



ACP Case No.: **ACP-323851-25**

CELBRIDGE HAZELHATCH MOBILITY CORRIDOR

Responses to Submissions on Section 177AE Consent Application



MDT0902-RPS-00-XX-SH-Z-1001

A1 C01

11th February 2026

Index of Section 177AE Submissions

No.	Name of Submitter	Page No.'s
1.	Transport Infrastructure Ireland	1
2.	Inland Fisheries Ireland	2 - 4
3.	John O'Neill	5
4.	Celbridge Heritage and Tourism Forum	6 - 7
5.	Celbridge Community Council	8 - 13
6.	Celbridge Estates Limited and the Donovan Family	14 - 15
7.	The Land Development Agency	16
8.	H2 Properties Unlimited Company	17 - 18

No.:	01	
Name of Submitter:	Transport Infrastructure Ireland	
Item No.	Summary of Observation	Response
1	Transport Infrastructure Ireland acknowledges receipt of referral of the proposed development on behalf of Kildare County Council and has no observations.	KCC acknowledges the receipt of TII's receipt of referral and notes that TII has no observations.

No.:	02	
Name of Submitter:	Inland Fisheries Ireland	
Item No.	Summary of Observation	Response
1.	<p><u>Construction Environmental Management Plan</u> Should development proceed, best practice should be implemented at all times in relation to any activities that may impact on surface water or riparian habitats. Any discharges to surface streams present on or near the site must not impact negatively on the local watercourses. All works should be completed in line with a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), which ensures good construction practices are adopted throughout the construction period and contains mitigation measures to deal with potential adverse impacts identified in advance of the scheme.</p>	<p>An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (document ref: MDT0902-RPS-00-XX-RP-Z-0051) has been prepared as part of the Section 177AE application for development consent. The Outline CEMP has been prepared having regard to the National Roads Authority (NRA) "<i>Guidelines for the Creation, Implementation and Maintenance of an Environmental Operating Plan</i>" (NRA, 2007).</p> <p>The appointed contractor will take ownership/ be responsible for the implementation of the Outline CEMP once appointed. It is intended that the CEMP will be a "live" document which will be updated by the appointed contractor and will be updated prior to and during construction on an as-needed basis to manage environmental risks and mitigation.</p> <p>The CEMP contains details of the mitigation and monitoring measures (Schedule of Environmental Commitments) from the Environmental Report and the NIS as part of the proposed development submitted to the competent authority and approval is sought on this basis and subject to such further Conditions as may be imposed by the Competent Authority. Specific mitigation measures in relation to protection of watercourses from pollution via surface water-runoff, pollution prevention control measures, measures in relation to instream works and works at the River Liffey have been included.</p>
2.	<p>The disturbance of riparian habitats should be minimised, buffer zones must be strictly adhered to, and riparian vegetation should be retained.</p>	<p>The applicant KCC notes the requirements and can confirm that a key design measure for the proposed development is the inclusion of a minimum 5m set back distance of the bridge abutments from the River Liffey banks as part of the proposed development submitted to the competent authority and approval is sought on this basis and subject to such further Conditions as may be imposed by the Competent Authority.</p> <p>As per Section 2.18.5 of the Environmental Report, the northern bridge abutment has been set back a minimum of 12 metres from the top of northern river bank. The minimum distance between the southern bridge abutment and the top of the southern river bank is approximately 9.5 metres and it is considered that these set back distances are sufficient to allow the bridge foundations and abutments to be constructed without impacting the river banks and approval is sought on this basis and subject to such further Conditions as may be imposed by the Competent Authority.</p>
3.	<p>To prevent water pollution, before commencing any works, Inland Fisheries Ireland strongly advise that all construction personnel and contractors are made familiar with and adhere to the mitigation measures in any construction phase water management plan, construction management and environmental plan, Inland Fisheries guidance on protecting fisheries during construction. Construction industry guidance and planning permission conditions pertaining to the site.</p>	<p>Section 5 of the Outline CEMP includes details of training and induction that will be required of all contractor's and subcontractor's personnel working and visiting the site and approval is sought on this basis and subject to such further Conditions as may be imposed by the Competent Authority.</p>
4.	<p>There can be no direct pumping of contaminated water from the works to a watercourse at any time. Any dewatering of ground water during excavation works must be pumped into an attenuation area before discharge.</p>	<p>The applicant KCC notes the requirements and confirms that aside from the Liffey Crossing, the earthworks do not include significant cuttings, and therefore dewatering of excavations will generally not be required. However, suitable sediment and erosion controls will be implemented for the runoff from the earthworks to ensure that the sediment load in water discharging to the receiving watercourses is kept below permissible levels and approval is sought on this basis and subject to such further Conditions as may be imposed by the Competent Authority.</p>

No.:	02	
Name of Submitter:	Inland Fisheries Ireland	
Item No.	Summary of Observation	Response
5.	Topsoil stored on site must be controlled to stop harmful material reaching surface waters. Drainage from stockpiles may need to be directed to a settlement area for treatment, and silt fences around piles may be necessary.	The applicant KCC notes this requirement and confirms that mitigation measures have been included for the protection of watercourses in Section 9.5.3 of the Environmental Report and Section 7.3.1 of the NIS and incorporated into the CEMP as part of the proposed development submitted to the competent authority and approval is sought on this basis and subject to such further Conditions as may be imposed by the Competent Authority.
6.	Provide detailed design drawings and method statements for the new bridge over the Liffey must be submitted to IFI for approval. Instream works can only take place from 1st July to 30 th September. Bridge foundations should be positioned at least 4.0 m from the wetted river channel to prevent impacts on riparian habitat. Consultation between the project team and IFI will be essential in order that a fisheries-sustainable solution is arrived at and incorporated in the final works programme.	The applicant KCC notes this requirement regarding detailed design drawings and method statements and will continue to engage with IFI throughout in this regard. With regard to instream works, KCC can confirm that the CEMP contains mitigation measures in relation to Instream works and these have been included in the Schedule of Environmental Commitments from the Environmental Report and the NIS as part of the proposed development submitted to the competent authority and approval is sought on this basis and subject to such further Conditions as may be imposed by the Competent Authority. KCC can also confirm as per Section 2.18.5 of the Environmental Report that the northern bridge abutment has been set back a minimum of 12 metres from the top of northern river bank. The minimum distance between the southern bridge abutment and the top of the southern river bank is approximately 9.5 metres. It is considered that these set back distances are sufficient to allow the bridge foundations and abutments to be constructed without impacting the river banks and approval is sought on this basis and subject to such further Conditions as may be imposed by the Competent Authority. KCC will continue to engage and coordinate with IFI in relation to the proposed construction activities.
7.	The installation of culverts should be subject to agreed method statements with IFI. The culverts must not be overly wide in design and again are subject to timing constraints. IFI's recommend that box culverts are used instead of pipe culverts. These will have the least impact on fish passage.	The applicant KCC notes the requirements with regard to agreed method statements and will continue to engage with IFI throughout in this regard. The details of the proposed watercourse crossing structures are outlined in Table 2-3 of the Environmental Report. 3 no. culverts are proposed, and 2 of these culverts are box culverts and approval is sought on this basis and subject to such further Conditions as may be imposed by the Competent Authority. There is 1 no. piped culvert proposed (Cul-01) as illustrated on Drawing MDT0902-RPS-01-XX-DR-C-DR1001. An aquatic survey of this watercourse was carried out in June 2023 and again in June 2025. The most recent survey in June 2025 confirmed that the habitat was unsuitable for all salmonid life stages, lamprey spawning and adult habitat, and crayfish and eel habitat and for this reason, a box culvert is not deemed necessary at this location.
8.	Surface water outfalls at any watercourse must have detail design and subsequent method statements submitted to IFI for approval.	The applicant KCC notes this requirement regarding detailed design drawings and method statements and will continue to engage with IFI throughout in this regard.

