



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501108-KE-26

Development

Removal of the existing mobile home on the site and the construction of a bungalow and all ancillary site works.

Location

Robertstown, County, Kildare

Planning Authority

Kildare County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2561112

Applicant(s)

Adam McLoughlin

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission with Conditions

Type of Appeal

Third Party Normal Planning Appeal

Appellant(s)

Gary O'Brien

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

13th May 2026

Inspector

Elaine Power

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description.....	3
2.0	Proposed Development.....	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0	Relevant Planning History.....	5
5.0	Policy Context	5
6.0	EIA Screening	7
7.0	The Appeal.....	7
8.0	Assessment.....	10
9.0	AA Screening	14
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	15
11.0	Recommendation	15
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	16
13.0	Conditions	16

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Appendix 2: EIA Preliminary Examination

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located in the village of Robertstown, Co. Kildare. The site has a stated area 0.11 ha and currently accommodates a mobile home (42sqm), with associated shed, open space and driveway. The site is bound to the south (front) by a Grand Canal Way which is a private towpath road running adjacent to the Grand Canal, to the north by a vacant plot of land and to the east and west by 2-storey houses. The sites boundaries include hedges / vegetation and wooden fences. Access to the site is from the private road via the L80735 Lowtown Road.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the removal of the existing mobile home and the construction of a single house with an upgraded vehicular entrance and all ancillary site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission was granted subject to 14 no. conditions. Condition no. 9 is considered relevant.

9. (a) All foul sewage and soiled water shall discharge to the public foul sewer system as per the submitted plans received by the Planning Authority on the 18/02/2026.

(b) Any existing unauthorised connections regarding the discharge of foul sewage shall cease within 2 months of the grant of this permission.

(b) Prior to commencement of development the Applicant / Developer shall sign an agreement with Uisce Eireann regarding connection to the public water/wastewater network operated by Uisce Eireann

Reason: In the interest of public health, to avoid pollution, and to ensure proper development.

3.2. **Planning Authority Reports**

3.2.1. ***Planning Reports***

The initial Planners Report dated 17th November 2025 considered that the proposed infill development the village location was acceptable in principle. Notwithstanding this, the report recommended that further information be sought with regard to the viability of a connection to the public foul network.

The Planners report dated 10th March 2025 considers that the item of further information was adequately addressed by the applicant. Due to the location of a 225mm sewer crossing the site the report notes that the proposed house has been relocated c. 3m west. The report recommended that permission be granted subject to conditions.

3.2.2. ***Other Technical Reports***

Area Engineer: Handwritten note dated 1st October 2025 states that the site notice is in place.

Environment Section: Report dated 29th October 2025 states that confirmation of availability of viable Uisce Eireann foul sewer should be required prior to granting permission. The report also provides 5 no. standard conditions.

Water Services Department: Report dated 9th October 2025 states that there is no objection subject to 2 no. standard conditions.

Transport, Mobility and Open Spaces Department: Report dated 18th November 2025 state that there is no objection subject to conditions.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

None

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

A submission was received from the appellant Gary O'Brien, who's property is located to the east of the appeal site. The concerns raised in the submission related to an unauthorised connection to the foul water drainage system located within the adjacent property.

4.0 Relevant Planning History

Subject Site

None

Surrounding Sites

Reg. Ref. 22320: Permission was granted in 2022 to subdivide a site, currently accommodating a single storey house, and construct a new single storey dwelling at The Bridge, Robertstown. The overall site (blue line boundary) of the site to be subdivided is located immediately east of the appeal site.

Reg. Ref. 19/293: Permission was granted in 2019 for the construction of 4 no. townhouses c. 300m south of the appeal site.

Reg. Ref. 2560214: Retention permission was granted in 2025 for alterations to the development approved under Reg. Ref 19/293 comprising revised design and height of the dwellings and the provision of an additional bedroom per house. This decision is currently on appeal, PL-500192-KE.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Kildare County Development Plan 2023 - 2029

The following policies set out in Chapter 3 Housing are considered relevant.

HO P5: Promote residential densities appropriate to its location and surrounding context.

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.

Volume 2 Village Plans and Rural Settlements

Volume 2 Part 2 Small Towns, Environs, Villages and Rural Settlements of the Development Plan identifies Robertstown as a village. Map V2-3.14a sets out the land use zoning objectives for Robertstown.

