



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-316521-23

Development	Retention of entrance, house and stables and associated site works.
Location	Ballylehane Lower, Ballylinan, Co. Laois
Planning Authority	Laois County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2343
Applicant	Brendan Walsh
Type of Application	Retain
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission to Retain
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant	Brendan Walsh
Date of Site Inspection	12 th October 2023
Inspector	Dolores McCague

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	5
3.4. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History.....	8
5.0 Policy Context.....	9
5.1. Project Ireland 2040 National Planning Framework	9
5.2. Eastern & Midlands Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy 2019-2031	10
5.3. Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2005	10
5.4. Development Plan.....	11
5.6. Roads & Parking Standards February 2007.....	12
5.7. Natural Heritage Designations	12
5.8. EIA Screening	12
6.0 The Appeal	12
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	12
6.2. Planning Authority Response.....	15
7.0 Assessment	15
7.2. Appropriate Assessment.....	15
7.3. Traffic Safety.....	15
8.0 Recommendation.....	17
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	17
9.2. Appendices	18
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1.1. The site is located at Ballylehane Lower, Ballylinan, Co. Laois. It is located off a local road, close to the N78, approx. 4.7km south west of Ballylinan.
- 1.1.2. The house, the subject of the appeal, is attached to an agricultural building which contains stables. The house and shed form a line of low profile buildings along the north eastern boundary of the site. The house is approx. 45 metres from the public road. It is accessed by a driveway with a vehicular circulation / car parking area to the front and side of the house and stables. The access is screened from the road by high timber fencing at the entrance.
- 1.1.3. The site comprises a rectangular field bounded by hedgerows. A large farmyard and dwelling, adjoins the site to the north east, with buildings close to the site boundary. The junction of the local road with the N78 is immediately beyond the farmyard entrance.
- 1.1.4. The site has a stated area of 1.02 hectares.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1.1. The application is described as:

Retain existing entrance as constructed; retain existing house and stables as constructed; retain existing general hardstand area; retain existing septic tank with permission to upgrade to a secondary effluent treatment system and all associated site works.
- 2.1.2. The house to be retained has a stated floor area of 97.8sqm, a maximum height of 4.2 metres. It is externally finished in unpainted render with a galvanised roof.
- 2.1.3. The application was accompanied by:

A letter from Whyte Planning Consultants Ltd, agents,
Site Characterisation Details,
Traffic Report' by TPS M Moran & Associates, which has also been supplied with the grounds of appeal.

It is proposed to upgrade the existing septic tank system to a secondary effluent treatment system and to retain the existing entrance as constructed.

Referring to the previous refusal reason and policy TRANS22 of the County Development Plan, they state that the application is supported by a report from an independent traffic planning expert, which shows that the traffic volumes are quite low and average speed on the road is well below the speed limit. Having examined the existing entrance, there is no advantage to moving it in safety terms.

They state that this addresses the single refusal reason.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. The planning authority decided to refuse permission and permission for retention for the reason:

Policy TRANS 8 and DM TRANS 2 of the Laois County Development Plan 2021-2027 requires development proposals accessing onto local roads to comply with the Council's road standards contained in the Laois County Council Roads and Parking Standards (2007). 3m x120m sight distances are required onto this Local Primary Road L-3858 at the location of the proposed entrance in accordance with the Laois County Council Roads and Parking Standards (2007). Adequate sightlines of 120m are not achievable at the location of the entrance. A 120m sight distance would not be available for on-coming vehicles towards vehicles turning right into the site. The development would, therefore, endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard because of the unavailability at the entrance of satisfactory sightlines on this Local Primary Road (L-3858). The proposed access from the public road at a point where sight visibility distances are substandard, conflicts with the provisions of the Laois County Development Plan 2021-2027 and would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and the obstruction of road users and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning Reports
- 3.2.2. The planning reports, 30th March 2023, recommending refusal, which issued, includes:

- Previous refusals which included sightlines: 18/202, 19/238 and 21/80.
- Under 21/80 the applicant sought to relocate the entrance (24.5m) further west, which was refused due to the unavailability of sight distances.
- Under 19/238 the applicant sought to relocate the entrance (44.7m) further west, refused as consent for works on adjoining lands to facilitate sight distances was unavailable.
- Sight distances of 2m x 90m are shown to be available.
- Area Engineer recommends refusal. 3m x 120m sightlines are not available.
- Screening for AA – no potential significant effects.