No.:	02	
Name of Submitter:	Inland Fisheries Ireland	
Item No.	Summary of Observation	Response
9.	Silt fencing and silt trappings on construction roads and any temporary watercourse crossings must be in place to avoid allowing silt to enter watercourses. They must also be regularly inspected and maintained to ensure they are performing their function properly.	The applicant KCC notes this requirement and confirms that mitigation measures have been included for the protection of watercourses in Section 9.5.3 of the Environmental Report and Section 7.3.1 of the NIS. Silt fencing has been specifically identified as a mitigation measure and shall be installed for all work within 15 m of the River Liffey, Loughlinstown Stream, the unnamed Simmonstown Stud stream, and the drainage ditch along the R405, as part of the proposed development submitted to the competent authority and approval is sought on this basis and subject to such further Conditions as may be imposed by the Competent Authority
10.	Regular inspections of local water courses and drainage ditches should be carried out and recorded during rainfall events to check that water quality and wildlife habitat are in place and working effectively.	The applicant KCC notes this requirement and confirms that Section 2.19.2 of the Environmental Report which relates to maintenance of drainage systems that inspections will be carried at regular intervals and after any significant storm events and approval is sought on this basis and subject to such further Conditions as may be imposed by the Competent Authority.
11.	Due to the development's size, appoint a qualified Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) to oversee site setup and construction. The ECoW must be on-site during construction to carry out water quality monitoring and to pay particular attention to works likely to generate suspended solids or other pollutants.	The applicant KCC notes this requirement and confirms that measures specifying the protection of biodiversity and mitigation of impacts to biodiversity are set out in Section 9.5.2.1 of the Environmental Report and 7.2.1 of the NIS and this includes the appointment of a Project Ecologist by KCC before the commencement of works. The contractor shall also appoint an Environmental Manager / Clerk of Works ('ECoW') before the commencement of works. The ECoW will be responsible for ensuring the mitigations prescribed are adhered to. The Contractor's ECoW will liaise directly with the Project Ecologist appointed by KCC to oversee the ecological aspects of the work. These measures have been included in Section 10 Environmental Commitments in the CEMP as part of the proposed development submitted to the competent authority and approval is sought on this basis and subject to such further Conditions as may be imposed by the Competent Authority.
12.	All discharges must follow the European Communities (Surface Water) Regulations 2009 and the European Communities (Groundwater) Regulations 2010.	The proposed surface water drainage layout for the proposed development is illustrated on drawings MDT0902-RPS-01-XX-DR-C-DR0000-DR0007. Various SuDS features are incorporated into the design of the proposed development to reduce operational phase pollutant run-off into watercourses and pollutant infiltration into groundwater in accordance with the European Communities (Surface Water) Regulations 2009 and the European Communities (Groundwater) Regulations 2010 and approval is sought on this basis and subject to such further Conditions as may be imposed by the Competent Authority.

No.:	03	
Name of Submitter:	John O'Neill	
Item No.	Summary of Observation	Response
1.	<p><u>Fencing between Proposed Scheme and Abbey Farm Green</u></p> <p>The plans show no existing arrangements for fencing on this section. Abbey Farm Green will be fully accessible from the proposed road with only some visual banking incorporated.</p> <p>The lack of adequate fencing between the CPO grounds to be acquired and the remaining estate green area will disrupt residents' peaceful enjoyment of the state. It could also undermine the residents, willingness to contribute to ground maintenance, as the green areas would no longer be perceived as part of the estate.</p>	<p>The extent of proposed fencing and environmental barrier design is illustrated on drawings MDT0902-RPS-01-XX-DRZ-FE0000-FE0007.</p> <p>The design of the proposed development does not incorporate fencing between the proposed road and the housing estate at this location, and in the opinion of the Council is not justified at this location as part of the proposed development.</p> <p>The landscape design of the proposed development includes the planting of native species woodland on the earthworks between the road and the green area along with standard trees. This is illustrated in drawing MDT0902-RPS-01-XX-DR-Z-LA0001. It is considered that, as well as providing visual screening of the proposed development, this planting will effectively delineate the road boundary without the need for additional fencing and approval is sought on this basis and subject to such further Conditions as may be imposed by the Competent Authority.</p>
2.	<p><u>Fencing between Abbey Farm Green and adjacent agricultural lands</u></p> <p>The Abbey Farm borders agricultural land to the southwest, over the years there has been livestock incursions due to poorly maintained fencing. This event could possibly occur in the future but with no fence preventing livestock from accessing the new road and bridge is a possible health and safety hazard.</p>	<p>The design of the proposed development does not incorporate fencing at this location, and in the opinion of the Council is not justified at this location as part of the proposed development.</p>
3.	<p>For the above reasons would urge that the existing plan be amended to incorporate suitable fencing between the road and bridge and the remaining Abbey Farm Estate Green along the riverbank.</p>	<p>The design of the proposed development does not incorporate fencing at this location, and in the opinion of the Council is not justified at this location as part of the proposed development.</p>

