on-street parking is available. Clients are asked to park in the driveway if possible as the road is narrow. If two cars park opposite each other, it can block access for emergency vehicles.
- Each client normally spends two to three hours on site. Incense is lit, lighting is dimmed, tea and coffee are offered, books are available and music is played.

- Products used are not dissimilar to domestic hair-care products and waste is carefully managed.
- Deliveries are minimal as products are usually collected from suppliers.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. On 25th November 2025, Kildare County Council issued a split decision. It decided to grant retention permission for the provision of roof lights to the attic store / stairs area and for the widening of the vehicular access, subject to six conditions. Condition 1 required accordance with submitted documentation and particulars. Condition 2 restricted the permission to the attic conversion and widened access only. Condition 3 required the existing dwelling and attic conversion to be occupied as a single housing unit. Condition 4 specified that the attic was to be used for storage only and not as habitable space. Condition 5 concerned sightlines at the entrance, while Condition 6 concerned surface water disposal.

3.1.2. The Council also decided to refuse retention permission for the extension to the garden shed / garage and for the change of use of part of the garage from residential to hair salon. The reasons for refusal were as follows:

1. It is considered that the change of use of the garage extension, proposed to be retained, as a hair salon is not expressly permitted within the "Existing Residential / Infill" zoning on the subject site as contained in the Leixlip Local Area Plan 2020-2023 (as extended) and as such the development would materially contravene said zoning objective which seeks to protect and enhance the amenity of established residential communities and promote sustainable intensification.

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 would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. On the basis of the substandard information supplied within the planning application, in particular with respect to lack of information on the dedicated car parking facilities for the hair salon on the subject site and taking account of the car parking provisions

of Section 15.7.8 of the Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029, it is considered that the Applicants have not demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority, that the development proposed to be retained would not endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard, obstruct road users and would not interfere with the safe and free flowing nature of traffic on the public road and surrounding residential developments. The development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. **Planning reports** dated 1st May and 20th November 2025 provided the reasoning for the authority's decision. The main points were as follows:

- The application form refers to an attic store but a bedroom is shown on the floor plan. However, the applicants have advised that the labelling is incorrect and that due to its dimensions the attic is suitable only as a store.
- During the site visit it was observed that the building to the rear of the property was in use partly as a domestic garage and partly as a hair salon. The salon consists of two chairs, a basin for washing, and a toilet. It has electricity and water connections. Access is from the side and rear of the property.
- The stated circumstances do not warrant retention of the hair salon. A grant of permission would set an undesired precedent in a residential area contrary to the zoning objective.
- The car-parking standard for three-bed dwellings is one space. Hair salons require the same parking provision as a small retail or office unit and on that basis at least one parking space would be required as the site is outside the town centre and away from any public transport links. The minimum size of a car-parking space is 2.5 metres by 5.0 metres. The space in front of the dwelling measures 7.3 metres in width by 5.0 metres in length. Notwithstanding the Roads Department's report, the car-parking facilities provided are insufficient for the development.

3.2.2. The Council's **Heritage, Biodiversity and Conservation Office** had no comments.

3.2.3. The Council's **Area Engineer** made no objection but set out recommended conditions.

- 3.2.4. The Council's **Water Services Department** had no objections subject to conditions.
- 3.2.5. The Council's **Environment Section** had no objection subject to a standard condition.
- 3.2.6. The Council's **Transport, Mobility and Open Space Department** had no objections.
- 3.2.7. Following clarification of the use of the attic space, the Council's **Fire Service** had no objection.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

- 3.3.1. No report was received from **Uisce Éireann**.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. **Application Site**

- 4.1.1. **UD8646:** In May 2024, the planning authority sent a warning letter to Jason Doyle concerning the unauthorised commercial use as a hair salon of a structure in the rear garden of the present application site.