The appeal site is zoned B: Existing / Infill Residential with the associated land use objective *to protect and improve existing residential amenity, to provide for appropriate infill residential development and to provide for new and improved ancillary services*. This zoning principally covers existing residential areas and provides for infill development within these existing residential areas. The primary aims of this zoning objective are to preserve and improve residential amenity and to provide for further infill residential development at an appropriate density. Residential uses are permitted in principle.

Map V2- 3.14bb sets out the Objectives for the village. There is a footpath / cycle path objective to the south (front) of the appeal site. The Grand Canal proposed Natural Heritage Area pNHA (002104) is also located to the south of the appeal site.

The following objectives are considered relevant:

V R1: Facilitate the appropriate redevelopment of derelict buildings and suitable infill development proposals, having regard to any protected structures within the vicinity of the site.

V R15: Develop a high-quality walking and cycling route from Binn's Bridge towards Fenton's Bridge to link with routes on the Grand Canal and Barrow Navigation.

V R16: Control new development accessed from the Grand Canal towpath in order to protect it as a walking/cycling route.

V R18: Proposed developments shall be subject to AA screening and where applicable Stage 2 AA to minimise the risk of likely significant effects on European Sites and their qualifying interest species which are hydrologically connected to the Grand Canal.

5.2. ***Robertstown Village Renewal Master Plan, 2024***

The vision for Robertstown aims to create a pedestrian friendly village that encourages compact residential growth, community and socio economic development and enhances its tourism potential through improved placemaking and public realm and opportunities.

5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

Grand Canal pNHA (002104) located to the south of the appeal site.

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment, refer to Appendix 1 and 2 of this report. Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of the third party appeal received on behalf of Gary O'Brien are summarised below.

Principle of Development

- The development is presented as a replacement of a mobile home with a bungalow.
- The existing mobile home is unauthorised. The planning status of the mobile home is not addressed in the application.
- Consideration is required as to whether rural housing policy applies in this instance.
- The permission relies on drawings and particulars that are materially inaccurate.

Wastewater

- The existing wastewater connection serving the applicant's site enters drainage infrastructure located within the appellants rear garden and does not connect in the manner represented on the submitted plans. This is supported by a CCTV survey which indicates two visible pipes from the direction of the applicants site. There is no consent, easement or legal entitlement for that use.
- The continued connection presents a real and immediate risk of continued interference with the appellants property and amenity until a lawful independent connection is secured.
- Condition 9 of the grant of permission does not solve the issue and is not an enforceable condition.

- If the infrastructure indicated is incorrect then the proposal is not capable of being built.
- The proposed development is premature pending an independent connection to the foul network.

Site Boundary

- The drawings submitted by way of additional information included lands to the rear of the site that are in third party ownership.
- If the site area was materially enlarged or reconfigured to solve access, drainage or layout issues then the revised plans may have introduced significant additional information. This may require revised public notices.

7.2. Applicant Response in the case of a 3rd Party Appeal

The applicants response to the third party appeal includes a revised site layout plan. The main planning grounds are summarised below.

Principle of Development

- This appeal is intended to delay and frustrate the proposed development which is proven to be in compliance with the Development Plan.
- The appellants premise that the existing development is unauthorised is a fundamental factual error. The Planners Report notes that there is a mobile home on the site since at least 2009. There is no enforcement history on the site. The proposed development is to remove the mobile home and construct a house.
- Infill development at this village location is acceptable in principle.
- The site is zoned B: Existing Residential and Infill.

Wastewater

- The appellants concerns regarding wastewater were raised by the Planning Authority and addressed by way of further information.
- The response to further information included a Confirmation of Feasibility from Uisce Eireann confirming that public infrastructure is present on site and that both water and wastewater connections are available.

- The amended site layout plan demonstrates a new connection to the public sewer and confirms that the existing disputed connection will be decommissioned.

Site Boundary

- The red line boundary was amended in the response to further information to demonstrate the line of the existing public sewer. These lands are within the ownership of the applicants family. A drawing has been submitted with the appeal drawing no. A04 (Rev A), which indicates the red line boundary of the appeal site.
- The area required for the proposed dwelling and the new drainage route is entirely within the applicants legal ownership.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority note the content of the appeal and confirms its decision. It requests that the Commission have regard to the Planners Report and the various technical department reports in relation to the assessment of the appeal.

