



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501467-KE-26

Development	Retention of amalgamation and change of use to coffee shop
Location	Unit 2 & 3 Morell Manor, Monread, Naas, Co Kildare
Planning Authority	Kildare County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	25165
Applicant(s)	Hey Darling
Type of Application	Retention
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Retention with Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party and First Party Appeal
Appellant(s)	Reginald Garrett Hey Darling
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	19/08/26
Inspector	Donal Farrelly

Contents

1.0 Introduction	3
2.0 Site Location and Description	3
3.0 Proposed Development	3
4.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
4.1. Decision	4
4.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
4.3. Prescribed Bodies	5
4.4. Third Party Observations to the Planning Authority	5
5.0 Planning History.....	5
6.0 Policy Context.....	6
7.0 EIA Screening.....	7
8.0 The Appeal	8
8.1. Grounds of Appeal	8
8.2. Applicant Response to third party	9
8.3. Planning Authority Response	11
8.4. Observations	11
8.5. Further Responses	11
9.0 Assessment.....	11
10.0 AA Screening.....	15
11.0 Water Framework Directive	16
12.0 Recommendation	17
13.0 Conditions	17
14.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	17

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. There are two appeals on this case. As the third party appeal annuls the decision of the planning authority, I will consider this first. The first party appeal is against condition no. 2 of the permission reference no. 25165, regarding financial contributions.
- 1.2. There was an oral hearing request from the third party appellant, however The Commission determined that an oral hearing was not required as the appeal could be dealt with through written procedures.

2.0 Site Location and Description

- 2.1. The retail units are located at the entrance to Morell Manor housing estate, with access off Morell Avenue. Morell Manor is located approximately 1.6km northwest of Naas Town Centre. Surrounding land uses are residential with an open space area located to the front of the building.
- 2.2. The appeal site is located at unit no's. 2 and 3, Morell Manor, Naas, Co. Kildare. The building comprises 3 no. retail units located on the ground floor with apartments on the first floor. Unit no's. 2 and 3 have been combined to form a coffee shop. Unit no.1 comprises a pilates studio.
- 2.3. 20 no. car parking spaces are provided. There are 3 no. spaces located to the front of the building. 12 no. spaces are located within the car park to the eastern side of the building. There are also 5 no. spaces located on the western side of the building. Access to the side and rear parking areas is provided along the sides of the appeal building.

3.0 Proposed Development

- 3.1. The proposal is for the retention of a change of use of unit no's. 2 and 3 to a coffee shop for sale of hot food, cold food and non-alcoholic beverages for consumption on and off the premises. A seating area is provided in unit no. 3 which includes 11 no.

tables and chairs for 22 no. people. The bike stand is located to the northeast of the appeal building within the car park. I note that Condition no. 3(b) of the Planning Authority grant of permission requires that the bicycle shelter is moved from the rear of the site to the front of the building.

4.0 Planning Authority Decision

4.1. Decision

Permission was granted by Decision Order dated 08/05/2026 subject to conditions.

4.1.1. Conditions of note.

Condition no. 2 is regarding a financial contribution of €7,750.00 which is subject of the first party appeal.

Condition 3(b) requests revised plans for the proposed bike shelter to the front of the building.

4.2. Planning Authority Reports

4.2.1. Planning Reports

The final planners report dated 06/05/26 recommends a grant of retention permission subject to 8 no. conditions. Further information had been requested regarding the operations of the coffees shop, parking and delivery details, access, details on employees,

4.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Chief Fire Officer. No objection subject to condition.
- Naas Area Engineer. No objection
- Environment section. No objection subject to conditions.
- Environmental Health Service. No objection subject to conditions.
- Water Services. No objection subject to conditions.
- Roads and Transportation Department. No objection subject to condition.

4.3. Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Eireann. No response

4.4. Third Party Observations to the Planning Authority

3 no. submissions to the PA from Reginald Garrett is similar to the third party appeal as summarised under section 8.1 of this report. The submission also outlines concerns with parking, traffic safety, waste, delivery trucks, public nuisance, and permission for a similar development which was refused.

5.0 Planning History

Planning reference no. 21/10. amalgamation of 2 No. retail units and change of use from retail to GP practice at Units 1 and 2, Ground Floor, together with new external sign. Permission granted on 14/05/21.

Planning reference no. 17/697. Change of use of 3 number retail units to 1 number crèche, including modifications to the internal layout and side and rear external elevations. The removal of 5 number car parking spaces to the rear of the site, removal of external bin enclosure wall and construction of 1.8m high wall to facilitate creation of a secure external play area to the side and rear of the site.

Reconfiguration of the existing car park to include the provision of 2 number additional parking spaces, the erection of a 1 metre railing to the top of the 0.8metre high eastern boundary wall, and all associated site works. Permission granted on 27/11/17

Planning reference no. 13/500037. Change of use of three existing ground floor retail units into 2 bedroom apartments including internal alterations, demolitions and associated site works. Permission granted on 15/07/13.

Planning reference no. ABP PL 73.104567/97500030. 1 no. 2 storey block consisting of 3 retail shops and 3 no. 2 bed apartments, 11 no. 4 bed 2 storey detached houses on sites 2 to 12 on Road 7. Permission granted by ABP on 05/05/98.

Condition no. 13 of **PL 73.104567** outlines that a development contribution is required to be paid to the planning authority. Condition no. 25 of the original Planning

Authority Planning Decision **97/500030** requests a development contribution of £10,601.00.

Letter from Town Clerk D. Kirrane dated 29/05/00 confirms compliance with Condition 13 in respect of 1 no. 2 storey block consisting of 3 no. retail shops and 3 no. 2 bed apartments. The letter confirms £10,601.00 development contributions were paid in full.

Adjacent unit no.1

Planning reference no. 10/500068. Permission for Takeaway use, to be part of the previously approved change of retail use, Pl. Ref. No. 10/500036 (Modifications to existing shop unit to include new ancillary use for the purposes of consumption of food on the premises and off the premises inclusive of new display counter and seating area). Permission refused on 21/01/11.

Planning reference no. 10/500036. Planning Permission for modifications to existing shop unit to include new ancillary use for the purposes of consumption of food on the premises and off the premises inclusive of new display counter and seating area. Permission granted on 20/10/10

6.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

The Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029 (Development Plan) is the relevant Development Plan for the appeal site. The subject site is zoned 'B Existing/Infill Residential (R2.6)' as per the Naas Local Area Plan 2021-2027 which forms part of the Development Plan.

Although a coffee shop is not outlined within the land use zoning matrix of the Local Plan, I consider that the business is more relevant to a 'restaurant' due to the internal seating and provision of food on site. 'Restaurant' is open for consideration under the B2 zoning objective.

I consider the following objectives and policies to be most relevant to the appeal.

Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029

Chapter 8 Urban Centre and Retail

Objective RET O77. Work with applicants and development interests to explore the potential of suitable, available and viable land and buildings for retail and other town centre uses across all centres in the County Retail Hierarchy.

Objective RET O86. Assess all applications for all retail development in accordance with the criteria set out above and in Chapter 15, Development Management Standards of this Plan.

Chapter 15 Development Management Standards

15.13 Retail. Outlines criteria for retail assessment including sustainable retail development, provide appropriate access, and increase employment opportunities.

Naas Local Plan 2021-2017

I consider that the coffee shop would constitute a 'Shop (Convenience)' as per 11.1.1 Land Use Zoning Matrix of the Local Plan. A coffee shop is open for consideration under the land use zoning if it is less than 100m².

The coffee shop aspect of the development is 36.44m² and the seating area is 88.11m². When the servicing areas (circa 47m²) are removed from the total retail area the total area of the coffee shop and seating area is circa 78m². This is less than 100m² therefore satisfies the zoning objective as I consider it an existing use that supports the local community.