3.2.3. Other Technical Reports

3.2.4. Eastern Area Municipal District Office, 16th Mach 2023 – recommending refusal:

The proposed site entrance is located on the L3858-34 a local primary road approaching the N78. In accordance with figure 2.2 of the Laois County Council Roads and Parking Standards documents, at the proposed entrance the driver joining the road or turning right into the entrance shall be able to have full unobstructed vision along the required sightline distance. The line of vision must, without exception, lie within the curtilage of the site and the public road. The driver must be able to have full vision along the required sightline distance from a drivers height of 1.05m to an object height of 1.15m. At this location the sightline distance required is 120m as per Table 2.2 of the Laois Roads and Parking Standards.

At this location the sightline is not available having observed the situation on site.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. Uisce Éireann – conditions.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. A Third Party Observation from Patrick Leonard, accompanied by a report from (TAGROUP) Thomas Campbell Consulting Engineers Ltd, outlining the observer's concerns:

- The position of the house in relation to the observer's farmyard. There is a significant risk of future restrictions being placed on Mr Leonard's farm, damaging his business.
- House design is not in keeping with other houses in the area.
- Local need does not seem to have been established.
- Road safety issues.
- Concerns over percolation system.

Re traffic:

The applicant carried out a traffic survey and came up with an 85th percentile speed of 68km/hr and then suggested that a suitable design speed for this road should be taken as 70km/hr. The report then proceeds to use the tables in both current TII publications DN-GEO-03031 Road Link Design and DN-GEO-03060 Junction Design. Plugging in a value of 70km/hr and getting 120m requirement but then mistakenly state under DN-GEO-03031 that step down to 90m sightline could be accepted. Observer's response shows in 'Appendix F' no step down to stopping sight distances are allowed at junctions as clearly described in DN-GEO-03031. Also the table in DN-GEO-03031 clearly states that for a design speed of 70km/hr, 120m is the required sight distance. 70km/hr is the selected design speed in the table in the Laois Roads and Parking standards 2007, for this local primary road; and 120m is the minimum required sight distance given.

The report makes the attempt to make the case that because all the vehicles on the road are not driving at the posted speed limit there should be a reduction in the stopping sight distance requirement. It is clear from table 2.1 (copied) that Laois County Council didn't expect that all vehicles on a local primary road would be travelling at 80km.hr, evidenced by the fact that they selected 70km/hr for the design speed; in line with DN-GEO-03031.

The report also attempts to argue that 2m set back distance is acceptable at this junction rather than 3m required in the Laois Roads and Parking Standards.

Observer's response shows in 'Appendix F', that relaxations and departures only apply as described in both current TII publications DN-GEO-03031 Road Link Design and DN-GEO-03060 Junction Design, in areas where the receiving major link, ie the existing road, is being upgraded as part of a national road scheme and where there is environmental or economic reason that exist that don't allow the desirable minimum to be achieved. In this case the major link is not being upgraded as part of a national road scheme. The relaxations are not relevant to this case.

The setback distance, per Laois Roads and Parking Standards and DN-GEO-03060, is 3m. This access is not lightly trafficked, it is used for agricultural and commercial activities as well as residential.

Design speed is not calculated using a vehicle speed survey. Design speed is calculated as described in DN-GEO-03031, using factors of geometric design such as alignment constraint, layout constraint, bendiness, Harmonic Mean Visibility, speed survey on entire road link, mandatory speed limits are also considered.