4.2. **Comparison Sites**

- 4.2.1. **ABP-305834-19:** On 14th February 2020, following a third-party appeal, An Bord Pleanála decided to grant permission for the change of use of an existing domestic garage and utility room to a yoga studio and meeting area in Waterford.
- 4.2.2. **24/60267:** on 2nd July 2024, Kildare County Council granted permission for the change of use of an existing ground floor living / home office space to a physiotherapy room for commercial use catering for private clients/patients on an appointment basis only at 15 Bleach Road, Dun Brinn, Athy. A condition was attached indicating that the permission did not authorise any signage.
- 4.2.3. **25/60344:** On 15th December 2025, Kildare County Council decided to grant retention permission for the use of a playroom as a beauty salon at 10 The Park, Oldtown Mill, Celbridge for a temporary period of three years. A condition was attached stating that the salon was to be operated only by the applicant, prohibiting commercial signage, restricting the opening hours and allowing only one client at a time by appointment.

Another condition required submission of a revised site layout demonstrating that all vehicles can enter and exit the site without the need to reverse on to the road.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. Map 4 of the **Leixlip Local Area Plan 2020-2023**, whose life was extended until 30th March 2026, shows the application site located in Zone B: Existing / Infill Residential. The land-use zoning objective, set out in Table 13-1 of the Plan, is to protect and enhance the amenity of established residential communities and promote sustainable intensification.
- 5.1.2. Table 13-3 of the Plan provides a matrix illustrating a range of land uses together with an indication of their broad acceptability in each zone. There is no reference to hair salons but convenience shops are indicated as open for consideration where no single unit has more than 100 square metres of net retail space. Other uses that are noted as being open for consideration include community/recreational/sports buildings and medical consultant / health centres.
- 5.1.3. Table 13-2 explains that open-for-consideration uses are not considered acceptable in principle in all parts of the relevant land use zone. However, such uses may be acceptable where the Council is satisfied that the proposed use would not conflict with the general objectives for the zone and the permitted or existing uses as well as being in the interests of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. Table 13-2 also says that proposed land uses not listed in the matrix will be considered on the merits of the individual planning application, with reference to the most appropriate use of a similar nature indicated in [Table 13-3] and in relation to the general policies and zoning objectives for the area.
- 5.1.4. Section 6.1.1 of the Local Area Plan states that the number of workers resident within Leixlip Electoral District was 7,168 in 2016, of whom 3,546 travel to work within Dublin City and suburbs. 2016 Census data also indicates that the number of people at work within Leixlip is 8,500. It is evident therefore that Leixlip is both an importer and exporter of workers. The most popular means of travelling to work by those living in Leixlip was by car with this mode accounting for 59% of all journeys. The average

journey time was 32 minutes and 39.7% of workers faced a commuting time in excess of 30 minutes.

- 5.1.5. Policy EDT2 of the Plan states that it is the policy of the Council, where commercial and industrial enterprises exist as non-conforming but long-established uses, to support their continued operation and reasonable expansion, save where such a use would impact negatively on the economic and social well-being of the area and inhibit development that is in conformance with the land use zoning objective. Objective EDT2.1 is to support the continued operation and reasonable expansion of existing non-conforming uses, provided they do not result in loss of amenity to adjoining properties; cause adverse impact on the environment; cause adverse impact on the visual amenity or character of the area; or inhibit the development of adjoining land in conformance with its land-use zoning objective.
- 5.1.6. Section 7.4 of the Local Area Plan considers social infrastructure, the provision of services and facilities which are essential for health, wellbeing and the social development of a town. It states that, in addition to the actual activity and function, social infrastructure facilities can provide an invisible platform of community and social interaction which some residents may rely upon for personal well-being. The provision of the requisite levels of social infrastructure within Leixlip is therefore important and vital to support the needs of the existing and planned residential base.
- 5.1.7. The **Draft Leixlip Local Area Plan 2020-2026** proposes no change to the zoning of the application site and no change to the land-use zoning matrix of relevance to this application. It repeats Section 6.1.1, Policy EDT2, Objective EDT2.1 and Section 7.4 unaltered.
- 5.1.8. Section 3.8 of the **Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029** states that residential amenity is influenced by a range of factors, such as private outdoor amenity space, privacy, and natural light. The relationship of buildings to each other and their individual design can have a significant impact on these factors and on residents' comfort. In older residential areas, infill development will be encouraged, while still protecting the existing residential amenity of these areas. Objection HE O6 is to 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.