No.:	04	
Name of Submitter:	Celbridge Heritage and Tourism Forum	
Item No.	Summary of Observation	Response
	<p>Welcome the proposed development that will provide much need infrastructure in a way that supports the modal shift to Celbridge’s sustainable development. Also welcome the positive proposal and attention to ecological, heritage and cultural aspects of the proposed development.</p> <p>The CHTF raises two key points which they feel are important from the perspective of Celbridge’s unique built and natural heritage.</p>	<p>KCC welcomes the submission from CHTF and its general support for the proposed development. The responses to the individual issues raised are addressed further below.</p>
1.	<p><u>Bridge design</u></p> <p>The proposed route passes through the former Celbridge Abbey demesne. The plans indicate the bridge will not be visible from key heritage vantage points, which is welcomed. However, the scheme, will be visible from certain points in the demesne and it also occupies a prominent place relative to the demesne. In this regard, there is an opportunity for artistic design of an iconic bridge, within its current scope, to reflect the stories and heritage of Celbridge Abbey in particular with regard to Jonathan Swift and Esther van Homrigh (‘Vanessa’).</p> <p>Adopting such a design would support local tourism objectives and relevant county policies and would provide a permanent cultural marker for Celbridge. Failure to pursue this approach would be a missed opportunity to enhance the bridge’s role and the character of the place.</p>	<p>A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) has been included in the Environmental Report, refer to Chapter 10 – Cultural Heritage (Archaeological, Cultural and Architectural Heritage). Section 10.3.8.3.1 of the assessment has acknowledged that the northern end of the proposed development passes through the former demesne lands associated with Celbridge Abbey. The assessment has further concluded that the areas on both sides of the river no longer support the heritage value of the demesne as it presents today.</p> <p>For the purpose of the CHIA, four no. viewpoint locations have been assessed for impact on setting of heritage features. Three of these capture three open locations within Celbridge Abbey. These are identified in Figure 10-10 of the Environmental Report and are as follows: CH01 – Celbridge Abbey Garden, CH02 – Celbridge Abbey Field and CH03 – Celbridge Abbey Rock Bridge. Wireframe images have been generated by the Project Team to illustrate visibility of the project and impact on setting of the heritage features. These were presented in Appendix 10.1E (Wireframes / Heritage Photomontages). The assessment concluded that <i>“The wireframe views reveal that the dense vegetation surrounding Celbridge Abbey and the bend of the river upstream beyond the weir obstruct any long range or informative or open views towards the southwest from these locations and that the development will not be viewed. Due to the topography, the landform, dense tree cover and the bend in the river the proposed development will not cause any visual changes to the setting of Celbridge Abbey”</i>.</p> <p>With regard to the design of the bridge structure, it was not intended that a bridge structure over the River Liffey, (part of the River Liffey Landscape Character Area with special sensitivity) would be a landmark or prominent structure, as a highly visible bridge structure would cause significant adverse impacts on landscape and visual amenity.</p> <p>The design intention of the bridge, as proposed, is to create a visually appealing and inviting structure that blends with its surroundings. As such, the proposed bridge structure has an uncomplicated slender form and is architecturally pleasing due it’s symmetry. The varying depth girders have a curved bottom flange which form an appealing arched elevation. This is illustrated on MDT0902-RPS-01-XX-DR-Z-BR1010 to MDT0902-RPS-01-XX-DR-Z-BR1012.</p> <p>Transverse deck cantilevers will overhang and partially shadow the main structural members, disguising the structural depth of the bridge, giving a slimmer, less intrusive appearance. The proposed parapet consists of a bespoke assembly which will combine good design with a high level of safety. The proposed barriers will be constructed from round and curved profiles that safeguard the safety of the more vulnerable road users.</p> <p>A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been included in the Environmental Report, refer to Chapter 11 – Landscape & Visual. The assessment has identified and determined the effects on landscape character, landscape features, visual receptors, and visual amenity because of the works associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. The LVIA</p>

No.:	04	
Name of Submitter:	Celbridge Heritage and Tourism Forum	
Item No.	Summary of Observation	Response
		has concluded that the proposed planting will limit the extent of influence associated with the Proposed Development on adjacent Landscape Character Areas with a resultant reduction in landscape impact.
2.	<p><u>Landscape design at attenuation basins</u></p> <p>The current plans suggests native and wildflower planting around the attenuation ponds 1 and 2 which is very welcome. However, the site is proposed to be fenced in with security gates.</p> <p>Given the location of the ponds within the former demesne lands associated with Celbridge Abbey on the Liffey, the shortage of public amenities in Celbridge, and the move to creating a Liffey Valley Park and opening the Liffey banks for public amenity, this space has an opportunity to be designed as a visual amenity for the community.</p> <p>We suggest that the proposed attenuation basins (1 and 2), in addition to their drainage function, are integrated with the scheme's landscape design to provide visual amenity as well as the proposed biodiversity value for the community. Public access could be managed to reflect the operational and safety function of the basins. The area could, for example, be integrated with adjacent walking/cycling routes through set-back viewing areas and landscaping that provides a clear and safe separation from the water's edge.</p> <p>This approach would provide an important sensitive approach to its position in relation to the demesne than an area solely with drainage function protected by security fencing.</p>	<p>The extent of proposed fencing and environmental barrier design is illustrated on drawings MDT0902-RPS-01-XX-DR Z-FE0000-FE0007. The location of Attenuation Basin 1 is located on northern side of the River Liffey on lands, while Attenuation Basin 2 is located on the south side of the River Liffey and these areas no longer support the heritage value of the demesne as it presents today.</p> <p>Paladin style security fencing is proposed where required to prevent unauthorised access such as around the proposed attenuation ponds. This is considered an essential measure for maintaining public safety to prevent risk of drowning due to the potential depth of water in the ponds and the close proximity of residential areas and approval is sought on this basis and subject to such further Conditions as may be imposed by the Competent Authority.</p>