Sightlines have only been shown to the near side and should have been shown for right turning traffic.

This access replaced a very small gate which had to be cleared to enter the field with a vehicle, and is currently unauthorised.

The report refers to traffic speed by hand held radar per Advice Note TA22/81, this is a British Standard and has been withdrawn. The location of the enumerator could not have been inconspicuous, as required in order not to influence speed. the enumerator's vehicle may have been parked, not as required. Readings should be taken in late spring, early autumn, not winter.

With the 85th percentile speed of 68 rounded up to 70km/hr, the required sight distance would be 120m, which is what the Laois Roads and Parking Standards also require.

If carried out as required, it is likely that the 85th percentile speed would be above 70km/hr.

The statement, that the recorded speeds are well below the 80kph posted speed limit, is completely misleading and false, when 91km/hr was rerecorded twice, as well as other speeds close to 80km/hr.

The survey carried out outside peak hours can not be regarded as an indicator of traffic levels.

Re. use of road safety tables – this is massively misleading. It gives minimum stopping distance for a car in a straight line. This road takes HGV's and buses, which have bigger stopping distances. Also, when a car is braking at a bend the driver will have to steer around the bend, this will require the driver to release the brakes, taking the car longer to stop, which is the case at this location.

4.0 Planning History

21/80, permission refused for relocation of entrance to the west, reason – unavailability of sightlines.

306208, P.A. Reg. Ref. 19/238 application for permission for the installation of a wastewater treatment system and polishing filter and, permission for retention of a single-storey house, hard standing area, alterations to the entrance and all associated site works. Following the PA's decision to grant, the application was refused on appeal for one reason:

Inadequate sightlines and traffic safety.

The Board direction states:

Board noted that the house was located within a Structurally Weak Rural Area in the Laois County Development Plan 2017-2023, and could not be satisfied on the basis of the information on the file that the applicant had demonstrated a social or economic need to live in this rural area in compliance with the requirements of National Policy Objective 19 of the National Planning Framework. However, the Board decided not to pursue this issue in the light of the substantive reason for refusal set out above.

P.A. Reg. Ref. 18/202 – Permission refused in 2018 for permission for installation of a wastewater treatment system and permission for retention of a single-storey house,

hard standing area, alterations to entrance and all associated site works for two reasons:

1. Having regard to the results of the site suitability assessment submitted with the application and the inspection of the site it is not considered that the proposed site is suitable for the safe treatment and disposal of domestic effluent and the proposed development would accordingly be prejudicial to public health.
2. Visibility at the site of the proposed entrance is extremely restricted, particularly to the southwest. It is considered that adequate sightlines of 120m are not achievable at the point of the entrance subject of retention. The development, therefore, would, endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard because of the unavailability at the entrance of satisfactory sightlines on this heavily trafficked Local Primary Road L3858 at a point where the maximum speed limit applies.

01/473 application by D & M Mannion, for outline planning permission for a 2 storey house garage bio-disc treatment plant and percolation area; further information request not replied to: water table and percolation test results were unsatisfactory.

4.1. Enforcement file UD 17/70 relates to the subject development.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Project Ireland 2040 National Planning Framework

- 5.1.1. Section 5.3 (Planning for the Future Growth and Development of Rural Areas - Countryside) states that it is important to differentiate between rural areas located within the commuter catchment of the five cities, largest towns and places of employment and rural areas outside these catchments. A more flexible approach, primarily based on siting and design, than the demonstration of a functional economic or social requirement for housing need in areas under urban influence, will be applied to rural housing in areas that are not subject to urban development pressure.
- 5.1.2. National Policy Objective 19 states it is an objective to ensure, in providing for the development of rural housing, that a distinction is made between areas under urban influence and elsewhere. In rural areas not under urban influence, facilitate the

provision of single housing in the countryside based on siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements.