5.1.9. Objective RE O52 of the County Development Plan is to co-operate with and facilitate Government agencies, and other bodies where feasible, in encouraging home-based employment including the provision of small-scale individual enterprises. Proposals which involve the change of use and/or new development for purposes of home-based employment will generally be considered favourably where it can be clearly demonstrated that a) the proposal is of an appropriate scale for its location; b) there are no adverse environmental, health and safety impacts, c) the proposal is without prejudice to residential amenity and d) the proposal will not detract from the vitality and viability of town or village centres.

5.1.10. Table 15-8 of the County Development Plan sets out maximum car-parking standards for selected land uses. It specifies one space each for houses up to and including three-bed units. For convenience retail, and office parks where the floor area does not exceed 1500 square metres, it specifies one space per 20 square metres of gross floor area.

5.1.11. Section 15.7 of the Plan includes the following additional points:

- The Council reserves the right to alter the requirements outlined (in Table 15-8), having regard to the circumstances of each particular development, on a case-by-case basis. For any use not specified, the default parking rate will be calculated based on those of a comparable use and/or as part of a transport and traffic assessment.
- The maximum provision of parking should not be viewed as a target. Lower rates of parking and car-free developments should be considered in the first instance, particularly where such developments are close to and can avail of public transport.
- The Council will normally require the provision of car-parking spaces within the curtilage of the site or convenient to the development.
- In addition to car parking, sufficient space will be required within the curtilage of the site for all service vehicles involved in the operation of the business.
- The minimum size for a car parking bay shall be 2.5 metres by 5.0 metres.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1. The application site is not within any Natura 2000 European site of nature conservation importance. The nearest Natura 2000 sites are:

- Rye Water Valley / Carton Special Area of Conservation (SAC), about 600 metres to the east, designated for petrifying springs and whorl snail; and
- Glasnamole Valley SAC in Co. Dublin, about 14 kilometres to the south east, designated for semi-natural dry grasslands, Molinia meadows and petrifying springs.

5.2.2. The application site is not in any Natural Heritage Area (NHA). The proposed Rye Water Valley / Carton NHA covers the same area as the SAC. A further 10 NHAs and proposed NHAs lie within 15 kilometres of the site, namely Royal Canal, Liffey Valley, Donadea Wood, North Dublin Bay, Slade of Saggart and Crooksling, Dodder Valley, Glenasmole Valley, Lugmore Glen, Killeel Wood and Grand Canal.

6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment Screening

6.1. 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 this report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1. The grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

- Kildare County Council is proposing 933 additional housing units in Leixlip by 2028. This will bring with it the requirement for additional services such as that being provided by the appellant. There are currently no suitable premises available in the vicinity in which to provide this valuable local service.
- Careful examination of the Local Area Plan does not support the statement that this development would materially contravene the zoning objective. Hair salons

are neither expressly permitted nor prohibited. Many uses that are generally acceptable are not expressly permitted. The proposed development is consistent with services noted in the Plan as being open for consideration, including community and medical services. Hair and beauty facilities generally provide a valuable service and promote mindfulness, which is known to provide significant medical benefits. Testimonials from satisfied clients were submitted.

- The use is carried on in a small room with a floor area below 13 square metres, detached from the appellant's dwelling and adjoining properties. Noise levels are typically very low. The appellant who provides this local service is employed at home, thereby removing the need to commute. This is a sustainable solution. While clients travel to the location, many would have to go further away should this service be discontinued. A neighbour in Leixlip Park, who is also a client, stated in her testimonial that clients are considerate in their presence and in their parking and do not impact negatively on the neighbourhood.
- It is not correct that the development would create an undesirable precedent. There is a discrepancy between the handling of this application and that of the Athy and Celbridge applications. Planning permission 25/60344 is an appropriate precedent. In support of that application, a layout was submitted with no parking spaces dimensioned. A site plan attached to the appeal statement has dimensions added to demonstrate that parking provision on the current application site, including the widened vehicular entrance, is generous and of a size suitable for disability access also. Car parking requirements for this development in Table 15.8 of the County Development Plan can be approximated to no more than two dedicated spaces.
- Maximum speed limits are being implemented in urban areas of Kildare. Leixlip Park would have a speed limit of 30 kilometres per hour, consistent with an estate where reversing into or out of driveways is common and expected.
- While the appellants are willing to seek alternative locations from which to serve the same community, this has proven impossible. They are willing to accept a condition that the premises be used commercially only by them and not leased or rented to any others. Such a condition would ensure that this remains a highly sustainable, community-focused business.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

- 7.2.1. The planning authority confirmed its decision and referred to its planner's reports and various technical department reports (summarised in Section 3.2 of this report).