No.:	05	
Name of Submitter:	Celbridge Community Council	
Item No.	Summary of Observation	Response
1.	<p>Celbridge Community Council (CCC) is supportive of the final route selection; however they raise a number of issues with the detailed design of the cycling and bus infrastructure and with impacts on the visual amenity of the adjoining River Liffey strategic spaces.</p> <p>They request that ACP grants permission for this project to proceed but makes permission conditional on several design changes as proposed within their submission.</p> <p>Overall, a number of positives were noted in relation to design in the River Liffey Strategic Open Space which were welcomed, such as the single-span design as it will limit impact on the river channel, Planting of native species woodland and standard trees in these areas and inclusion in the design of provision for the possibility of a future greenway / active travel route along the banks of the Liffey.</p>	<p>KCC welcomes the submission from Celbridge Community Council and its general support for the proposed development. The responses to individual issues raised within the submission are addressed further below.</p>
2.	<p><u>Cycling Infrastructure, Sustainable Transport:</u></p> <p>CCC notes that the provision of cycling infrastructure in this project is to be welcomed. Segregated cycleways, full set-back with lower-priority side entrances, and connectivity with both the Hazelhatch Road cycleway and Hazelhatch train station are important project features. CCC however states that provision could be further improved.</p> <p>Many of the crossings and junctions in this project proposal fall short of the guidance in the NTA's Cycle Design Manual and should be revised.</p> <p>Given the number of deviations from the Cycle Design Manual, a full review of the cycling infrastructure should be undertaken prior to proceeding to the next stage of design.</p>	<p>There is currently no cycle infrastructure beyond the end points of the proposed road.</p> <p>The proposed junction design is for a shared crossing at each junction which provides consistency for pedestrians and cyclists usage as pedestrian and cyclist flows are expected to be moderate rather than high intensity at opening year.</p> <p>The detail design can be developed to accommodate segregated crossings within the proposed CPO land-take with the exception of the two tie-in junctions at either end, as there is no cycle infrastructure beyond the end-points of the proposed development.</p>
3.	<p><u>Cycling Infrastructure Issue #1 : Clane Road junction</u></p> <p>CCC notes that there are a number of problems with the proposed design:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Zero provision for cyclists on two of three legs of this junction. This is very surprising given the importance of cycling as a sustainable mode of transport in this project 2. The signalized toucan pedestrian/cyclist crossing uses a shared-space approach, rather than segregated crossing lanes. This is odd given the expected heavy traffic levels at this junction and deviates from best practice, as outlined in the NTA's Cycle Design Manual <p>The result is a junction where experienced and low-confidence cyclists will take a variety of non-marked, shared-traffic routes through the junction, increasing the likelihood of collisions with motorized traffic and pedestrians.</p> <p>Propose the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include at least one unidirectional, 2m-wide cycleway on the southern side of the Clane Road, in two segments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. From the pedestrian lights between the Texaco and Abbey Farm entrance, to the corner of the junction with the mobility corridor road, 2. From the other corner of the junction with the mobility corridor road to the pedestrian lights just west of the entrance to St John of God's St Raphaels campus 	<p>Providing additional cycling infrastructure along the Clane road is outside of this project scope. Future KCC projects may include these facilities as part of a coherent cycle track network for Celbridge. There is currently no cycle infrastructure beyond the end points of the proposed road.</p>

No.:	05	
Name of Submitter:	Celbridge Community Council	
Item No.	Summary of Observation	Response
	<p>In both cases, there is free space to accommodate such a lane, albeit with some landscaping.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convert the Toucan crossing on mobility corridor road leg of the junction to one with full mode separation, along the lines of "TL501 Protected Junction" from the NTA's Cycle Design Manual. <p>While not a perfect solution, it provides safe routes to/from the junction, guiding cyclists away from motorized traffic, pedestrians and a busy petrol station forecourt. The endpoints for the Clane Road cycle lanes are two signal-controlled pedestrian crossings, giving safe crossing points away from the junction, for less confident cyclists.</p> <p>In the longer term, the Celbridge Hazelhatch mobility corridor needs to be part of a coherent cycle track network for Celbridge, for example, in line with the NTA's Great Dublin Cycle Network. This suggests further extension of the cycle tracks along the length of the Clane Road beyond the proposed limited approach in this submission.</p>	
4.	<p><u>Cycling Infrastructure Issue #2: Pedestrian crossing at the Abbey Farm pedestrian link</u></p> <p>The "General Arrangement Sheet 2" map indicates that there are traffic signals controlling this crossing. However, the expected label is missing ("Signalised Toucan Pedestrian/Cycle Crossing With Raised Table")</p> <p>Proposed change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add an appropriate label ("Signalised Toucan Pedestrian/Cycle Crossing With Raised Table") to the documentation, at the pedestrian crossing near the Abbey Farm pedestrian link. 	<p>A signalised Toucan pedestrian / cyclist crossing is proposed at this location. A raised table is not proposed with the crossing.</p> <p>The detail design can be developed to accommodate segregated crossings within the proposed CPO land-take of the proposed development.</p>
5.	<p><u>Cycling Infrastructure Issue #3: Newtown Road signalized junction</u></p> <p>It is notable that priority is not given to the cycle track crossing this junction. This presumably is due to the level of traffic on the Newtown Road. However, if the traffic is at such a level, then the junction itself should not have a shared space between cyclists and pedestrians. Mode separation on the three crossings, such as that shown in "TL501 Protected Junction" from the Cycle Design Manual should be deployed.</p>	<p>There is currently no cycle infrastructure beyond the end points of the proposed road.</p> <p>The proposed junction design is for a shared crossing at each junction which provides consistency for pedestrians and cyclists usage as pedestrian and cyclist flows are expected to be moderate rather than high intensity at opening year.</p> <p>The detail design can be developed to accommodate segregated crossings within the proposed CPO land-take of the proposed development.</p>
6.	<p><u>Cycling Infrastructure Issue #4: Pedestrian/cycling permeability into the Temple Manor residential estate</u></p> <p>It is surprising that there is no pedestrian/cycling access from the Temple Manor residential estate on to the new mobility corridor road.</p>	<p>A direct access for pedestrians / cyclists from the proposed Mobility Corridor to Temple Manor would require a new opening in the boundary of the housing estate resulting in further loss of existing vegetation. It is considered that pedestrians / cyclists access to the proposed Mobility Corridor via Newtown Road is an appropriate point of access/egress.</p>
7.	<p><u>Cycling Infrastructure Issue #5: Hazelhatch Road signalized junction</u></p> <p>The issue here is similar to that at the Newtown Road junction, except now there are six cycle tracks and four pedestrian paths converging at two shared spaces. Mode separation is absolutely essential here. Furthermore, there is enough room for such a modification.</p>	<p>There is currently no cycle infrastructure beyond the end points of the proposed road.</p> <p>The proposed junction design is for a shared crossing at each junction which provides consistency for pedestrians and cyclists usage as pedestrian and cyclist flows are expected to be moderate rather than high intensity at opening year.</p>