7.4. Observations

None

7.5. Further Responses

A response from the appellants to the first party's response to the appeal was received. To prevent repetition only new issues raised by the appellant are summarised below.

- The appeal is not frivolous or vexatious and raises valid planning concerns.
- The applicant's response does not resolve the core deficiencies.
- The ownership and redline issue remain unresolved.
- Uisce Eireann's Confirmation of Feasibility does not resolve the central issue raised.
- Immunity from enforcement is not equivalent to a positive planning approval or does it resolve the planning concerns identified.
- The Planning Authority did not adequately examine the planning status and servicing history of the site.

- The existing wastewater arrangements were expressly acknowledged to be unauthorised.
- Unresolved uncertainty regarding lawful servicing of the site.

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. Having examined the appeal details and all other documentation on file, including the submission received in relation to the appeal, the report of the local authority and inspected the site, and having regard to relevant policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Wastewater
- Design and Layout
- Red Line Boundary

8.2. ***Principle of Development***

8.2.1. The third party requested that consideration be given as to whether the Development Plans rural housing policy applies in this instance. The appeal site is located within the village of Robertstown. It is zoned B: Existing / Infill Residential with the associated land use objective *to protect and improve existing residential amenity, to provide for appropriate infill residential development and to provide for new and improved ancillary services*. Residential uses are permitted in principle. Therefore, I am satisfied that the Development Plan's rural housing policy is not relevant in this instance.

8.2.2. There is an existing mobile home on the appeal site with a stated area of 42sqm. It is proposed to remove this existing mobile home to facilitate the construction of a single storey house. The third party raised concerns that the existing mobile home on the appeal site is unauthorised. There is no planning history for the appeal site. The Planners Report states that the mobile home has been on the appeal site since before 2009. The applicant has not provided information regarding the planning status. However, the response to the appeal states that the Under Section 157(4) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 the Planning Authority cannot issue an enforcement notice for development that took place more than 7 years ago and notes that there are no enforcement proceedings relating to the site.

There is no evidence available that that the existing mobile home has the benefit of planning permission.

- 8.2.3. The appeal site is zoned for residential development within the well-established village of Robertstown. I am satisfied that the planning status of the existing mobile, to be removed as part of the proposed development, does not have a material impact on the assessment on the proposed house. It is my opinion that the proposed house should be assessed on its merits.

8.3. **Wastewater**

- 8.3.1. The third party states that the existing wastewater connection serving the applicant's site enters drainage infrastructure located within the appellants rear garden and does not connect in the manner represented on the submitted plans. The appeal states that this is supported by a CCTV survey which indicates two visible pipes from the direction of the applicants site. A letter is attached as Appendix 3 of the appeal from McGuinness Maintenance Services which states that a survey was carried out on the main sewer line at the manhole location to the rear of the property. The purpose of the survey was to clear a blockage. The survey identified a number of connections to the sewer. The third party further states that the applicant has no consent, easement or legal entitlement to use infrastructure within his property and that the continued connection presents a real and immediate risk of continued interference with the appellants property and amenity until a lawful independent connection is secured and that the proposed development is premature pending an independent connection to the foul network.
- 8.3.2. The proposed development includes the removal of the existing mobile home and the current arrangements for disposal of wastewater for the mobile home on the appeal site do not form part of the proposed development. In response to the appeal the applicant confirmed that the existing disputed connection would be decommissioned, and the proposed development would be connected to the public sewer.
- 8.3.3. The proposed house would connect to the public wastewater network. In response to the request for further information the applicant submitted a Confirmation of Feasibility from Uisce Eireann which indicates that a connection to the public wastewater network is feasible without infrastructure updates.
- 8.3.4. Section B of the Confirmation of Feasibility includes a map of Uisce Eireann's infrastructure in the vicinity of the appeal site. The information provided indicates that there is a public foul

sewer under the eastern portion of the site. The proposed house would connect directly to this public sewer, and the existing connection would be decommissioned. While the concerns of the third party are noted, I am satisfied that the proposed development can be connected to the public network without infringing on any third party lands. It is acknowledged that there is an existing residential property on the site. However, I am satisfied that the proposed development is not premature pending a connection of this property, which does not form part of the proposed development, to the public network.

