



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501040-KY-26

Development	Retention of existing walls and gates.
Location	Ardroe, Inch, Co. Kerry
Planning Authority	Kerry County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560932
Applicant(s)	Veronica Tinney
Type of Application	Retention
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Retention with Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Gearoid Kennedy
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	1 st May 2026
Inspector	Suzanne Kehely

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
2.8. Planning Authority Reports	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
3.1. Prescribed Bodies	5
3.2. Decision	5
4.0 Planning History	5
5.0 EIA Screening	6
5.1. Third Party Observations	6
6.0 Policy Context	6
6.1. Development Plan	6
6.3. National policy and Guidance	9
7.0 The Appeal	10
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	10
7.2. Applicant Response	10
7.3. Planning Authority Response	10
8.0 Assessment	11
9.0 AA Screening	16
10.0 Water Framework Directive	16
11.0 Recommendation	17
12.0 Reasons and Considerations	17
Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	19

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site of 0.48ha relates to a domestic dwelling fronting onto the Dingle Way in a hillside upland scenic location overlooking Dingle Bay c 1.5km west of Inch Beach, Co. Kerry. The site is located on the seaward side of a narrow track that serves a number of dwellings. It slopes down from the track and commands expansive views over Dingle Bay.
- 1.2. The track has a rough stone surface along the site frontage and beyond to the east and its alignment inhibits free flow of vehicular traffic in that two cars cannot freely pass and the surface is quite uneven.
- 1.3. The site frontage comprises a recessed vehicular entrance with a c.1.8m high gate mounted on taller gate piers which also support similarly high wing wall that slope down in height as the ground rises. The wall extends to the original hedgerow line where the entrance widens. The intervening surface is paved with small concrete pavers. The remainder of the front boundary consists of hedgerow. During my inspection on a Friday afternoon there was no vehicular traffic along the track however there were a number of walkers passing the site.
- 1.4. The site backs on to a local tertiary road from which there is intervening growth and otherwise the boundaries comprise hedging/hedgerows.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for retention of existing entrance walls and gates as constructed and all associated site works. Drawings and details were submitted on 13/10/202 with the application and subsequently on 14/11/2025, 24/11/2025, 3/12/2025/ and in response to FI on 16/01/2026 and in relation to public notices for the FI on 4/02/2025.
- 2.2. A supporting letter sets out the design rationale and issues with sheep and general security and that the design is also in keeping with 5 of the 8 dwellings in the vicinity that have painted wall and that is not visible on approaching from either side. I note some of this letter is redacted on the file but I have also had sight of an unredacted version.

- 2.3. A design statement which, based on a series of photographs of other entrances in the area and viewpoints of the subject entrance, concludes that the entrance walls and gate do not have a visual impact on any of the neighbouring dwellings or on the general public.
- 2.4. Drawings submitted 16/1/26 adjust site boundary to match that permitted under PA07/4037. (Details include site location map site layout map and land ownership map to reflects this. Revised noticed submitted on 4/2/26
- 2.5. The drawings show the height of the gate piers at 2m and road entrance piers at 1.5m with a intervening pair of sloping wings joining the piers just below the caps.
- 2.6. On plan the entrance with is 3.75m and widens to 13.265m at the road frontage over a setback depth of c.4m with wing walls - each extending of over 5.8m in length
- 2.7. Gates open inwards and cattle grid extending the width of entrance. The entrance ins brick paved with a concrete drain along the road frontage.
- 2.8. **Planning Authority Reports**
- 2.8.1. Planning Reports: On initial assessment certain deviations from site boundary details as compared to the parent permission were noted. Details were requested in respect of site layout and site location map and land ownership – these were submitted on 16/1/2026. The report noted the visual amenity of site in the context of the CDP. No negative traffic impact is likely to arise and not likely to impact on residential amenities. The visual impact is rated as low and acceptable in that the splayed entrance and gates are only visible just outside the site with the remainder of roadside hedge being retained as mature hedging to the line of the front fence.
- 2.8.2. Other Technical Reports
- Ecologist, Environmental Assessment Unit (25/11/25): The development is not considered to require either an AA or an EIA as no meaningful pathway for a significant impact or real likelihood of significant effects on the Natura Sites or on the environment generally arising from the development

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Prescribed Bodies

No Reports

3.2. Decision

- 3.2.1. Following a request for further information and a satisfactory response, by order dated 3rd March 2026 the planning authority issued notification of its decision to grant permission subject to one condition.