3.7.2 Retail. The policies and objectives of this Plan underpin an overall strategy which seeks to strengthen and protect the viability of the established retail function of Naas.

5.4 Natural Heritage Designations

Mouds Bog SAC (002331) is located circa 9km southwest of the appeal site.

Proposed Natural Heritage Areas

Grand Canal (002104) is located circa 750m west of the appeal site.

7.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development does not come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA, that is, it does not comprise construction works, demolition or intervention in the natural surroundings. [Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report].

8.0 The Appeal

8.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal and a third party appeal were submitted. The details of these which I consider relevant are summarised below.

A third party planning appeal has been submitted which includes a map and photographs and is summarised below. The appeal also included the submissions to the Planning Authority which are also included in the summary below for completeness.

- A notice of enforcement was sent to restore the premises to its original state. Further information was submitted to the Planning Authority. This further information lacked full details. The appellant considers that the decision was rushed and not adequate from the Planning Authority.
- The appellant outlines previous planning applications reference no's. 24/276 and 24/256. I note that 24276 was a change of use application for the coffee shop but was withdrawn. I note that 24256 was an incomplete application also for a change of use to a coffee shop.
- A similar development planning reference number 10500068 was refused.
- Traffic safety issues and car parking.
- Issues regarding waste collection.
- Concerns with unauthorised development.

The first party grounds of appeal is specific to the total amount of development contribution to be paid regarding Condition no 2 of the permission reference no. **25165**. The first party appellant seeks the removal of Condition no. 2. A letter has been submitted by a consultant acting on behalf of the first party appellant. The letter outlines that the appeal is being submitted pursuant to s48 (10) (b) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended). The letter is summarised as follows;

- Planning permission was granted in 1998 under PL73.104567 (97/500030) for development on land that includes the appeal site. This included for one

number two-storey block consisting of three retail shops and three number apartments.

- Condition 13 of ABP order PL73.104567 required a development contribution to be paid. A letter dated 29/05/00 from Mr. Declan Kirrane (Town Clerk) confirms that Condition 13 of the permission has been complied with. The contribution levy has already been paid for 3 no. retail units at ground level.
- The appellant references Section 8 of the Planning Authority's 'Level of Contribution'.
- The PA file indicates that a rate of €62 per square metre was applied to a total floorspace of 125m². This equates to €7,750. This is consistent with s8.2 and s9 of the Contribution Scheme.
- There is no additional floorspace, and the change of use is regarding the existing floorspace.
- The letter references case law *Cork County Council v An Bord Pleanala* [2006] IEHC 192.
- The letter references ABP cases in which levies were both reduced and also removed. This is regarding additional floor space and increased demand on services as a result of a change of use.
- Condition no. 2 represents double charging.
- S10.6 of the PA Scheme allows removal of the contributions where no new or upgrade to infrastructure is required. The appellant believes that no contribution is required.
- The appellant references previous change of use applications in which it was determined that the change of use was not development, or was exempted development.

8.2. Applicant Response to third party

A first party appellant response letter was submitted by a consultant in response to the third party appeal letter. This is summarised as follows.

- They disagree with the issues raised by the third party appellant. The issues raised are not supported by other residents.
- The application represents a low profile commercial use that does not propose any changes to the outside of the building or increase in floorspace. It does not raise and environmental or engineering concerns. It complies with the zoning objective.
- There is no objection to the compatibility of the coffee shop use in relation to the adjacent residential area.
- The unit serves local residents.
- The third party has made a number of submissions with the complaints not consistent.
- Deliveries are required regarding the servicing of the business.
- The applicant undertook works in the belief that they were exempted development. The amalgamation of the units involved the removal of an internal wall.
- The planning application was to regularise development on site. The applicant is entitled to submit a retention application to address the enforcement issues.
- The previous applications were invalidated and another withdrawn. The current application is the first that was validated and proceeded to a final determination.
- The previous application for a change of use to a takeaway was refused under planning reference no. 10500068 and was in relation to unit no. 1. The current proposal relates to unit no's. 2 and 3. This previous refusal is not relevant to the current proposal.
- The issued outlined by the third party regarding further information are not elaborated on. All items were addressed by way of further information except items 2 and 10 as the landlord is the owner of the car park.
- No evidence is presented regarding car parking being dangerous.

- Parking provision for a coffee shop which serves adjacent housing is not dissimilar to a retail unit. Parking is identified on the site layout plan submitted to the planning authority. Car parking standards in s15.7.8 of the Development Plan are maximum numbers.
- The applicant is unaware of any near misses regarding vehicular incidents. A record from the Road Safety Authority was included which shows one accident which was on a different road to the appeal site and predates the start of the café and is not relevant.

8.3. **Planning Authority Response**

- None

8.4. **Observations**

- None

8.5. **Further Responses**

- None

9.0 **Assessment**

9.1. Having reviewed the application details and all other documentation on file including the submissions received in relation to the appeal and the report of the local authority. I have also inspected the site, and I have had regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance. I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of development and planning history
- Parking and servicing of the development
- Development contributions
- Other matters

9.2. Principle of development and planning history

The existing use within unit no. 1 is a pilates studio, with a coffee shop operating within unit no's 2 and 3. **ABP PL 73.104567/97500030** granted planning permission for 3 no. retail units on the ground floor. The previous planning permission planning reference no. **21/10** included the amalgamation of units 1 and 2 to form a GP practice. It does not appear that this permission was enacted. Planning reference no. **17/697** was for a change of use of 3 number retail units to 1 number crèche. It also does not appear that this permission was enacted.

9.3. The third party appellant refers to planning applications 24/276 and 24/256. 24/256 was an incomplete application and was invalidated with a letter issued by the planning authority on 16/08/24 to confirm same. 24/276 was a retention application which was withdrawn, with a letter issued by the planning authority on 26/08/25 to confirm same.

9.4. The third party appellant also references planning reference no. **10500068** in their submission to the Planning Authority. I note planning reference no. 10500068 was for a hot food takeaway for unit no. 1 which was refused due to impacts on residential amenity. I do not consider this refusal relevant regarding the current retention application for a coffee shop (units no. 2 and 3) which includes the sale of hot food for both on and off site. I consider a coffee shop use different to a takeaway with respect to hours of operation, provision of on-site seating for 22 no. people, nature of the business, nature of the food cooked and associated smells, and potential impact on residential amenity.

9.5. I consider that the retention permission is for a change of use from 2 no. retail units to a coffee shop. The subject site is zoned 'B Existing/Infill Residential (R2.6)' as per the Naas Local Area Plan 2021-2027. I consider that the coffee shop would constitute a 'Restaurant' as per 11.1.1 Land Use Zoning Matrix of the Local Plan. A coffee shop is open for consideration under the land use zoning.

9.6. The coffee shop aspect of the development is 36.44m² and the seating area is 88.11m². When the servicing areas (circa 47m²) are removed from the gross area the net retail area of the coffee shop and seating area is circa 78m². I consider that the change of use is for a retail unit that is already constructed and established within a neighbourhood retail area. I am therefore satisfied that the coffee shop

adheres to the zoning objective and I consider it an appropriate use that supports the local community.

9.7. I therefore consider the change of use from 2 no. retail units to a coffee shop to be acceptable in principle.

9.8. Parking and servicing of the development

9.9. I note that concerns with car parking formed part of the submission letters to the Planning Authority and these were included with the appeal submission. I note that the appellant outlines in their submission letters that car parking is chaotic and dangerous, and that there have been numerous near misses with people and dogs. The appellant also raises concerns regarding waste storage and delivery trucks.

9.10. The first party appellant outlines in their response letter that no evidence has been submitted to support the claim that parking is dangerous and chaotic, and that parking for the units was approved under ABP **PL73104567**. The site layout plan submitted to the Planning Authority identifies 20 no. car parking spaces, with 3 of these spaces provided to the front of the building. The first party appellant argues that s15.7.8 sets the maximum car parking standards and that local residents also walk and cycle to the coffee shop.

9.11. The first party appellant outlines that vehicles enter and leave the area at slow speeds and that they are unaware of any near misses. They also submitted a record of accidents from the Road Safety Authority which documents one accident on Morell Road, which is a different road to the coffee shop and occurred in 2018 which pre dates the start of the coffee shop.

9.12. The appellant also outlines in their further information submission to the Planning Authority that delivery trucks utilise the existing circulation areas on site regarding delivery vehicles. Waste storage areas are also outlined on the site layout submitted by way of further information to the Planning Authority.

9.13. S 15.7.8 recommends 1 car parking space per 10m² of a café. I consider that the café is approximately 78m² excluding the service area. This equates to 8 no. car parking spaces. Unit no. 1 which is not subject of this appeal is a pilates studio, which I consider to be a gymnasium/recreation centre which requires 1 car parking

space per 15m². The area of unit no. 1 is circa 93m², which equates to 6 car parking spaces.

9.14. I am satisfied that 20 no. car parking spaces is adequate provision for the coffee shop and the pilates studio. I also observed cars traveling at slow speeds during my site visit and having regard to the RSA details submitted by the appellant I am satisfied that the operations of the café do not result in any significant road safety issues.

9.15. I note that the parking is established for a significant period of time. I also note that the Transport, Mobility and Open Spaces Department outlined no objection to the development subject to a condition that the development does not impair drainage. Having visited the site I consider that there is no physical evidence that there are issues with vehicles entering and leaving the site or inadequacy in parking provision. During my site visit I also observed the location of the waste collection areas to the rear of the building and I am satisfied that delivery vehicles can adequately access the site.

9.16. I note that Condition no. 3(b) of the Planning Authority grant of permission requires that the bicycle shelter is moved from the rear of the site to the front of the building. I am satisfied that location of the bike shelter to the front of the building will not result in a visual impact and will be appropriately positioned near the front door of the coffee shop.

9.17. **Development contributions**

9.18. The PA file indicates that a rate of €62 per square metre was applied to a total floorspace of 125m². This equates to €7,750. This is consistent with s8.2 Non Residential Development and s9 Retention Permission of the Kildare Contribution Scheme 2023-2029.

9.19. The appellant is appealing condition no. 2 of 25165 regarding the financial contribution. I note the rationale provided by the appellant in that financial contributions are not applicable in this instance as they were paid in full for the original grant of permission planning reference no. **ABP PL 73.104567/97500030**.

9.20. I refer to planning reference no. **ABP PL 73.104567/97500030** which is the original grant of permission for the 3 no. retail units. Condition no. 13 of PL 73.104567

outlines that a development contribution is required to be paid to the planning authority. Condition no. 25 of the original Planning Authority Planning Decision 97/500030 requests a development contribution of £10,601.00.

- 9.21. I note a letter on the Planning Authority's file regarding **97/500030** from Town Clerk D. Kirrane dated 29/05/00 which confirms compliance with Condition 13 in respect of 1 no. 2 storey block consisting of **3 no. retail shops** and 3 no. 2 bed apartments. The letter confirms £10,601.00 development contributions were paid in full.
- 9.22. Having regard to said letter I am satisfied that the original development contributions associated with the 3no. retail units have been paid in full.
- 9.23. I refer to s10.6 of the Kildare Contributions Scheme 2023-2029 which states that a 100% reduction on contributions will be granted for change of use permissions where the development does not lead to a need to upgrade infrastructure or services or lead to a significant demand on existing services. There is no additional floor space associated with the change of use and I do not consider the change of use to a coffee shop to constitute a significant demand on existing services.
- 9.24. Having regard to the above I consider that development contributions were paid in full on the original grant of permission. Therefore, further development contributions for a change of use to a coffee shop which is not subject to an increase in floorspace or increase on demand of existing services is not required.
- 9.25. **Other matters**
- 9.26. The third party appellant has raised a number of issues and concerns regarding the use of the premises and other enforcement related matters and procedures. I consider enforcement issues, and any matter of enforcement falls under the jurisdiction of the Planning Authority.

10.0 **AA Screening**

- 10.1. I have considered the project in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located at Unit no's. 2 and 3, Morell Manor, Naas, Co. Kildare approximately 9km northeast of the The Mouds Bog SAC.

The retention permission is for a change of use to a coffee shop.

No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered that no significant construction works are proposed, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the development for retention 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 (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

11.0 Water Framework Directive

- 11.1. An assessment of the development for retention has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive, together with relevant guidance published by the Environmental Protection Agency (Ireland), including applicable codes of practice for the protection of water quality.

The existing development connects to the foul and water mains.

Having considered that no significant construction works are required, it is concluded that the proposal for retention does not result in any risk of deterioration in the status of any water body, including surface waters (rivers and lakes), groundwater, transitional waters, or coastal waters. This applies to both qualitative and quantitative status, and in respect of temporary and permanent effects.

The development for retention does not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the maintenance or attainment of Good Ecological Status/Potential and Good Chemical Status, as required under the Directive. Accordingly, the development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

12.0 Recommendation

12.1. I recommend to the Commission that permission is granted and that no Section 48 contribution applies. Condition no. 2 of the retention permission to be removed for the reasons and considerations set out below.

13.0 Conditions

Having regard to:

- the provisions of the Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029, and the Naas Local Area Plan 2021-2027.
- The provision of a coffee shop in an established neighbourhood retail area which does not give rise to a traffic hazard.
- the provisions of '10.6 Change of Use' of the Kildare Development Contributions Scheme 2023-2029 which states a 100% reduction on contributions for change of use applications where the development does not lead to the need for new or upgraded infrastructure or services or significant demand placed on existing services.
- It is considered that development contributions have been paid with respect to the development for retention under planning reference no. **PL 73.104567/97500030** and therefore s10.6 of the Kildare Development Contributions Scheme 2023-2029 applies. The Commission considers that development contributions are not required for this change of use as no additional floor area is included and that the use is modest and will not result in additional pressure on existing infrastructure.

14.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The development shall be retained and carried out in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, 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. Within 3 months of the final grant of permission, the Applicant shall submit for the written agreement of the Planning Authority, a revised location for the proposed bicycle shelter/parking to be situated to the front of the building/unit. Revised plans and particulars shall be submitted to the Planning Authority for written approval.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

3. Outdoor seating and tables are not permitted and are subject to a separate planning permission.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

4. (a) All foul sewage and soiled water shall be discharged to the public foul sewer.

(b) Only clean, uncontaminated storm water shall be discharged to the surface water drainage system.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

5. All surface water generated within the site boundaries shall be collected and disposed of within the curtilage of the site. No surface water from roofs, paved areas or otherwise shall discharge onto the laneway or adjoining properties.

Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and to prevent flooding or pollution.

6. All waste shall be managed and disposed of in accordance with the Waste Management Act 1996 as amended, and the Kildare County Council Waste Management Byelaws 2018.

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

7. No additional advertisement flags, signs, banners, posters or other advertisement material shall be erected on the façade of the building, within the curtilage of the site, or on any external windows.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity

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.”

Donal Farrelly
Planning Inspector

10/09/26

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501467-KE-26
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of a change of use of unit no's. 2 and 3 to a coffee shop for sale of hot food, cold food and non-alcoholic beverages for on and off the premises. Retention is included for a change of use for a seating area in unit no. 3.
Development Address	Unit no's. 2 and 3, Morell Manor, Naas, 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)	
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:** _____