No.:	05	
Name of Submitter:	Celbridge Community Council	
Item No.	Summary of Observation	Response
	<p>Proposed change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Separate pedestrian and cyclist spaces at the Hazelhatch Road junction crossings, as per the Cycle Design Manual best practice, 	<p>The detail design can be developed to accommodate segregated crossings within the proposed CPO land-take of the proposed development.</p>
8.	<p><u>Cycling Infrastructure Issue #6: Transition to the new two-way cycle track on the Hazelhatch Road</u></p> <p>To enter the new two-way cycle track on the Hazelhatch Road, southbound cyclists are expected to take control of the southbound vehicular lane and wait for a safe gap in northbound traffic before entering the new two-way cycle track. This is a manoeuvre for a confident cyclist only. Crossing dismounted, on foot, is an alternative approach, but will be very challenging in peak hour traffic.</p> <p>Proposed change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A signalized crossing for southbound cyclists to join the two-way cycle track as per “TL608 Signalized Cycle Crossing” in the National Transport Agency’s Cycle Design Manual. 	<p>The proposed pedestrian / cyclist facilities at this location will join with an existing shared pedestrian / cyclist path along Hazelhatch Road. The proposed dropped kerb is to allow access to the proposed cyclist facilities for cyclists who are travelling southbound on the road carriageway rather than using the existing shared facilities. Therefore the suggested crossing facility is not considered necessary at this location and would require landtake from the adjacent private property.</p>
9.	<p><u>Cycling Infrastructure Issue #7: Signalized crossing on the Loughlinstown Roundabout</u></p> <p>Here, there are four cycle tracks and four pedestrian paths converging at two shared spaces. Mode separation in the crossing, such as that shown in “TL606 Signalized Parallel Crossing” from the Cycle Design Manual is absolutely essential here. Furthermore, there is enough room for such a modification.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that that this crossing is close to the Grand Canal Greenway. It will be less than 800m from the crossing (along the R504 running south from the roundabout) to the nearest access to the greenway.</p> <p>Proposed changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Separate pedestrian and cyclist spaces at the Hazelhatch Road junction crossings, as per the Cycle Design Manual best practice. Provide appropriate tie-ins at the crossing for cyclists on the R504 south towards the Grand Canal Greenway. 	<p>There are no existing facilities for cyclists along the R405 between the proposed pedestrian / cyclist crossing and the Grand Canal Greenway. It is considered that the arrangement of this crossing is appropriate for the adjoining pedestrian / cyclist facilities.</p>
10.	<p><u>Bus Network Infrastructure Issue: Lack of Bus Stops</u></p> <p>New routes and diversion of existing routes are to be expected for the Celbridge Hazelhatch mobility corridor. The objective would be for these bus services to act as feeders for the train services that run from the train station. It is clearly beyond the scope of this planning application to give the plans for such bus services changes. However, the application should address, where feasible, the necessary roadside infrastructure.</p> <p>No bus network infrastructure is included in the plans.</p> <p>With no plans available for the Simmonstown KDA(Key Development Area, as outlined in KCC’s Celbridge Local Area Plan 2017-2023) to the north of the mobility corridor, it is understandable that bus stops are difficult to plan in, along that road. However, with no permeability planned from the Temple Manor residential estate, there is a clear value proposition for inbound and outbound bus stops on the mobility corridor link road, close to the Newtown Road junction. These bus</p>	<p>The proposed cross-section of the Mobility Corridor can accommodate bus stop facilities.</p> <p>There are no current bus services along this route and provision of same would be subject to appropriate consultation and processes with the transport agencies and the public in the future.</p> <p>Bus stops would be located along the Mobility Corridor in the future at the optimal locations to serve existing and future housing developments.</p>

No.:	05	
Name of Submitter:	Celbridge Community Council	
Item No.	Summary of Observation	Response
	<p>stops would service the existing residential housing on the Newtown Road and potentially at least some of those in any new housing within the Simmonstown KDA.</p> <p>Proposed change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add two new bus stops, one on either side of the new mobility corridor link road. 	
11.	<p><u>Speed Limit Issue: Lack of Traffic Calming</u></p> <p>As per the Section 177AE Environmental Report for the project, there is a transition from a 60km/hr speed limit to 50km/hr speed limit roughly 50m east of the Newtown Road junction. However, there are no visual or geometry features in the current design documentation to encourage compliance by west-bound drivers. There is a resulting risk of speeding through the Newtown Road junction and onwards on the bridge, areas of higher pedestrian use.</p> <p>Proposed change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add speed calming measures at the 60km/hr to 50km/hr speed limit transition. 	<p>In addition to the mandatory speed limit, proposed roadside treatments such as provision of kerbing, public lighting, signage, and landscape treatments reinforce the message to drivers to slow down. Further traffic calming measures are not considered necessary.</p>
12.	<p><u>Issues with Visual Impact in the River Liffey Strategic Open Space</u></p> <p>The proposed bridge crossing the River Liffey will inevitably have a visual impact; however, the current design represents an unsympathetic intrusion into a highly sensitive riverside landscape. Without some redesign, both the bridge structure and the adjacent Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) features risk undermining the natural beauty and amenity value of this strategic open space.</p> <p>The proposed designs raise several concerns regarding visual impact and suitability for a sensitive urban and heritage landscape setting, see items below.</p>	<p>It was not intended that a bridge structure over the Liffey would be a landmark structure as a highly visually intrusive bridge structure would cause unacceptable adverse impact on the landscape. As illustrated on drawings MDT0902-RPS-01-XX-DR-Z-BR1010-BR1012, the proposed bridge structure has an uncomplicated slender form and is architecturally pleasing due to its symmetry. The varying depth girders have a curved bottom flange which form an appealing arched elevation. Transverse deck cantilevers will overhang and partially shadow the main structural members, disguising the structural depth of the bridge, giving a slimmer, less intrusive appearance. The proposed parapet consists of a bespoke assembly which will combine good design with a high level of safety. The proposed barriers will be constructed from round and curved profiles that safeguard the safety of the more vulnerable road users.</p> <p>As indicated in Table 8.11 of Environmental Report MDT0902-RPS-00-XX-RP-Z-0067, it is predicted that the Proposed Development will not be widely prominent across this Landscape Character Area as surrounding, enclosing vegetation has the potential to quickly absorb the proposed changes</p>
	<p>1. The proposed bridge would traverse an historic landscape area only 500m from the centre of an expanding heritage town. The scheme would pass between Temple Mills upstream, and Celbridge Abbey and Celbridge Mill downstream. Development of infrastructure at this location demands a design response that respects its unique setting - this location cannot be treated like a site on agricultural land in a rural area.</p>	<p>A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) has been included in the Environmental Report, refer to Chapter 10 – Cultural Heritage (Archaeological, Cultural and Architectural Heritage). This CHIA describes and presents an assessment of the potential effects of the Proposed Development on Archaeological, Cultural and Architectural Heritage. The assessment has considered the potential for visual changes to the setting of Celbridge Abbey and the setting and visual amenity of the Temple Mills ACA.</p> <p>The CHIA has acknowledged that the proposed development will traverse the former demesne lands associated with Celbridge Abbey which is a historic landscape area. The lands through which the proposed development crosses are now separate from the</p>