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Issues

- 8.1.1. The planning authority decided to grant permission for the attic windows and widened access and, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I concur with this part of its decision. A condition restricting the use of the attic is required.
- 8.1.2. Having inspected the site and considered in detail the documentation on file for this first-party appeal, it seems to me that in relation to the garage extension and hair salon use, the main planning issues are:
- whether these developments involve a material contravention of the Development Plan;
 - whether the hair salon is acceptable in principle at this location; and
 - whether sufficient car parking is available.

8.2. Material Contravention of the Development Plan

- 8.2.1. The planning authority's first reason for refusal amounts to an assertion that because the Leixlip Local Area Plan does not expressly say that hair salons are permitted in Zone B (in which the application site is located), the use therefore materially contravenes the zoning objective. I do not accept that that is a tenable interpretation of the Plan. It is true that hair salons are not mentioned in Table 13-3. However, Table 13-2 states that land uses not listed in the matrix will be considered on their merits, with reference to the most appropriate use of a similar nature indicated in Table 13-3 and in relation to the general policies and zoning objectives for the area. In my opinion, the Commission need not consider itself constrained by Section 37(2) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, which sets out the circumstances in which a development which materially contravenes a development plan may be approved on appeal.

8.3. **Acceptability in Principle**

- 8.3.1. Article 10 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 indicates that, subject to certain provisos, changes of use within any of the classes of use specified in Schedule 2, Part 4 are exempted development. Class 1 in Part 4 is use as a shop. A shop is defined in Article 5 of the Regulations as a structure used for any or all of a number of specified purposes, where the sale, display or service is principally to visiting members of the public. One of those specified purposes is hairdressing. The relevance of this definition is that a hair salon is considered to be a use so similar in nature to a shop that planning permission is not normally required for a change of use from one to the other.
- 8.3.2. It seems to me that in considering the acceptability of the hair salon at the application site, a shop is the most appropriate use of a similar nature to which reference can be made. Convenience shops with no more than 100 square metres of net retail space are indicated as open for consideration in Table 13-3 of the Local Area Plan and the identical provisions of the Draft Local Area Plan. Table 13-2 of both Plans states that open-for-consideration uses may be acceptable where they would not conflict with the general objective for the zone, which in this instance is to protect and enhance the amenity of established residential communities and promote sustainable intensification. I conclude that the acceptability of the appellant's hair salon hinges on whether it protects and enhances the amenity of the surrounding residential area.
- 8.3.3. When I inspected the site, I was able to confirm that this home-based hair salon is a low-key use confined to a small space within a domestic outbuilding. Nothing I saw suggested that it has any material adverse impact on the amenity of the surrounding residential area. From the testimonials submitted, it is apparent that the availability of this service is regarded as an enhancement by users, including some local residents.
- 8.3.4. I am not persuaded that a grant of permission would set an undesirable precedent for other similar developments. While every planning application must be considered on its own merits, it is evident from the planning history that the Council has approved a similar use in Celbridge. Conditions could be imposed to restrict working hours, to prohibit signage on the site and to enable the Council to retain control of future changes of use within the same use class. Taking all the foregoing into account, I conclude that the first reason for refusal has not been sustained.

8.4. Car Parking

- 8.4.1. The parking standards set out in the Kildare County Development Plan are maximum standards. A maximum of one space is required to serve the appellant's three-bedroom house. A maximum of one space would be required for a convenience shop with the same floor space as the appellant's hair salon, which is a comparable use. There are two off-street car-parking spaces to the front of the house accessed from the street. Drawing P-04 submitted with the appeal statement demonstrates that these spaces both meet the County Development Plan's size requirements.
- 8.4.2. The further information provided by the appellants indicates that deliveries are minimal, as products are usually collected from suppliers. I have no good reason to doubt this evidence. It is also stated that clients are directed to park in one of the driveway spaces and there is normally only one client on the site at any given time. It is, however, acknowledged that on rare occasions two clients may be present as a maximum. During my site inspection, which took place on a mid-week morning, I saw some on-street parking in Leixlip Park but it was far from being at saturation level. Subject to conditions requiring retention of the existing parking layout and appointment system, I conclude that the second reason for refusal has not been sustained.