- 8.3.5. The third party also raised concerns that Condition 9 of the grant of permission does not solve the issue and is not an enforceable condition. Condition 9 comprised three elements. Condition 9 (a) requires that all foul sewage and soiled water discharge to the public foul sewer system as per the submitted plans received by the Planning Authority on the 18/02/2026. Condition 9(b) requires that any existing unauthorised connections regarding the discharge of foul sewage shall cease within 2 months of the grant of this permission and condition 9(c) requires the applicant to sign an agreement with Uisce Eireann regarding connection to the public water/wastewater network operated by Uisce Eireann. The provisions of this condition require the applicant to dispose of wastewater via Uisce Eireann's public network and to cease any unauthorised connections. In my opinion this condition is a reasonable and enforceable condition. It is also noted that the applicant raised no objection to the provisions of condition 9 and it is proposed that the house would connect to the public network. If permission is being granted it is my opinion that a similar condition should be attached.

8.4. ***Design and Layout***

- 8.4.1. The proposed single storey house has a stated area of 240sqm. It accommodates an open plan Kitchen / Living / Dining room, utility room, a separate sitting room, a home office, 4 no. bedroom (2 no. ensuite), a bathroom, storage and circulation space. The house has a pitched roof with a maximum height of c. 5.9m. The drawings submitted state that the house would be finished in a white render. Section 15.4.6 of the Development Plan sets minimum floor space and open space requirements for house design to ensure a high standard of building design. It is noted that the proposed house reaches and exceeds these minimum standards. I have no objection to the design or layout of the house and consider that it represents a reasonable response to its urban context.

- 8.4.2. The house is located to the rear of the site, c 15m from its southern boundary with the Grand Canal towpath. It is located c. 1.6m from the sites northern boundary with a vacant plot of land. The proximity of the house to the sites northern boundary is noted. However, having regard to the limited height (single storey) of the proposed house I am satisfied that it would not negatively impact on the future development potential of the site to the north.
- 8.4.3. The siting of the house was relocated 3m west within the site to provide a 3m clearance either side of the existing Uisce Eireann infrastructure under the site. The location of the house, as submitted in response to further information, is c. 2.3m from its western boundary and c. 6.7m from an existing house and c. 10m from its eastern boundary and c. 21m from an existing house. Having regard to the urban location, the limited height of the proposed house and the existing site boundaries which provide screening between the appeal site and adjoining sites I am satisfied that the proposed development would not impact on existing or future residential amenity by way of overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing.
- 8.4.4. The proposed development also includes a revised vehicular entrance with a splayed access onto the Grand Canal Way. I have no objection to the proposed access arrangements.

8.5. ***Red Line Boundary***

- 8.5.1. The third party raised concerns regarding the red line boundary was materially enlarged or reconfigured to solve access, drainage or layout issues then the revised plans may have introduced significant additional information, and this may require revised public notices.
- 8.5.2. The appeal site as submitted with the original application has a stated area of 0.11 ha and the red line boundary is indicated on Drawings A00 and A02. In response to the appeal the applicant expanded the red line boundary, as indicated on Drawing no. A04, to include the vacant land to the north. In response to the appeal the applicant states that this area was included to demonstrate the line of the existing public sewer. The lands to the north of the site and included within the extended red line boundary are within the ownership of the applicants family. A drawing has been submitted with the appeal, drawing no. A04 (Rev A), which indicates the red line boundary of the appeal site which is entirely within the applicants legal ownership and which accommodates the proposed development. This red line boundary is the same as that submitted with the original application.
- 8.5.3. While the alteration to the red line boundary in the response to the further information request is noted. I am satisfied that sufficient information has been submitted indicating the