No.:	05	
Name of Submitter:	Celbridge Community Council	
Item No.	Summary of Observation	Response
		<p>Celbridge Abbey and are outside of the setting of the structure. The lands on the northern side of the river are in use as a public green space; there is a boundary dividing this green area from the former demesne lands, preventing access into the Celbridge Abbey lands, and on the southern side of the river, the lands are overgrown and unused. These areas on both sides of the river no longer support the heritage value of the demesne as it presents today.</p> <p>For the purpose of the CHIA, four no. viewpoint locations have been assessed for impact on setting of heritage features. Three of these capture three open locations within Celbridge Abbey and are identified in Figure 10-10 of the Environmental Report and are as follows: CH01 – Celbridge Abbey Garden, CH02 – Celbridge Abbey Field and CH03 – Celbridge Abbey Rock Bridge. The remaining location CH04 was at Temple Mills ACA (c. 91m southwest of the proposed development).</p> <p>Wireframe images have been generated by the Project Team to illustrate visibility of the project and impact on setting of the heritage features. These were presented in Appendix 10.1E (Wireframes / Heritage Photomontages).</p> <p>The assessment concluded that <i>“The wireframe views reveal that the dense vegetation surrounding Celbridge Abbey and the bend of the river upstream beyond the weir obstruct any long range or informative or open views towards the southwest from these locations and that the development will not be viewed. Due to the topography, the landform, dense tree cover and the bend in the river the proposed development will not cause any visual changes to the setting of Celbridge Abbey”</i>.</p> <p>With regard to Temple Mills ACA, a wireframe view was taken from the northern end of the ACA at the entrance to the mill buildings and captures the view northwest towards the proposed development. The assessment concluded that <i>“there will be no change to the setting or visual amenity of the northern end of the Temple Mills ACA”</i>.</p>
2.	The prime location of the site for the proposed bridge close to the future town centre expansion (KDA 1: Oakley Park), the existing neighbourhood centre on the Clane Road, and the future Simmonstown KDA, means that it will evolve as a hub for movement of people between residential areas and new retail / services.	No comment.
3.	<p>The current SuDS design proposals prioritise engineering over amenity, failing to integrate public use or ecological enhancement, contrary to Kildare County Council’s own Sustainable Drainage Systems Guidance, which emphasises multi-functional benefits. There is a genuine concern that the proposals may be implemented like the examples from the Adamstown-Celbridge Link Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The use of paladin-style security fencing and gates around SuDS attenuation basins on heritage landscapes is visually intrusive and undermines the intended amenity and ecological value of these open spaces. o The scheme as currently proposed would diminish the character of the River Liffey corridor and risks sterilising valuable open space in west Celbridge, which is already underserved by parklands and recreational spaces. 	Paladin style security fencing is proposed where required to prevent unauthorised access such as around the proposed attenuation ponds. This is considered an essential measure for maintaining public safety to prevent risk of drowning due to the potential depth of water in the ponds and the close proximity of residential areas. It is considered that the visual impact of this security fencing will be mitigated by the surrounding existing vegetation and proposed planting.
4.	The current bridge design proposals focus on engineering solutions, with little evidence of creativity or concern for aesthetics.	A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been included in the Environmental Report, refer to Chapter 11 – Landscape & Visual. The assessment has included an assessment of predicted visual impacts from a range of viewpoints that have been selected to be

No.:	05	
Name of Submitter:	Celbridge Community Council	
Item No.	Summary of Observation	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The photomontages provided only show the bridge from a single viewpoint and during full foliage, which does not accurately represent year-round visibility or the true extent of visual impact. ○ The design features—walled abutments, and arched weathered steel girders—result in an imposing, utilitarian structure that blocks landscape views and creates a sense of enclosure beneath the bridge. ○ The mesh covered parapet, guardrail, and street lighting are more appropriate for a motorway overpass than for a bridge in a sensitive landscape, as seen in recent unsuitable examples like the bridge over the Lyreen River in Maynooth. ○ The focus appears to be on engineering and maintenance efficiency, with little evidence of consideration for aesthetics or integration with the surrounding environment. 	<p>representative of a range of views that are experienced by a variety of receptors within the study area in line with guidance, namely GLVIA3.</p> <p>A series of 7 representative viewpoints were selected by the LVIA specialist to illustrate the existing visual context of the Proposed Development. In addition, 4 viewpoints were selected by the Cultural Heritage specialist to inform the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment. The LVIA is supported by photomontages from these 7 viewpoint locations. A site visit was undertaken in June 2024 to assess the existing environment, to establish the existing visual resource and to identify sensitive receptors i.e. residential properties, scenic viewpoints. The baseline photography utilised in the production of the accompanying photomontages was captured during this site visit. Representative baseline views and, where relevant, predicted views prior to mitigation and with mitigation (photomontages) are illustrated in the photomontages. The photomontages have been provided to illustrate a Year 1 and Year 10 scenario, with the latter including mitigation planting and is considered to be representative of a year when planting is well established and providing screening effects. The photomontage which depicts the bridge is VP6 and was selected to represent the predicted visual effects of the Proposed Development from Riverview – Abbey Farm and to aid the visual impact assessment.</p> <p>With regard to the design of the bridge structure, it was not intended that a bridge structure over the River Liffey, (part of the River Liffey Landscape Character Area with special sensitivity) would be a landmark or prominent structure, as a highly visible bridge structure would cause significant adverse impacts on landscape and visual amenity.</p> <p>The design intention of the bridge, as proposed, is to create a visually appealing and inviting structure that blends with its surroundings. As such, the proposed bridge structure has an uncomplicated slender form and is architecturally pleasing due to its symmetry. The varying depth girders have a curved bottom flange which form an appealing arched elevation. This is illustrated on MDT0902-RPS-01-XX-DR-Z-BR1010 to MDT0902-RPS-01-XX-DR-Z-BR1012. Transverse deck cantilevers will overhang and partially shadow the main structural members, disguising the structural depth of the bridge, giving a slimmer, less intrusive appearance.</p> <p>The proposed parapet consists of a bespoke assembly which will combine good design with a high level of safety. The proposed barriers will be constructed from round and curved profiles that safeguard the safety of the more vulnerable road users.</p> <p>Furthermore, the LVIA has concluded that the proposed planting will limit the extent of influence associated with the Proposed Development on adjacent Landscape Character Areas with a resultant reduction in landscape impact.</p>

No.:	06	
Name of Submitter:	Celbridge Estates Limited and the Donovan Family	
Item No.	Summary of Observation	Response
1.	<p><u>Access to Potential Future Development Lands</u></p> <p>The proposed road design should not preclude future junctions to the KDA lands (zoned residential and educational) or to adjoining unclassified lands north and south of the Mobility Corridor. About three fields and five maintenance access points are proposed; given the potential for substantial residential development nearby, the approved design and planning conditions should retain flexibility to provide safe and suitable vehicular access in both directions.</p>	<p>It is considered that the proposed development design allows “flexibility to provide safe and suitable vehicular access” to any future developments along the Mobility Corridor and subject to such necessary statutory development consents as required by landowners.</p> <p>It is noted that field accesses can be removed in the future if made redundant by any developments and subject to such necessary statutory development consents as required by landowners.</p>
2.	<p><u>Building Lines and DMURS Principles</u></p> <p>The road design does not appear to facilitate street frontages up to the back of the footpath which is an important placemaking strategy in accordance with DMURS. The proposed road levels should not result in excessive embankment / fill that may have implications for future access.</p> <p>The stormwater management strategy incorporating linear stormwater channels and storage features should be reviewed so as not to impact adjacent development. The current design has swales on both sides of the corridor; this is not favourable to a streetscape.</p> <p>The layout and extent of the attenuation basins and swales on both sides of the corridor to be reviewed in light of potential impact on future residential development frontages. The current proposal of the attenuation basins and swales would push back potential development by 20m in some cases from the road edge.</p> <p>The proposed attenuations basins and swales along the mobility corridor may conflict with DMURS by increasing the separation between the carriageway and future development plots.</p>	<p>As indicated on Geometric Design drawings MDT0902-RPS-01-XX-DR-Z-GE0000-GE0003, the vertical alignment of the proposed road follows existing ground levels where possible. However, there is need to increase the height of the proposed road at some locations, such as were required to cross a watercourse culvert or to provide freeboard to predicted flood levels.</p> <p>The proposed attenuation basin and swales are necessary to meet KCC’s requirements to implement Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to manage stormwater and reduce flood risk.</p> <p>The Proposed Development has been designed as link road rather than a street. However, it will be possible to develop to the back of the footpath with the exception of the locations where drainage features are required alongside the proposed road and subject to such necessary statutory development consents as required by landowners.</p>
3.	<p><u>Road Alignment / Speed / Traffic Calming</u></p> <p>The posted limit is 50 km/h, the corridor’s long, straight alignment may encourage speeding unless traffic-calming and placemaking measures are applied. Consider interventions such as crossings, horizontal deflections, carriageway narrowing, raised junctions, verge planting, on-street parking bays and active frontages. These measures, aligned with DMURS, would improve safety, reinforce a lower-speed character and enhance place-making.</p>	<p>As per Section 2.4 of Environmental Report MDT0902-RPS-00-XX-RP-Z-0067, the proposed speed limit for the new road is 60 km/h from the southern approach to Newtown Road Junction to Loughlinstown Road Roundabout.</p> <p>In addition to the mandatory speed limit, proposed roadside treatments such as provision of kerbing, public lighting, signage, and landscape treatments reinforce the message to drivers to slow down. Further traffic calming measures are not considered necessary.</p>
4.	<p><u>Bus Stops / Bus Route</u></p> <p>There are no bus routes currently proposed for the Celbridge–Hazelhatch Mobility Corridor, future re-routing or new services are likely as the area develops. The road design and cross-section should therefore be future-proofed to allow integration of bus stops at suitable locations and to enable bus movements at junctions without requiring significant alterations later.</p>	<p>The proposed cross-section of the Mobility Corridor can accommodate future bus stop facilities.</p> <p>There are no current bus services along this route and provision of same would be subject to appropriate consultation and processes with the transport agencies and the public in the future.</p> <p>Bus stops would be located along the Mobility Corridor in the future at the optimal locations to serve existing and future housing developments.</p>
5.	<p><u>Strategic Services</u></p> <p>The proposed strategic corridor will occupy a strategic central location with development on both sides. For the purpose of future development, construction of key services and utilities along the route to facilitate the development of the KDA lands.</p>	<p>Utilities Design drawing MDT0902-RPS-01-XX-DR-Z-UT2001, illustrates how the proposed road cross-section can accommodate future underground utilities such as communication ducting, gas main, foul sewer, ESB ducting and watermain. The design of these utilities is outside the scope of this road project.</p>

No.:	06	
Name of Submitter:	Celbridge Estates Limited and the Donovan Family	
Item No.	Summary of Observation	Response
6.	Fully supportive of the improved cycle link to Celbridge & Hazelhatch train station. The link would be improved by the extension of the cycle path to the train station existing exit road.	KCC welcomes the support of the cycle link to Hazelhatch and Celbridge Train Station. There is an existing shared pedestrian / cyclist path which extends out of the grounds of the train station to the other side of the entrance at which the proposed cycle link is finishing. Therefore, it is considered that the extent of the proposed cyclist link is adequate.
7.	<p>Junction Treatments</p> <p>Junctions appear sized to accommodate future development of adjacent zoned lands, but several could be refined to better support cycle design guidance. For example, the Newtown Road / Mobility Corridor junction should be considered for redesign as a protected junction (ref. TL 501-503), removing shared pedestrian/cycle space and providing a safer, more direct route for active travel users.</p>	<p>The proposed junction design is for a shared crossing at each junction which provides consistency for pedestrians and cyclists usage as pedestrian and cyclist flows are expected to be moderate rather than high intensity at opening year.</p> <p>The detail design can be developed to accommodate segregated crossings within the proposed CPO land-take of the proposed development with the exception of the two tie-in junctions at either end, as there is no cycle infrastructure beyond the end-points of the proposed development.</p>

No.:	07	
Name of Submitter:	The Land Development Agency	
Item No.	Summary of Observation	Response
1	<p>The LDA owns land at Ballyoulster in Celbridge which are the subject of an active SHD Application at the time of writing. The LDA is supportive of the proposed mobility corridor with regard to the delivery of improved and sustainable infrastructure that will serve the town and its environs.</p> <p>While the LDA does not own any lands directly adjacent to, or served by, the proposed mobility corridor, it is considered that the provision of the proposed transport infrastructure will improve improve transport network and movement options in Celbridge and its environs. This improved infrastructure will facilitate the development of residentially zoned lands in the town and assist KCC in the achievement of its proposed housing targets over the lifetime of the County Development Plan 2023 – 2029.</p>	<p>KCC welcomes the strong support of the LDA for the proposed development and its recognition that while the project itself does not deliver housing, it supports the Housing for All objective of increasing new housing supply by providing sustainable access and opening KDAs south of the river Liffey in Celbridge.</p> <p>The proposed CHMC is consistent with and supports the aims of relevant policies and objectives at national, regional and local levels, particularly in the delivery of enhanced pedestrian and cycle infrastructure and enhanced connectivity with Hazelhatch and Celbridge Train Station.</p>

No.:	08	
Name of Submitter:	H2 Properties Unlimited Company	
Item No.	Summary of Observation	Response
1.	<p><u>Planning Permissions</u></p> <p>The site's commercial use as a service station is long established. Relevant permissions include: PL Ref 01/958 (granted 1 May 2002) for a local shop and petrol station with staff accommodation; PL Ref 08/835 (granted 14 October 2008) for shop extension, additional sales and seating areas and a rear storeroom; PL Ref 16/886 (granted 16 June 2017) for retention of alterations and extensions to the petrol filling station and shop; and PL Ref 18/731 (granted 22 October 2018) for retention of the existing exit-only arrangement.</p> <p>The proposed development may affect the applicant's ability to comply with existing permissions and their conditions. It is unclear whether granting permission and implementing the proposal would require the applicant to make new applications to regularise a revised internal traffic layout.</p> <p><u>Dangerous Substances Regulations</u></p> <p>The client's property operates as a petrol filling station licensed under the Dangerous Substances (Flammable Liquids and Fuels Retail Stores) Regulations, 2019. Changes to the petrol station's traffic layout resulting from the proposal could constitute "Major Works" under those regulations and would require the licence holder to apply for an amended licence.</p>	<p>The entrance into the Garage is moving south of the existing entrance. The proposed new access will be to standard and will be an improvement over existing access.</p> <p>Impacts shown to arise as result of a proposed development, can be the subject of a claim for compensation as part of the statutory compensation process.</p>
2.	<p><u>Traffic Arrangements</u></p> <p>The subject site on the Clane Road, Celbridge, comprises a petrol forecourt and convenience shop, two apartments, a service area, carwash and ancillary facilities, accessed via an existing right of way from Clane Road. The proposal would extinguish that right of way and create a new entrance south of the current access point, resulting in changes to traffic movements into and within the applicant's site.</p> <p>The application does not include a clear assessment of risks to safe operation from the proposed access/traffic changes (including risk of injury and environmental harm). No mitigation measures are documented. This lack of detail prevents a proper appraisal of the proposal's safety and environmental impacts.</p> <p>The proposed changes to the petrol filling station's traffic arrangements should be fully assessed by a competent authority or consultant to determine impacts on site safety and environmental risk and to inform any licensing decisions.</p>	<p>The entrance into the Garage is moving south of the existing entrance. The proposed new access will be to standard and will be an improvement over existing access.</p> <p>Impacts shown to arise as result of a proposed development, can be the subject of a claim for compensation as part of the statutory compensation process.</p>

No.:	08	
Name of Submitter:	H2 Properties Unlimited Company	
Item No.	Summary of Observation	Response
3.	<p><u>Construction methodology and continuity of operation</u></p> <p>No methodology is provided for carrying out major civil works in the vicinity of the petrol station. It is therefore unclear whether the works can be undertaken without materially disrupting the station's safe operation. If temporary closure or other measures are required, these should be set out and included in the application and any compulsory purchase documentation.</p>	<p>An assessment of the potential effects of the Proposed Development on material Assets: Non-Agricultural Properties has been included in the Environmental Report, refer to Chapter 12 – Material Assets: Non-Agricultural Properties. This comprises of non-agricultural properties directly impacted by the Proposed Development and includes commercial properties.</p> <p>As per Section 12.5.1 of Environmental Report MDT0902-RPS-00-XX-RP-Z-0067, the following mitigation measures will be implemented during the construction phase of the project <i>“access will be maintained to all affected property as much as possible and if interrupted will be restored without unreasonable delay. Traffic management measures will be put in place during construction where temporary or minor diversions are required.”</i> Also, regarding disturbance of services, <i>“where required, an alternative source of water / electricity will be provided to ensure that disruption to properties is minimised during the construction phase.”</i> and approval is sought on this basis and subject to such further Conditions as may be imposed by the Competent Authority.</p> <p>KCC will continue to engage and coordinate with the applicant in relation to the proposed construction activities.</p> <p>Impacts shown to arise as result of a proposed development, can be the subject of a claim for compensation as part of the statutory compensation process.</p>
4.	<p><u>Recommended further investigations.</u></p> <p>A detailed survey of existing structures, fuel storage/dispensing infrastructure and drainage.</p> <p>A swept-path analysis for vehicles accessing/egressing dispensing locations, car parking and the carwash.</p> <p>A swept-path analysis for fuel delivery tankers servicing the site.</p>	<p>A topographical survey has been completed which included the grounds of the service station. Additional survey of the service station's existing structures, fuel storage/dispensing infrastructure and drainage, is not considered necessary to inform the proposed development's preliminary design as included in this planning application. However, this additional detailed survey may be carried out during the detailed design phase of the project as part of engagement with the landowner should Approval and confirmation of the CPO be granted.</p> <p>The entrance into the Garage is moving south of the existing entrance The proposed new access will be to standard and will be an improvement over existing access.</p> <p>Swept path analysis has been carried out for fuel delivery tankers servicing the site. The results of this analysis indicate that the proposed access arrangements will allow the fuel delivery tankers to service the site without the need for excessive manoeuvring.</p> <p>Impacts shown to arise as result of a proposed development, can be the subject of a claim for compensation as part of the statutory compensation process.</p>