9.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

- 9.1. Having considered the nature, location and small scale of the proposed development, the nature of the receiving environment as a built-up urban area, the nature of the foreseeable emissions therefrom, the availability of public piped services to accommodate the foul effluent arising therefrom, the distance from the nearest European site and the absence of any known hydrological link between the application site and any European site, I am content on the basis of objective information that the development is not likely to have a significant effect on any European site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. I therefore conclude that the carrying out of an appropriate assessment under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The application site is located about 600 metres from Leixlip Reservoir on the River Liffey. The proposed development comprises the retention of an extension to a domestic garage, use of part of garage as a hair salon, roof lights in an attic, and the widening of a vehicular access. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.2. I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and 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.
- 10.3. The reasons for this conclusion are the nature and small scale of the works, the distance from nearest water bodies and the lack of known hydrological connections.
- 10.4. I conclude 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.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend to the Commission that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 12.1. Having regard to the Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029 and the Draft Leixlip Local Area Plan 2020-2026, it is considered that, subject to the compliance with the conditions set out below, retention of the development would be consistent with the zoning objective to protect and enhance the amenity of established residential

communities and promote sustainable intensification and that it would not prejudice the safety and convenience of road users. The development would therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be retained in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the revised attic floor plan, Drawing P-02 Revision A submitted on 23rd October 2025; and by the dimensioned parking layout, Drawing P-04 received by An Coimisiún Pleanála on 22nd December 2025, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>Surface water drainage arrangements shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such services and works. No surface water runoff from the site shall be discharged on to the public road or any adjoining properties. All surface water shall be collected and disposed of within the boundaries of the site.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of public health and sustainable drainage, to avoid pollution and prevent flooding.</p>
3.	<p>The attic shall be used solely for domestic purposes related to the existing dwelling on the site but shall not be used as bedroom accommodation.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of orderly development and fire safety.</p>
4.	<p>Notwithstanding the exempted development provisions of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 or any statutory provision amending or replacing them, the use of the extended garage shall be restricted to a hair salon (as specified in the application), unless otherwise authorised by a prior grant of planning permission.</p> <p>Reason: To enable the planning authority to consider any future changes of use that may be proposed and to protect the residential amenity of the area.</p>

5.	<p>The hair salon:</p> <p>(a) shall be operated only by the applicant (Siobhan Maher) as a home-based economic activity with no staff;</p> <p>(b) shall not be open to clients outside the hours of 10am to 8pm on Wednesdays to Fridays and 9am to 2pm on Saturdays, without the prior written agreement of the planning authority; and</p> <p>(c) shall not serve more than one client at a time. Clients shall be seen by appointment only.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the residential amenity of the area.</p>
6.	<p>Notwithstanding the exempted development provisions of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 or any statutory provision amending or replacing them, no signage shall be erected or displayed on the dwelling or the extended garage or anywhere within the curtilage of the dwelling.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent overt commercialisation of the property and protect the residential amenity of the area.</p>
7.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under Section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000. The contribution shall be paid within one month of the date of this permission or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000 that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under Section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.</p>

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



TREVOR A RUE

Planning Inspector

6th April 2026

Appendix A: Form 1 – EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	<i>PL-500521-KE-25</i>
Proposed Development Summary	<i>Retention of extension to domestic garage, use of part of garage as a hair salon, provision of roof lights to attic, and widening of vehicular access</i>
Development Address	<i>90 Leixlip Park, Leixlip, Co. Kildare</i>
In all cases check box /or leave blank	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (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"/> <i>Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.</i>
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3</i>	
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"/> <i>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.</i>	No Screening required.
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: *Trevor A Rue*

Date: 6th April 2026

TREVOR A RUE