The development shall be retained on site in accordance with the plans and particulars received by the Planning Authority on 13/10/2025, 16/01/2026 and 04/02/2026.

Reason: To regulate and control the layout of the development

4.0 Planning History

4.1. The subject site

Planning Authority (PA) Ref. 07/4037 (also 4037/07 in PA Order) Permission granted to V Tinney for the retention of modification to dwelling house permitted under ref 02/2367. Condition 5 – existing roadside boundary shall be retained except for where its removal is necessary for the construction of an entrance. Reason: Visual amenity

Condition 6 The new boundary fence and wing wall shall be constructed in sod and stone or native stone. Wing walls forming the entrance shall be erected to a height of not more than 1m above the existing road level and shall be splayed at an angle of 45° to the line of the front fences. Reason: to integrate the structures into the surrounding areas.

Condition 7 Vehicular access to the site shall be located to the satisfaction of the planning authority and shall be recessed at least 3.5m from the centre of the front boundary fence. Reason: To avoid a traffic hazard.

Condition 19 The site shall be landscaped with suitable indigenous trees and shrubs or hedges to the satisfaction of the planning authority. A detailed landscaping and boundary treatment plan shall be submitted for written agreement within one month of the date of grant of permission. Reason: to provide adequate screening

PA Ref. 022367 permission granted to V Tinney for dwelling house.

PA Ref. 002767 permission refused to Henry Leahy for a dwelling house.

4.2. The adjacent site

PA Ref. 051319 permission granted to Z. Phelan and U. McShane for dwelling house on adjacent site. Conditions 11 and 12 are the same as 5 and 6 in ref 07/4037.

5.0 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 Act).

5.1. Third Party Observations

- Concerns about visual impact high rendered wall frontage on the Dingle way (Camp to Annascaul) as a walkway and keeping the beauty of the area intact, loss of hedgerows and the breach of planning conditions setting a precedent.
- Object to scale of use of rendered blockwork painted white and not the specified native stone or sod and stone.
- A letter of support with general reference to unobtrusive nature and nature of traffic along a private boreen.

6.0 Policy Context

6.1. Development Plan

6.2. General – rural house design

The site is zoned other rural areas. The following objectives refer to rural house design.

- KCDP 5-21 Ensure that all developments are in compliance with normal planning criteria and environmental protection considerations.
- KCDP 5-22 Ensure that the design of housing in rural areas comply with the building a house in Rural Kerry Design Guidelines 2009 or any update of the guidelines.

6.2.1. **Landscape Section:**

Section 11.6 sets out policies and objectives in relation to Landscape, and the following seek protection of the rural landscape:

- Objective KCDP 11-77 Protect the landscapes of the County as a major economic asset and an invaluable amenity which contributes to the quality of people's lives.
- Objective KCDP 11-78 Protect the landscapes of the County by ensuring that any new developments do not detrimentally impact on the character, integrity, distinctiveness or scenic value of their area.

Landscape Designations: The policies and objectives applicable for Visually Sensitive Areas apply.

Section 11.6.3.1 states: Visually sensitive landscape areas comprise the outstanding landscapes throughout the County which are sensitive to alteration. Rugged mountain ranges, spectacular coastal vistas and unspoilt wilderness areas are some of the features within this designation. These areas are particularly sensitive to development. In these areas, development will only be considered subject to satisfactory integration into the landscape and compliance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. The County enjoys both a national and international reputation for its scenic beauty. It is imperative in order to maintain the natural beauty and character of the County, that these areas be protected

6.2.2. **Development Management Guidelines (Volume 6):**

Design:

Section 1.5.10.4 states that new dwellings prepared in the rural area shall have regard to 'Building a House in Rural Kerry – Design Guidelines', Kerry County

Council, 2009 (or any subsequent guidance document) and that 'Boundaries are important.'

Rural houses and entrances:

section 1.5.10.5 states:

The application must demonstrate safe vehicular access to and from the proposed dwelling, in terms of visibility from the proposed entrance, but also in terms of the impact on traffic safety through the turning and stopping movement of vehicles entering or leaving the site. Should any remedial works be required on land outside the ownership of the applicant, letters of consent from the relevant landowners will be required, similarly if utility poles are to be relocated, letters of consent from utility providers shall be provided.

- All applications should include (at a minimum scale of 1:500) comprehensive details of how adequate sightlines and stopping distances can be achieved according to the road category. Where satisfactory sightlines can only be achieved by removing extensive hedgerows, trees, ditches or stone walls and an alternative site should be sought.
- Entrance gates shall be recessed 4.5m. behind the line of roadside hedgerow, with side boundaries splayed at an angle of 45 degrees to the public road carriageway. Opportunities for shared use of access or combining access points should be availed of.
- The opening of an access shall not interfere with existing roadside drainage. Where an existing drain requires culverting a pipe of a diameter specified by the Road's Authority shall be laid.

Screening and Integration: Section 1.5.10.6 states: The design and location of the dwelling shall be influenced by the existing screening on the site. Additional screening and planting may be required to integrate the dwelling into the site and to screen the development from the public road; this shall be clearly demonstrated on a landscaping plan. Regard shall be had to 'Building a House in Rural Kerry – Design Guidelines', Kerry County Council 2009 in relation to guidance on the most suitable position on the site for the dwelling.

Hardcore Surface and Surface Water Disposal Section 1.5.10.10 states:

- Surface water be disposed of to soak pits or watercourse(s) adjoining the site and shall not be allowed to flow onto the public road or to adjoining properties. Details shall be submitted with the planning application.
- There is no minimum standard required for soft landscaping, however, the **hard landscaping of areas around dwelling houses shall be limited.**
- Where feasible nature-based solutions to manage water run-off should be considered.

6.3. National policy and Guidance

6.3.1. Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2005

- Chapter 3 advocates design guidelines in development plans and states the importance of the principle that ‘The siting and design of new dwellings takes account of and integrates appropriately with its physical surroundings...’
- Chapter 4 In relation to Roadside Boundaries it states: ‘The removal of existing roadside boundaries, except to the extent that this is needed for a new entrance, should be avoided where at all possible except where required for traffic safety purposes. Roadside boundaries, whether hedgerows, sod and stone bank, stone wall or other boundaries, provide important features that are elements of both the landscape and ecology of rural areas. The retention of such boundary treatments assists in absorbing new rural housing into its surrounding and should generally be encouraged.’
- Section 4,8 In relation to assessing planning applications it states: ‘In assessing the design aspects of specific rural housing proposals, planning authorities should make well balanced and informed judgements on the merits of each proposal, taking on board the degree to which a site is sensitive in visual and other terms, the character of surrounding development and the wider area...’

5.4 Natural Heritage Designations

- The Dingle Peninsula SPA site code 004153 bounds the site to the south and is c.110m from the development area.

- Castlemaine Harbour SAC Site code 000343 is c. 420m from the development area and Castlemaine Harbour SPA 004029 are located c 300km to the south of the development area.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

- The permission ignores what is described as a fundamental rural house condition – that requires a maximum height limit on wing walls and construction materials to be sod and stone or natural stone
- There are inaccuracies with the planning report regarding status of road as private, description of house as dormer and degree of hedgerow removal.
- The conclusion that there is no negative impact on traffic is disputed given the breach in height of wall as required for traffic safety reasons and consequent obstruction of sightlines which have not been demonstrated notwithstanding the opportunities for such when seeking further information.
- The observer's original submission objecting to the development is attached. This refers, inter alia, to the inappropriate precedence of higher rendered walls due to dates of such and that they generally predated the requirement of maximum retention of hedgerows and use of stone. The high wall is unwelcome and an eyesore for both local residents and many walkers along this part of the Dingle Way.

7.2. Applicant Response

- The applicant submits that the appeal is part of a retaliatory campaign and requests that the appeal be dismissed as frivolous, vexatious and without planning merit.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

- None

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. **Issues and Validity of Appeal**

8.1.1. Having reviewed the application details and all other documentation on file, including the submissions received in relation to the appeal, and inspected the site, and having regard to relevant policies and guidance, I consider that the appeal raises valid planning grounds with the main issues for assessment being:

- Nature and principle of development
- Impact on visual amenity
- Traffic safety
- Other matters

8.1.2. Accordingly, I do not consider it appropriate to dismiss the appeal as requested by the applicant on grounds of being frivolous, vexatious or without any merit.

8.1. **Nature and Principle of Development**

8.1.1. This applicant is seeking to regularise the planning status of the front boundary treatment and entrance layout for a dwelling house as constructed for which permission was permitted with specific front boundary and entrance requirements.

8.1.2. From my examination of the drawings, the original permission was for a layout with a splayed entrance which is indicated on the drawings in the history file. (See attached in a pouch in the file.) These drawings include a recessed splayed entrance with an opening of approx. 15m at the road edge and narrowing to 6.5m over a depth of less than 4m as measured from the road edge. The 45° angle of splayed walls with the road edge line is included. Permission for a dwelling was conditional on being in accordance with the submitted plans with the added specification of the maximum wing wall height not exceeding 1m above the road level and that the materials be sod and stone or stone. The recess was also required to not be less than 3.5m.

8.1.3. On comparison with the drawings for the entrance to be retained I note the following changes. The entrance width is similarly 15m in width at the road frontage, but the entrance gate piers are more recessed being in the order of 5-6m. This appears to provide a larger splayed area and has been paved with concrete blocks. The driveway extends alongside the side of the dwelling close up to the eastern boundary where hedgerows were previously shown in the permitted site layout plan.

Accordingly; the hard surfaced area appears to be more expansive. Of particular note is that the boundary wall height is in excess of 1m above the road level. The elevation drawings indicate a height of 1.5m at the road edge and 2m gate pier height where it is recessed.

- 8.1.4. In terms of principle, while the entrance clearly contravenes condition 6 of permission for the dwelling house under planning authority ref 07/4037 by reason of a clear breach of very specific requirements in terms of height and materials, this does not preclude a subsequent application for a new form of boundary treatment. However, I consider there is fundamental issue in this case with the principle of deviating from the requirements of condition 6 on grounds of failing to satisfactorily integrate with the surrounding visually sensitive area.

8.2. Visual Amenity

- 8.2.1. The site is located in a visually sensitive area. In terms of the site characteristics derived from its elevated hillside setting on the southern side of the Dingle Peninsula and from which there are expansive uninterrupted and spectacular views over Dingle Bay, the site is such that it is particularly sensitive to development. I note in section 11.3.1 of the CDP it states that development will only be considered subject to satisfactory integration into the landscape and compliance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 8.2.2. In this case the site relates to a dwelling house that was permitted in 2002 and as set out in the history has had various modifications to the design from the original permission. While the retention of the boundary wall may seem a fairly minor development in the context of the scale of the house, it was nevertheless the subject of particular conditions in relation to height and design in an effort to integrate the overall development. By current development management guidance, the design details of the boundary and entrance remain fundamental considerations in permission for a house in a rural area and particularly in such a sensitive setting into which it is to be integrated. I refer to the design guidance in Volume 6 of the development plan which states 'the boundary is important...', the rural housing design guidance and the Ministerial Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines which advocate such design guidance - all are cited in detail in section 5 of this report.

8.2.3. The development plan guidance on development in designated areas is set out in chapter 11 of Volume 1. Section 11.6.4 refers and clarifies the context for the protection of the landscape as a major factor in developing policies for rural areas. Landscapes and scenery are not just of amenity value but constitute an enormous economic asset. The protection of this asset is therefore of primary importance in developing the potential of the County and Objective KCDP 11-76 and Objective KCDP 11-77 apply in this regard. Accordingly, of particular note in this case is the location and nature of the access road which is little more than a track over which the council has no charge but which is public in use. It forms part of a walking trail – the Dingle Way as signposted at the junction to the west. Part of the ambiance and enjoyment of this trail is the spectacular sea views - a contributing factor to the local landscape character. The development plan places value on such public amenities. It states that ‘Visually sensitive landscapes are particularly notable by virtue of their scenic and visual quality and offer significant opportunities for tourism development and rural recreational activities.’ It goes on to state that it will seek to ensure that a balance is achieved between the protection of sensitive landscapes and the appropriate socio-economic development of these areas. While development is not precluded in visually sensitive landscapes it states however that development proposals will be required to demonstrate that they integrate and respect the visual quality of the landscape and this regard criteria is set out in order to appraise such development. Of note this includes:

- Individual proposals shall be designed sympathetically to the landscape and the existing structures and shall be sited so as not to have an adverse impact on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of the landscape or natural environment.
- Any proposal must be designed and sited so as to ensure that it is not unduly obtrusive. Existing site features including trees and hedgerows should be retained to screen the development.
- Individual residential home units shall be designed sympathetically to the landscape, the existing structures and sited so as not to have an adverse impact on the character of the landscape or natural environment. Existing site features including trees and hedgerows shall be retained to form a part of a

comprehensive landscaping scheme. Consideration must also be given to alternative locations.

8.2.4. I consider the nature of the wall comprising a cement block wall rendered and capped at a height of up to 2m and spanning some 14m of the frontage fails to be sympathetic to the local context which is more suited to the use of low walling of local stone thereby being more earthy in tone and reflecting local stone wall building tradition. The materials and finish together with the expansive concrete paved splayed entrance up to 5m in depth would detract from the local landscape character by the extensive use of incongruous materials and blocking open rural views from the trail while also contributing to its suburbanisation. It would therefore detract from a local recreational asset in the area.

8.2.5. The applicant and appellant both make reference to examples of boundaries to support their respective cases. While ultimately the merits of the case, by reference to current guidance, are the main consideration I note that most more recently constructed entrances typically feature a low wall and generally maintain an open rural character which also provides for passive surveillance along this walking route but moreover the layout does not overly suburbanise the area or obstruct the expansive and spectacular views that are a feature of this local landscape. Of particular note and relevance is the adjacent dwelling to the east which was subject to the same conditions of permission in terms of minimising hedgerow loss and specifying maximum height and use of stone as a material and has been constructed accordingly with a low stone wall and rural type metal gate that provide open views of the seascape beyond. While I appreciate the applicant has security issues when absent, I consider the manner in which this is addressed is not visually compatible with the local environs which form part of a designated trekking route. In conclusion, I do not consider there to be any material changes in circumstances to justify the extent of deviance from the original condition pertaining to the front boundary wall. Accordingly, I consider permission should be refused for its retention.

8.3. **Traffic Safety**

8.3.1. The appellant, a civil engineer with 30 years of experience, challenges the assessment of the planning authority in respect of traffic safety. The appellant disputes the conclusion that there is no negative impact on traffic given the breach in

height of boundary wall as required for traffic safety reasons and consequent obstruction of sightlines. It is argued that such sightlines have not been demonstrated despite the opportunity when seeking further information.

8.3.2. Conditions 7 and 8 of the original permission were I note for reasons relating to traffic safety and these conditions have been substantially complied with. They required a gate to be recessed by at least 3.5m from the road edge and also sought to address the management of surface water run-off. As the entrance is recessed over 4m in depth and the site is below the road, such conditions cannot be reasonably seen to be breached.

8.3.3. The height of wall is moderately recessed from the road edge and while its lowering in height would improve visibility, the hedging to some extent counters this. I consider, given the nature of the road being, in effect, primarily an established and signposted walking trail and given its alignment that vehicular traffic is unlikely to be a significant issue. I consider the overriding consideration is the visual integration of the structure with the surrounding area as is the stated reason for condition 6 pertaining to the entrance wall. I do not consider traffic safety constitutes reasonable grounds for refusal of permission in this instance.

8.4. Other matters

8.4.1. The application seeks permission for retention of ancillary works, but these are not clearly specified other than as set out in the site layout drawings details. The most obvious deviation from the previous permitted layout plans is the change in entrance driveway layout which appears to be larger and closer to the boundary. By current development management standards in volume 6 of the development plan, the increase in hard surfacing is contrary to guidance. Section 1.5.10.10 states that 'the hard landscaping of areas around dwelling houses shall be limited.' The applicant has made no case justifying this layout increasing the hard surface which extends up to the road edge and alongside the house.

8.4.2. The applicant makes the case that the high boundary is intended to obstruct views as well as restrict access for security reasons. While I note this is not supported with any garda reports, notwithstanding I do not consider this is sufficient basis to permit a more obstructive, visually obtrusive and unusual form of boundary treatment as compared to that already specified as a condition for the dwelling house and as

required and completed in the neighbouring plot on the same side of the road in this prominent and visually sensitive area.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed works in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject sites relate to a variation to boundary details as permitted as part of a constructed and habitable dwelling house removed at le 1km from any European site. While the other end of the site abuts the Dingle Peninsula SPA, in view of the small scale of works and developed nature of the site, there is no likelihood of any significant impact arising. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal as the substantive issues related primarily to localised impact on amenities.
- 9.2. 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 European Site. The reason for this conclusion is based on small scale nature of works and nature of the development and lack of connections to any European Site.
- 9.3. I conclude that 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. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The proposed development involves a modest scale of works to the frontage of a dwelling house on a 0.48-hectare site. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seeks 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.

10.2. 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 reason for this conclusion is as follows.

- Scale and size of the proposed development within a domestic dwelling site.

10.4. Taking into account WFD screening report, 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.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that permission to retain the entrance walls and gates be refused based of the following reasons and considerations.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. It is considered that the retention of the existing front boundary wall and gates, by reason of height, layout, extent and overly suburban character would be an unduly incongruous feature in this Visually Sensitive Area characterised by elevated and scenic setting overlooking Dingle Bay in the Dingle Peninsula and along a route forming part of the Dingle Way. It is therefore considered to be an unsuitable form of boundary treatment having regard to provisions for rural houses and landscape protection as contained in Chapters 5 and 11 of Voume One and the Development Management Standards and Guidelines of Volume Six in the Kerry County Development 2022-2028. Permission for the retention of this development would therefore by itself and the precedent it would set would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area, detract from the character of the area and would accordingly be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The retention of the boundary exceeding a height of 1m and in a rendered finish would fail to integrate with the surrounding area and therefore materially contravene condition 6 of permission under planning authority register reference 4037/07.

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."

Suzanne Kehely

Senior Planning Inspector

13th July 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	501040-KY-26
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of existing walls and gates.
Development Address	Ardroe, Inch, Co. Kerry
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?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☐ No, No further action required.
(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)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ 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
☒ 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?	

☒ 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.	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)
☐ 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
☐ 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 ☐	
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____