5.2. Eastern & Midlands Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy 2019-2031

- 5.2.1. Section 4.2 (Settlement Strategy) – Support the sustainable growth of rural places by promoting the revitalisation of rural towns and villages, including ready to go regeneration projects coupled with investment where required in local employment and services and targeted rural housing policies, to be determined by local authorities.
- 5.2.2. The ‘Policy Response’ to local towns, villages and rural areas set out in Table 4.3 (Settlement Typologies and Policy Responses) is ‘consolidation coupled with targeted rural housing and investment policies where required to improve local employment, services and sustainable transport options and to become more self-sustaining’.
- 5.2.3. Section 4.8 (Rural Places: Towns, Villages and the Countryside) states, inter alia in relation to housing, that support for housing and population growth within rural towns and villages will help to act as a viable alternative to rural one-off housing. It also states that the National Planning Framework and the RSES makes a distinction between areas under urban influence and rural areas outside these catchments and in these rural areas ‘a more flexible approach based primarily on siting and design will apply’.
- 5.2.4. Regional Policy Objective RPO 4.81 states that in rural areas outside the Rural Areas Under Strong Urban Influence local authorities shall encourage sustainable growth in areas that have experienced decline or stagnation, facilitate the provision of single houses in the countryside based on siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements.

5.3. Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2005

- 5.3.1. These guidelines state that it is to be expected that all planning authority areas which are predominantly rural will contain, to varying extents, at least three of the rural area types defined in the NSS. The three concerned are (1) areas under strong urban influence, (2) areas with a traditionally strong agricultural base, (3) structurally weak areas. In the latter, the policy should be of accommodating any demand for

permanent residential development, while acknowledging the importance of supporting the urban structure of such areas as well.

5.4. **Development Plan**

5.5. Laois County Development Plan 2021-2027 is the operative plan, relevant provisions include:

This area is identified as 'Structural Weak Areas' in the core strategy map 2.2.

In relation to structurally weak rural areas the plan details these as follows:

The rural areas generally exhibit characteristics such as persistent and significant population decline as well as a weaker economic structure based on indices of income, employment and economic growth. These rural areas are more distant from the major urban areas and the associated pressure from urban generated housing.

To help stem decline and strengthen structurally weak areas, it is an objective of the Council that in general, any demand for permanent residential development should be accommodated, subject to meeting normal planning and environmental criteria.

TRANS 8 Require development proposals accessing onto Laois's roads network to comply with the Council's road standards contained in the Road Design Section document titled Roads and Parking Standards (2007) and to any subsequent revisions thereto.

DM TRANS 2 Sightlines: Sightline requirements are determined by the Council having regard to Laois County Council Roads and Parking Standards (2007) guidelines and in exceptional circumstances on a case by case basis. Factors including the type, speed limit and condition of the road shall be taken into consideration: Where sightlines are inadequate and would give rise to a traffic hazard, development will not be permitted. In cases where an access already exists with inadequate sightlines, it is Council policy to recommend the closing up of this entrance and to facilitate another entrance with adequate sightlines. All applications for planning permission must clearly indicate the sightlines available at the proposed access within the boundary of the site.

5.6. Roads & Parking Standards February 2007

- 5.6.1. This document, which is referred to in County Development Plan 2021-2027 includes:

For a local primary road the following criteria are listed:

speed limit 80km/h,

design speed 70km/h,

'x' distance 3m,

'y' distance of 120m.

5.7. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.7.1. The closest Natura area is River Barrow and River Nore SAC approx. 5.8km to the south east.

5.8. EIA Screening

- 5.8.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the development and the nature of the receiving environment, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination stage, and a screening determination is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. Whyte Planning Consultants Ltd agents have submitted the appeal on behalf of the appellant Brendan Walsh. The grounds include:
- The entrance has been subject to an independent traffic consultant's report which has indicated that the existing arrangement is entirely safe and a 90m sightline can accommodate the development without any implication of public safety due to the average traffic speed on the road, low traffic volume and horizontal and vertical arrangement.

- The planning authority have refused the permission based on a narrow interpretation of policy TRANS 8 and have not assessed the application in a fair and balanced manner.
- They have interpreted policy TRANS 8 strictly and not entirely within the spirit of the Laois County Development Plan and they request the Board to take account of the road traffic report.
- A document titled 'Traffic Report' by TPS M Moran & Associates, accompanies the grounds,

6.1.2. Traffic Report' by TPS M Moran & Associates

6.1.3. This document, which was also submitted with the planning application, includes:

- While Local Authorities may have historically developed their own guidelines in relation to road character, road design and road link capacity all of these publications have now been superceded.
- The only design standards which apply nationally are derived from the Transport Infrastructure Ireland DN-GEO suite of publications relating to Road Link Design and the Department of Transport Publication Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets.
- It is extracts from these standards that form the basis for the technical assessment.
- Motorists constantly adjust their speed to reflect the character of the road layout.
- While the L3858 is assigned a default rural speed limit of 80kph since 2014, a default speed limit of 80kph for roads of this character is no longer deemed appropriate by the Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport.
- TII Road Design Publications suggest carrying out vehicle speed surveys on the receiving road link, upon which the design speed should be a key factor together with the layout of the existing road.
- Extracts from 'The Geometric Design of Major/Minor Priority Junctions and Vehicular Access to National Roads' are quoted.
- Extracts from 'DN-GEO-03060' are quoted; with reference to relaxation of standards.

- The 80kph default speed limit should not be the sole design consideration in determining visibility sightlines from a local road.
- The existing access has been in operation since the mid 1990's.
- The general condition of the L3858 in the vicinity of the application site can be regarded as of a good standard with a good road surface. The horizontal alignment of the L3858 is relatively straight approaching from the northeast and past the site with a slow road bend to the southwest. The vertical alignment of the L3858 rises gently from west to east approaching and along the frontage.
- A speed survey was undertaken. Recording speeds between 28kph and 91kph.
- Average speed eastbound 61.07kph and 85th percentile 68.05kph; westbound 61.50kph and 68.20kph.
- The recorded speeds are well below the 80kph posted speed limit.
- The level of traffic recorded was very low.
- Trip generation for a dwelling is discussed, and TRICS data provided.
- DN-GEO-03060, table 5.4, states that the 'x' distance can be reduced to 2.00 metres.
- Based on the 85th percentile speed of well less than 80kph along this section of the L3858, a 2.0m sightline within the site access, as a relaxation, can be provided into the leading and non-leading traffic directions of the L3858 which is sufficient to enable traffic to exit this access.
- A 'y' distance is discussed with reference to table 5.5 of DN-GEO-03060; for a 60kph design speed 90m is required. They note that the design speed does not equate to the speed limit.
- The 'y' distance can be 90m which is one step below the design speed.
- Table 1.3 of DN-GEO-03060 is also quoted, with reference to permitting a 90m sightline as part of a 70kmh design speed assessment being one step below Desirable Minimum. It is further argued that the sightline could be reduced to 70m, per table 1.3.

- The Rules of the Road publication is referred to: table 6.0, regarding wet weather driving conditions, when minimum stopping distance for an 80kph road is 81.0m 16.0m reaction time and 65.0m maximum braking distance.
- There is no technical reason for this site access not being supported.
- The survey results for 21st November 2022, 11.50 to 15.50, are given.

6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

6.2.1. The Planning Authority has not responded to the grounds of appeal.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1.1. I consider that the main issues which arise in relation to this appeal are appropriate assessment and traffic safety, and the following assessment is dealt with under those headings.

7.2. **Appropriate Assessment**

7.2.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, I am satisfied that no appropriate assessment issues arise and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

7.3. **Traffic Safety**

7.3.1. The grounds of appeal states that the planning authority have interpreted policy TRANS 8 strictly and not entirely within the spirit of the Laois County Development Plan and they request the Board to take account of the road traffic report which they enclose.