correct red line boundary and the size (0.11 ha) of the site. I am also satisfied that the proposed works to facilitate the proposed development can be carried out within the red line boundary.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the appeal in light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.
- 9.2. The proposed development is located within the urban area of Robertstown. It comprises the removal of an existing mobile home and the construction of a residential dwelling. The closest European Sites, that form part of the Natura 2000 Network are Ballynafagh Lake SAC (001387) located 1km northwest of the appeal site, Ballynafagh Bog SAC (000391) located c. 2.6km northwest of the appeal site and Moulds Bog SAC (002331) c. 5.3km south of the appeal site.
- 9.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the proposed development I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.
- 9.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
 - The location of the development in a serviced urban area.
 - The nature and extent of the proposed development.
 - The distance to the nearest European Site.
 - The lack of a direct hydrological or ecological pathway to a European Site.
- 9.5. 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.
- 9.6. 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 appeal site is located in the urban area of Robertstown Village. The Grand Canal Main Line East (Barrow) (Code IE_14_AWB_GCMLE) is located immediately south of the appeal site. This waterbody has a Good Status and is Not at Risk. The groundwater body underlying the site is Kildare (IE_SE_G_077). The groundwater has a Good Status and is Not at Risk.
- 10.2. The development comprises the removal of an existing mobile home and the construction of a house. No water deterioration concerns were raised.
- 10.3. I have assessed the proposed development 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 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.
- 10.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The urban location.
 - The nature and extent of the development.
 - The location of the appeal site outside an area at risk of flooding.
- 10.5. 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

It is recommended that permission be granted subject to conditions.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the residential zoning objective of the subject site, the provisions of Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029, the site's urban location, the existing pattern of development in the area and to the nature and scale of the proposed development it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below the design, layout, scale and height of the proposed house would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area or of any adjacent property, would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience and would not be prejudicial to public health. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 18th day of February 2026, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The external finishes shall be consistent with details submitted with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 18th day of February 2026, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to commencement of any development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. (a) Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreement with Uisce Éireann to provide for a service connection to the public water supply and wastewater collection network.

(b) Any existing unauthorised connections regarding the discharge of wastewater from the site shall cease within two months of the grant of this permission.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water / wastewater facilities.

4. Drainage arrangements including the attenuation and disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the relevant Section of the Council for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit to the Planning Authority for written agreement a Stage 2 - Detailed Design Stage Storm Water Audit. Upon completion of the development a Stage 3 Completion Stormwater Audit to demonstrate Sustainable Urban Drainage System measures have been installed and are working as designed and that there has been no misconnections or damage to storm water drainage infrastructure during construction, shall be submitted to the planning authority for written agreement.

Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management.

5. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.

6. All service cables associated with the proposed development, such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television, shall be located underground.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity

7. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer or any agent acting on its behalf, shall prepare a Resource Waste Management Plan (RWMP) as set out in the EPA's Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects (2021) including demonstration of proposals to adhere to best practice and protocols. The RWMP shall include specific proposals as to how the RWMP will be measured and monitored for effectiveness; these details shall be placed on the file and retained as part of the public record. The RWMP must be submitted to the planning authority for written

agreement prior to the commencement of development. All records (including for waste and all resources) pursuant to the agreed RWMP shall be made available for inspection at the site office at all times.

Reason: In the interest of proper planning and sustainable development

8. 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, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development 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 Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, 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.

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.”

Elaine Power

Senior Planning Inspector

4th June 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-5001108-KE-26
Proposed Development Summary	Removal of an existing mobile home and the construction of a single storey dwelling.
Development Address	Robertstown Co. Kildare.
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.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
☒ 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)	10 (b)(i): Construction of more than 500 dwelling units 10 (b)(iv): Urban Development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere. 15: Any project listed in this Part which does not exceed a quantity, area or other limit specified in this Part in respect of the relevant class of development, but which would be likely to have significant effects on the environment, having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7.
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: _____

Appendix 2: EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-5001108-KE-26
Proposed Development Summary	Removal of an existing mobile home and the construction of a single storey dwelling.
Development Address	Robertstown, Co. Kildare.
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	The proposed development comprises the removal of an existing mobile home and the construction of a single storey dwelling. The nature and scale of the development is similar to the character of the surrounding area and the established pattern of development. Having regard to the relatively limited nature and scale of the proposed development I am satisfied that it would not give rise to significant use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution, nuisance, or a risk of accidents. The site is not at risk of flooding. There are no Seveso / COMAH sites in the vicinity of this location.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	The proposed development is an urban zoned and serviced site in the village of Robertstown. There is an existing residential use on the site. This site is located to the north of the Grand Canal pNHA. Given the nature and scale of the development it does not have the potential to impact on this site during the construction or operational phase of the house. There are no protected landscapes, views or prospects within the vicinity of the site. There are no protected structures or sites of historic or cultural significance within or immediately adjacent to the site. Having regard to the location of the site and the nature and scale of the development I am satisfied that there is no potential to significantly affect environmental sensitivities in the area.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts	Having regard to the characteristics and urban location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of

(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR require