



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-319956-24

Development	Demolition of building and construction of 3 apartments with ground-floor retail/storage, together with all associated site works.
Location	Boherbee, Tralee, County Kerry
Planning Authority	Kerry County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	24/60196
Applicant(s)	Svajunas Jonavicius
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refusal
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant	Svajunas Jonavicius
Observer	Nuala and David O'Brien
Date of Site Inspection	10 th April 2025
Inspector	Gary Farrelly

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site has a stated area of 0.069 hectares and is located within the urban townland of Boherbee within the town of Tralee, County Kerry. The site comprises of a linear plot of land which extends for approximately 75 metres between its southern and northern boundaries. The site fronts both the R-875 (Boherbee) to the south and the R-878 (John Joe Sheehy Road) to the north. Austin Stack Park is located approximately 140 metres east of the subject site.
- 1.2. The frontage along the R-875 comprises of a terraced single storey property which is currently vacant. The boundary to the north along John Joe Sheehy Road comprises of a vehicular gate which serves an existing yard and sheds. The site is bounded by Walter Lyons Furniture Stores to the west and a residential property to the east.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought to demolish the existing single storey property which fronts the R-875 and to construct a mixed-use development comprising of retail and storage on the ground floor, office on the first floor and 3 no. apartments above the storage area to the rear of the site. The demolition works will total 238sqm.
- 2.2. The front elevation along the R-875 will comprise of a two-storey property with direct independent access to the apartments and first floor office provided from the street front. External finishes will comprise of a nap off-white render finish with natural slate finish to the roof. The ground floor shopfront will comprise of an aluclad glazed finish. The retail space will measure 70sqm.
- 2.3. The 3 no. apartments to the rear will be externally finished in soldier brick with a natural slate finish to the roof. Each apartment is proposed to have a floor area of 80sqm and will all comprise of 2 no. bedrooms. A perforated soldier brick void is proposed to be designed along the length of the eastern party boundary in order to prevent overlooking from the proposed development on the residential property to the east.
- 2.4. It is proposed to connect to the public water and wastewater mains. A total of five car parking spaces are to be provided within the northern part of the site.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority decided to refuse to grant permission, by Order dated the 28th of May 2024, for 3 no. reasons:

- 1. The proposed development would have a significant visual impact on the existing streetscape of Boherbee as the proposed shopfront does not comply with the provisions of the Kerry County Council 'Shopfront Design Guidelines' (2018). The proposal would set an undesirable precedent for similar such development. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*
- 2. The absence of a northern facing street front elevation and the extent of the setback from John Joe Sheehy Road as part of the proposed development, would have a significant negative visual impact and would set an undesirable precedent for similar such development at a location where a new mixed use urban streetscape is required as per the current Town Plan. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*
- 3. The proposed development would result in piecemeal and haphazard development of the Opportunity site within which it is located and would be contrary to the provisions of the current Town Plan which requires a coordinated approach to development due to multi-ownership. The proposed development is considered to be premature pending the development of a new Town Plan and a Masterplan for the redevelopment of the overall Opportunity Site.*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

Planning Report

There is 1 no. area planner (AP) report on file which assessed the development in terms of the principle, traffic, effluent disposal, residential amenity and visual impact. The AP report considered there was no likely potential for significant effects to Natura 2000 sites and that Appropriate Assessment (AA) was not required. The AP also

considered that the proposal was not one which required Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) as no likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development were noted. The AP recommended a refusal of permission which was endorsed by the Senior Executive Planner.

Other Technical Reports

None according to file.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None according to file.

3.4. Third Party Observations

There were a total of 2 no. third party observations which raised concerns with the submitted drawings, overlooking, impact on daylight, the 10 metre height of the apartments and the impact of the development on the structural integrity of the boundary wall.

4.0 Relevant Planning History

PA ref. 18/263 (site approximately 160 metres west)

Permission was refused by the planning authority for a 3-storey mixed-use development. The reasons for refusal related to concerns regarding parking standards and negative impact on adjoining properties in terms of overshadowing of private rear garden spaces. It was also considered that the development would compromise the development potential of adjoining lands.

PA ref. 16/1164 (site approximately 110 metres west)

Permission was refused by the planning authority for 8 no. apartments for a number of reasons including concerns that the development would comprise the development potential of adjoining lands.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Kerry County Development Plan 2022-2028

Volume 2

Appendix 1 - Tralee Town Development Plan

1.4.3.4 John Joe Sheehy Road

It is an objective of the Council to:

TR 40: Prepare a masterplan to guide and facilitate the regeneration and development of the John Joe Sheehy Road area in a co-ordinated manner to provide a new residential urban quarter that prioritises walking, cycling and permeability between Boherbee, the Listowel Road and the Town Centre maximising the existing public transport hub, planned cycleways and new civic spaces.

1.5.1 Opportunity Sites

John Joe Sheehy Road – Zoned M1 and measuring 3.5 hectares. Development potential for a new mixed-use urban streetscape providing residential and commercial use. A coordinated approach is required due to multi ownership.

It is an Objective of the Council to:

TR 41: Facilitate and/or require the preparation of masterplans for the Opportunity sites and the Lohercannon Area where appropriate prior to redevelopment of opportunity sites identified in the plan to ensure their development in a cohesive and integrated manner.

Volume 1

It is an objective of the Council to:

KCDP 3-5: Strengthen the social and economic structure of rural towns and villages by supporting the re-use of existing buildings and the regeneration of under-utilised buildings and lands.

KCDP 4-1: Support and facilitate the objectives and actions in Housing for All (HfA) to regenerate towns and villages, to tackle dereliction, vacancy, to deliver site assembly opportunities and to promote the sustainable development of land to achieve compact

growth and increased population in these centres and to engage with the Land Development Agency (LDA), where appropriate, in the identification, planning and co-ordination of strategic, publicly owned land banks to achieve compact growth, sustainable development, and urban regeneration.

KCDP 4-2: Facilitate and support the sustainable development of towns and villages of sufficient scale and quality to be drivers of growth, investment, and prosperity.

KCDP 4-27: Prioritise the regeneration of underused town centre and brownfield / infill lands in order to achieve the sustainable delivery of new housing within the existing urban footprint of settlements in the County.

KCDP 4-29: Support the re-use of existing vacant buildings within town/village centres for various uses including co-working facilities.

KCDP 4-31: Promote the development of vacant residential and regeneration sites in all development centres in the County, as appropriate, in accordance with the provisions of Housing for All – A New Housing Plan for Ireland.

KCDP 4-58: Encourage sustainable large-scale convenience and comparison retail development in the County to be principally focused at appropriate locations in the Town Centres of the Key towns of Tralee and Killarney in line with the Retail Planning Guidelines for Planning Authorities and associated Retail Design Manual (2012).

Volume 6

Appendix 1 Development Management Standards & Guidelines

Section 1.5 Residential Development

- 1.5.5 Apartment Standards

Kerry County Council Shopfront Design Guidelines (2018)

5.2. National Policy

- Project Ireland 2040 – National Planning Framework (2018) and National Development Plan 2021-2030
- Climate Action Plan (CAP) 2025 / CAP 2024

Climate Action Plan 2025 builds upon last year's Plan by refining and updating the measures and actions required to deliver the carbon budgets and sectoral emissions ceilings and it should be read in conjunction with Climate Action Plan 2024.

5.3. National Guidelines

- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)
- Sustainable Urban Housing Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2023)

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

The subject site is not located within any designated site. The nearest designated sites are Tralee Bay Complex Special Protection Area (SPA) (Site Code 004188) and Tralee Bay and Magharees Peninsula, West to Cloghane Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (Site Code 002070) which are located approximately 1.8km southwest of the subject site. This is also designated as a proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA). The Ballyseedy Wood SAC (Site Code 002112) is located approximately 2.1km southeast of the subject site.

5.5. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, to the established urban nature of the receiving environment, to the nature, extent, characteristics and likely duration of potential impacts, and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations, it is considered that the proposed development is not likely to have significant effects on the environment. The need for EIA can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required. I refer the Board to Appendix 1 regarding this preliminary examination.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first-party appeal was lodged to the Board on 19th June 2024. The grounds of appeal are summarised as follows:

- The council has not taken any proactive steps to bring about the development of a masterplan for the opportunity site, used its CPO powers or arranged a meeting with existing landowners. There is no interest from the market to develop the opportunity site and it is in deteriorating condition. It is not realistic for a masterplan or a new Tralee Town Development Plan coming through in a reasonable and relevant timeframe.
- The proposals are strongly supported by the National Planning Framework in terms of compact development in urban and brownfield sites. This is reflected in the Core Strategy of the Kerry County Development Plan 2022-2028.
- In response to the Shopfront Design Guidelines the design has been revisited and the proportions changed to better harmonise with those of its neighbour. Revised drawings have been submitted.
- The site has been underused for many years and the proposals will help meet an urgent housing need in accordance with the NPF and Housing for All.
- In response to the first reason for refusal in terms of negative visual impact, a revised design of the shopfront is submitted which matches the proportions of the shop front elements nearby. Revised drawings and a photomontage have been provided.
- In response to the second reason for refusal in terms of its setback from John Joe Sheehy Road, it is considered that the development sits well back from the road which is essential for privacy and noise reduction for the new residents. The set back is similar to that already existing with other properties along the road.
- In response to the third reason for refusal in terms of piecemeal and haphazard development, the ambition to development site comprehensively is understood,

however, in reality, no concrete steps have been taken to bring the envisaged masterplan forward, and a replacement Town Plan is several years away.

- It is requested that the Board allows this appeal.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

The PA did not issue a response to the grounds of appeal.

6.3. Observations

An observation from Nuala and David O'Brien was received by the Board on 15th July 2024. The issues raised are summarised as follows:

- The decision of the PA is fully endorsed and supported and the reasons for refusal were premised on a robust and justified planning and development assessment. It is respectfully requested that the Board refuses permission for the development.
- The proposed development does not comply with the provisions of Kerry County Council's 'Shopfront Design Guidelines' (2018) and would set an undesirable precedent in the town. The revised shopfront does not have any signage for the retail store which should form an integral part of a shopfront. No details of the materials on the shopfront are provided and there is no information on the lettering.
- The proposal, by reason of its scale, massing and height, will result in an unacceptable pattern of development on this small, restricted site. There is an established building line along John Sheehy Road and the set back of the development is a significant difference in the building line which will give rise to a significant negative visual impact on the location and would set an undesirable precedent.
- The increase of the height of the building to 3-storeys is a significant increase from the current 1-2 storey developments within the vicinity.
- The proposed walkway at first floor level may lead to direct overlooking into the rear garden and no details regarding its illumination at night time have been provided.

- There are noise and general disturbance concerns regarding the use of the courtyard and pathway, the parking of cars and deliveries and the use of the rear storage area.
- The proposal represents haphazard development on an identified opportunity site.
- The apartment units do not comply with the minimum storage space requirements or the minimum floor areas for private amenity space and communal amenity space. This is a poor standard of accommodation for future residents. The bedroom aggregate floor areas are only slightly above the minimum standard.
- The dimensions of the parking spaces do not meet the standards set out in the development plan. There is also concern with a conflict of these spaces with delivery drivers.
- There is potential for conflict between the proposed ground floor and first floor uses. No information on the end user of the commercial unit is provided. The floor plans indicate 25 pallet areas, numerous shelving units and a delivery area and suggests that the retail store will be for the sale and storage of bulkier goods which would have a significant impact on adjoining residential amenity.
- No information has been provided regarding the proposed operational hours.
- There are traffic safety concerns if residents or delivery vehicles are forced to wait on the public road in order to allow vehicles leave the site. A construction management plan should have been submitted.
- The provision of 4 car parking spaces is inadequate and it is not stated whether they are for the residents or the retail store. Permission should be refused on road and traffic safety concerns.
- There is a lack of information regarding the party boundary wall and there is a chance that it could be impacted by any future construction works.

7.0 Assessment

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

- Compliance with Tralee Town Development Plan
- Visual Impact
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic Safety

Compliance with Tralee Town Development Plan

7.2. The subject site is zoned 'M1 Mixed Use, General Development, Opportunity Site' and forms part of both the John Joe Sheehy Road Masterplan Area and John Joe Sheehy Road Opportunity Site (OS), as designated within the Tralee Town Development Plan (TTDP). Section 1.4.3.4 of the TTDP states that this OS offers a significant opportunity for regeneration and residential development with a number of vacant derelict buildings and sizeable linear lands, if combined, offering significant potential for development. It is acknowledged that the fragmented pattern of landownership in the area makes the co-ordinated development of the area challenging, however, in order to maximise the potential of these undeveloped and brownfield lands the preparation and adoption of a detailed masterplan is considered essential. I note that this is reflected in objectives TR 40 (John Joe Sheehy Road) and TR 41 (Opportunity Sites) of the TTDP.

7.3. The PA's third reason for refusal related to the development of the site being contrary to the required co-ordinated approach to development of the OS and to its prematurity pending the development of a masterplan. In response, I note that the applicant has questioned the timeframe and commitment of the Council in developing said masterplan.

7.4. Having inspected the site, I noted that the properties between Boherbee and John Joe Sheehy Road all comprise of long linear plots. I also note that there have been a

number of previous refusals on plots to the west of the subject site on grounds of the developments potentially compromising the development potential of adjoining plots. The Board should note that I have significant concerns with the approach to the development of this site. The TTDP clearly sets out that the development of the John Sheehy Masterplan area and OS shall be carried out in a cohesive, integrated and coordinated manner. Whilst I acknowledge the applicant's comments that a masterplan has not been developed to date, it is my view that the development of the site in isolation and in the absence of a masterplan would represent piecemeal development which would be contrary to objectives TR 40 and TR 41 of the TTDP. Therefore, it is my recommendation to the Board that the PA's reason for refusal should be upheld.

Visual Impact

- 7.5. I note that the PA had concerns with two elements of the proposed development in terms of negative visual impact; (a) the design of the shopfront fronting Boherbee, and (b) the set back of the development from John Joe Sheehy Road.

Boherbee Shopfront

- 7.6. The Board should note that the applicant has submitted revised designs of the shopfront in response to this reason for refusal. Having reviewed the PA report on file I note that it did not explain how the design does not conform with Kerry County Council's Shopfront Design Guidelines 2018. It should be noted that the subject site is not located within an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). I have reviewed the revised design provided by the applicant and I am satisfied with the proposed contemporary design of said shopfront. I note the concerns of the observer regarding the absence of signage, however, I am satisfied that such signage/lettering could be conditioned to be agreed with the PA prior to commencement of the development, if the Board are minded to grant permission.

John Joe Sheehy Road

- 7.7. Having inspected the site, I noted that the frontage along John Joe Sheehy Road comprises of some commercial units providing frontage along the road with other plots comprising of structures set back from the public road. I am not in agreement with the observation in that there is an established building line and it is my view that some sort of flexibility should be applied in order for the development to be able to provide car

parking/deliveries within the site. Notwithstanding this, the Board should note that this does not alter my fundamental issue with the development in that it represents piecemeal development that is contrary to objectives TR 40 and TR 41.

Residential Amenity

- 7.8. The Board should note that the observation has also raised a number of concerns with regards to the impact of the development on residential amenity in terms of overlooking from the first floor walkway, loss of light, noise and general disturbance.

Overlooking

- 7.9. With regards to overlooking, I note that the submitted side elevation drawing states that the first floor boundary wall is designed to allow for privacy from overlooking to the property to the east. I have measured the height of the wall as c. 1.8 metres on the submitted Section A-A drawing, and c. 1.2 metres to the void openings. I note that no information is provided by the applicant that explains how this design would prevent views through the 1.2 metre high voids into the adjoining property to the east. Therefore, I am in agreement with the observation that there would be potential for overlooking of the neighbouring garden and property to the east. However, having regard to the other substantive reason for refusal the Board may not wish to pursue this matter.

Loss of Light

- 7.10. The observation also raises concerns with potential loss of light to the adjoining property to the east. I note that the BRE 2022 Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, A Guide to Good Practice states that for gardens or amenity areas to appear adequately sunlit throughout the year, at least half of a garden or amenity area should receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21st March. Having regard to the location of the development to the west of the observer's property, I consider that this is achievable and, therefore, it is my view that the proposed development will not result in a significant adverse impact on adjoining residential amenity in terms of loss of light.

Noise and General Disturbance

- 7.11. The Board should note that no information has been provided in relation to the intended user of the shop, the intended hours of operation and associated delivery hours. I consider the application to be deficient in the absence of this information.

Notwithstanding this, having regard to my other substantive reason for refusal set out below, I do not consider it necessary to pursue this matter.

Amenity of apartment users

- 7.12. I note the observer's concerns that the apartment units represent a poor standard of accommodation for future occupants. Having reviewed the submitted plans, I note that the design does not accommodate any private or communal amenity space. I also note that all the windows proposed are single aspect facing an internal courtyard. Notwithstanding that the minimum floor areas meet the minimum requirements set out in the Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2023, I am in agreement with the observation that the design and layout of the apartment units are substandard. However, again, having regard to my other substantive reason for refusal set out below, I do not consider it necessary to pursue this matter.

Traffic Safety

- 7.13. The Board should note that the observation has also raised concerns with the proposed development in terms of traffic safety. I note that the submitted drawings do not indicate any space for a turning area for the delivery vehicles. Furthermore, the application does not specify the type of delivery vehicles that will enter and exit the site. It is my view that inadequate information has been provided by the applicant in this regard. However, again the Board should note that having regard to the other substantive reason for refusal set out below, it is my view that it is not necessary to pursue this matter.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening

- 8.1. I have considered the project in light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The subject site is located approximately 1.8km from Tralee Bay Complex SPA (Site Code 004188) and Tralee Bay and Magharees Peninsula, West to Cloghane SAC (Site Code 002070) and approximately 2.1km from Ballyseedy Wood SAC (Site Code 002112). The proposed development comprises demolition and construction works within the urban area of Tralee. No nature conservation concerns were raised by the PA as part of the application or observations in the planning appeal.

8.2. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- To the location of the proposed development within a built-up urban area and to the built-up nature of the surrounding area.
- To the distance from the nearest European sites regarding any other potential ecological pathways and intervening lands.
- Taking into account the screening determination by the PA.

8.3. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European site, either alone or in-combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and, therefore, AA under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, is not required.

9.0 Recommendation

It is my recommendation to the Board that permission should be **Refused** for the reasons and considerations set out below.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the location of the proposed development within an area designated as an opportunity site (John Joe Sheehy Road) and masterplan area, within the Tralee Town Development Plan (Volume 2) of the Kerry County Development Plan 2022-2028, and in the absence of said masterplan for the opportunity site, it is considered that the proposed development of the site in isolation would represent piecemeal development which would be contrary to objectives TR 40 (John Joe Sheehy Road Masterplan Area) and TR 41 (Opportunity Sites) of the Tralee Town Development Plan which seek to develop the subject lands in a coordinated, cohesive and coordinated manner. It is, therefore, considered that the proposed development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Declaration

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.

Gary Farrelly
Planning Inspector

13th May 2025

Appendix 1

(a) Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-319956-24			
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of building and construction of 3 apartments with ground-floor retail/storage, together with all associated site works.			
Development Address	Boherbee, Tralee, County Kerry			
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	X
			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)?				
Yes	X	Part 2: 10(b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units 10(b)(iv) Urban Development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere.		Proceed to Q.3
No				No further action required
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?				
Yes				EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	X			Proceed to Q.4

4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development relates to a development within the urban area that measures 0.069 hectares and comprises the construction of 3 no. dwelling units. 	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?			
No	X	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q4)	
Yes		Screening Determination required	

(b) Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

The Board carries out a preliminary examination [Ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)] of, at least, the nature, size or location of the proposed development having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations. This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	<p>The development site measures 0.069 hectares. The size of the development is not exceptional in the context of the existing environment.</p> <p>There is no real likelihood of significant cumulative effects with existing and permitted projects in the area.</p>
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of	<p>The site is located within an established urban area. It is considered that the proposed mixed use development would not introduce any new or greater impacts to existing or surrounding land uses.</p> <p>The subject site is not located within any designated site and is located approximately 1.8km from the Tralee Bay Complex Special Protection Area (SPA) (Site Code 004188) and Tralee Bay and Magharees Peninsula, West to Cloghane Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (Site Code 002070) and approximately 2.1km from the Ballyseedy Wood SAC (Site Code 002112). My appropriate assessment screening under Section 8 of this report determined that the proposed</p>

historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	development would not likely result in a significant effect on any European Site. The subject site is located outside Flood Zones A and B for coastal or fluvial flooding.	
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	Having regard to the type and characteristics of the proposed development which would be consistent with the existing urban environment, to its location removed from any environmentally sensitive sites and to the fact that there would be no significant cumulative considerations with regards to existing and permitted developments in the area, there is no potential for significant effects on the environment.	
Conclusion		
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA	
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.	X
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment	Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.	
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIAR required.	