7.3.2. The submission indicates that sightlines of 2m x 90m can be achieved.

7.3.3. The traffic report attached to the grounds of appeal was provided to the planning authority, and considered prior to their decision to refuse.

7.3.4. A detailed observation to the planning authority included a critique of the traffic report, prepared by an engineering consultant retained by the observer. That

observation included that relaxations and departures only apply as described in both current TII publications DN-GEO-03031 Road Link Design and DN-GEO-03060 Junction Design, in areas where the receiving major link ie the existing road is being upgraded as part of a national road scheme and where there is environmental or economic reason that exist that don't allow the desirable minimum to be achieved. In this case the major link is not being upgraded as part of a national road scheme and they point out that the relaxations are not relevant to this case. This refers to the applicant's suggestion that the 'x' distance could be reduced to 2m.

- 7.3.5. The 'x' distance refers to the setback from the road edge at the applicant's entrance from which lines of visibility are required. I concur with the assessment that there is no justification for relaxing the 'x' distance below the recommended 3m setback.
- 7.3.6. In relation to the relaxation of the 'y' distance. The 'y' distance is the extent / length of visibility required along the road, from the entrance location. This is based mainly on the category of road, in this case a primary local road.
- 7.3.7. The argument is made on behalf of the applicant that based on the traffic survey: the low traffic speeds encountered and low traffic levels, it is considered that a lesser 'y' distance should apply. The argument is rebutted in detail, in the report of Thomas Cambell Consulting Engineers submitted with the observation to the planning authority, which refers to various possible limitations of the speed survey carried out, and offers counter arguments to the interpretation of the results.
- 7.3.8. The publication Roads & Parking Standards, February 2007 is referred to in the development plan in TRANS 8 and DM TRANS 2, both of which are referenced in the refusal reason.
- 7.3.9. The 'Roads & Parking Standards' include, for a local primary road, a speed limit of 80km/h, a design speed of 70km/h, a 'y' distance of 120m and an 'x' distance of 3m. These are in line with the most recent iteration of the TII publication DN-GEO-03060 in which an 'x' distance of 3m and a 'y' distance of 120m, are referred to as corresponding to a design speed of 70km/h.
- 7.3.10. I am satisfied that there is no conflict between the standards referred to in the county development plan and national standards as regards the sightline requirements for this site. I am also satisfied that the planning authority have not interpreted policy

TRANS 8 strictly such as not to be entirely within the spirit of the Laois County Development Plan.

- 7.3.11. In my opinion the proposed development would access a primary local road at a location where it would be provided with inadequate sightlines and where the additional traffic turning movements, to which the development would give rise would endanger traffic safety by reason of traffic hazard and this is a reason to refuse permission.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1.1. I recommend that the planning application be refused for the following reasons and considerations.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed development would access a primary local road at a location where it would be provided with inadequate sightlines and where the additional traffic turning movements, to which the development would give rise, would endanger traffic safety by reason of traffic hazard.

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, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Planning Inspector

24th October 2023

9.2. Appendices

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference			
Proposed Development Summary	Retain existing entrance as constructed; retain existing house and stables as constructed; retain existing general hardstand area; retain existing septic tank with permission to upgrade to a secondary effluent treatment system and all associated site works.		
Development Address	Ballylehane Lower, Ballylinan, Co. Laois		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	/
		No	No further action required
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) or does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes		Class.....	EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	/		Proceed to Q.3
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)
			Conclusion
No		N/A	No EIAR or Preliminary

				Examination required
Yes		Class/Threshold.....		Proceed to Q.4

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?				
No	/			Preliminary Examination required
Yes				Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

Appendix 2 Photographs

Appendix 3 Laois County Development Plan 2021-2027, extracts.

Appendix 4 Roads & Parking Standards February 2007

Appendix 5 DN-GEO-03060 2017 & 2023 extracts