



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-320162-24

<b>Development</b>	Construction of extension & attic conversion on an early years & family support centre, widening of vehicular entrance & associated site works.
<b>Location</b>	Barnardos, 14 Tivoli Terrace South, Dun Laoghaire, Co. Dublin, A96 Y008
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	D23A/0671
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Bernardos
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant permission
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Turlough Carolan
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	17 <sup>th</sup> February 2025
<b>Inspector</b>	Bernadette Quinn

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The appeal site is located on Tivoli Terrace South at its junction with Tivoli Terrace East. The site contains an end of terrace two storey over basement dwelling fronting on to Tivoli Terrace South and with its eastern side elevation facing Tivoli Terrace East. There is a single storey over basement hipped roof extension to the rear. The area is predominantly residential in character. The appeal site has a stated area of 0.044 ha and contains an existing early years and family support centre. There is vehicular access off Tivoli Terrace South and car parking within the front garden. To the rear is an area of private open space which is surrounded by block walls. Surrounding properties, including the adjoining properties to the west within the terrace are in residential use and there is a car sales outlet adjoining the southern boundary.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the construction of a two storey rear extension, attic conversion, widening of vehicular entrance, and all associated site works at an existing preschool and family support centre.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Decision**

- 3.2. By order dated 17<sup>th</sup> June 2024, Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council issued notification of the decision to grant planning permission subject to 7.

### **3.3. Planning Authority Reports**

#### **3.3.1. Planning Reports**

The planners report dated 13/12/2023 can be summarised as follows:

- A childcare facility is permitted in principle on 'A' zoned lands.
- The building is of vernacular and heritage interest and consideration of Policy Objective HER20 is relevant.

- The proposed hipped roof ridge will sit at a lower level than the ridge height of the main part of the dwelling which is considered acceptable.
- A replacement rear extension should replicate the centred design element of the adjacent dwellings in the terrace. Further information is required to provide revised plans.
- The proposed roof alterations comprising conversion of the attic space and installation of 5 no. roof windows on the front roof plane and addition of an intersecting overlaid hip roof to the existing pitched roof are considered acceptable.
- Further information is required to clarify if the proposed development will facilitate an increase in the capacity of the facility as any such increase could result in impacts upon neighbouring residential amenity and traffic.
- There are concerns that the proposed extension will result in overbearance and overshadowing impacts to No. 13 Tivoli Terrace South, further information is required in this regard.
- Further information is required in relation to provision of adequate cycle parking facilities.

Following receipt of further information, the planning officers report dated 17/06/2024 can be summarised as follows:

- Revised plans show the proposed rear extension shall not extend to the west of the existing rear return and demonstrate a reduction in building bulk and mass and the retention of the extensions centred position to the rear which is considered commensurate to the built form of the rear elevations of other dwellings in the terrace and is acceptable.
- The proposed works will not result in an increased intensity of use.
- The revised rear extension shows a flat roof which does not appear to be consistent with the revised Attic Floor View Plan. It is recommended that a condition be included stipulating that the roof of the rear extension is to comprise a hipped roof design.

- It is considered that the proposal would not adversely impact on the residential amenity of adjacent properties by reason of overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing appearance and would not significantly detract from the character of the surrounding area.

### 3.3.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Planning: No objection subject to condition.

Transportation Planning: Following a request for further information in relation to cycle parking, no objection subject to conditions.

Environmental Health Officer: No objection subject to condition.

### 3.3.3. Conditions

Condition 2: The roof of the rear extension element shall comprise an adjoining hipped roof profile, as indicated on submitted revised drawing: Attic Floor Plan View Plan TT-15 modified by way of further information. REASON: In the interest of orderly development.

### 3.4. Prescribed Bodies

None received.

### 3.5. Third Party Observations

10 no. third party observations were received objecting to the proposed development. The grounds of objection raised include impacts on residential amenity, negative visual impacts, traffic impacts, heritage impacts, impacts on property values, establishment of undesirable precedent, building was not designed as a childcare facility, and lack of consultation with neighbours.

## 4.0 Planning History

Appeal Site

232/87: Permission granted for change of use to children's day nursery.

358/88: Permission granted for demolition and reconstruction of rear extension.

Adjoining property to west:

D05B/0733: Retention permission granted for demolition of existing extension and construction of a new two storey extension over basement to rear.

## **5.0 Policy Context**

### **5.1. Development Plan**

- 5.1.1. The Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan, 2022-2028 is the statutory development plan for the area. The site is zoned Objective 'A' residential with the objective to: "provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities" under which 'Childcare Service' is listed within the 'Permitted in Principle' category of this zoning objective where the use will not have adverse effects on the 'A' zoning objective.
- 5.1.2. In Chapter 4 Policy Objective PHP6: Childcare Facilities states that it is a Policy Objective to encourage the provision of appropriate childcare facilities as an integral part of proposals for new residential developments and to improve/expand existing childcare facilities across the County. Encourage the provision of childcare facilities in a sustainable manner to encourage local economic development and to assist in addressing disadvantage. Policy PHP20: Protection of Existing Residential Amenity states that it is a Policy Objective to ensure the residential amenity of existing homes in the Built Up Area is protected where they are adjacent to proposed higher density and greater height infill developments.
- 5.1.3. In Chapter 11 Policy Objective HER20 relates to retention of and repairs to buildings of vernacular and heritage interest. Policy Objective HER21: Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Buildings, Estates and Features relates to the appropriate development of exemplar nineteenth and twentieth century buildings.
- 5.1.4. In Chapter 12 Development Management, Section 12.3.2.4 outlines considerations which the planning authority will have regard to in assessing applications for childcare facilities. Considerations include Safe access and convenient off-street car parking and/or suitable drop-off and collection points for customers and staff; Applications for childcare facilities in existing residential areas will be treated on their

merits, having regard to the likely effect on the amenities of adjoining properties, and compliance with the above criteria.

- 5.1.5. Section 12.2.7.1 relates to extensions to dwellings and outlines that first floor rear extensions noting that they can have potential for negative impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties. Factors for consideration will include Overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking - along with proximity, height, and length along mutual boundaries; Remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability; Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries; External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing.
- 5.1.6. Table 12.5 outlines car parking zones and standards with a requirement for childcare land use of 1 space per 60 in Zone 2.
- 5.1.7. Section 12.4.10 relates to parking and access for childcare facilities. General Specifications requires that vehicle entrances and exits shall be designed to avoid traffic hazard for pedestrians and passing traffic.

## **5.2. Ministerial Guidelines**

- 5.2.1. 'Childcare Facilities Guidelines for Planning Authorities' (2001)'.

In the interest of promoting sustainability the Guidelines advocate that suitable locations for the provision of childcare facilities include residential areas, employment nodes, large educational establishments, major towns/district/neighbourhood centres and areas convenient to public transport networks. Section 3.2 'Development Control' sets out criteria that should be applied. Section 3.3.1 'New and Existing Residential Areas' states that "Detached houses/sites or substantial semi-detached properties with space for off-street parking and/or suitable drop-off and collection points for customers and also space for an outdoor play area" are suitable sites for full day care facilities.

- 5.2.2. Circular PL 3/2016 issued in March 2016 by The Department of Environment, Community and Local Government states the following: "Planning Authorities are requested to exclude matters relating to childcare facility standards outlined in Appendix 1 of the Childcare Facilities Planning Guidelines 2001 – including the minimum floor area requirements per child – from their consideration of planning applications relating to childcare facilities and to solely focus on planning related

considerations that fall within the remit of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, in the determination of such planning applications”.

### **5.3. Natural Heritage Designations**

5.3.1. None in the vicinity of the site.

### **5.4. EIA Screening**

5.4.1. The development is not a class of development specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001. See Appendix 1 Form 1.

## **6.0 The Appeal**

### **6.1. Grounds of Appeal**

One third party appeal has been received from Turlough Carolan. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The proposal will negatively impact the residential and visual amenity of neighbouring properties and the surrounding area and is therefore contrary to the sites zoning objective which seeks to protect existing residential amenities.
- The revisions to the extension in response to the further information request, whilst setback from the shared boundary increase the depth of the two storey over basement element by 2.9m resulting in additional massing which will be overbearing and out of context for the site. Serious concerns remain regarding the scale and massing of the extension due to the proposed height and depth.
- The proposed extension is out of scale with the established scale in the surrounding area. An additional floor area of 58.76 sq.m. is considered substantial for a rear extension.
- Side elevations were not submitted which has not allowed for a full assessment of the scale of the proposal.

- Due to the scale, massing and layout there will be impacts on daylight access and overshadowing to neighbouring dwellings and associated private amenity space.
- The proposal fails to consider Section 12.3.1 and policy objective PHP20 of the development plan in relation to consideration of daylight access to, and amenity of, the neighbouring property.
- The proposal fails to comply with Section 12.3.7.1 of the development plan in relation to extensions to dwellings due to scale, massing with a height of 9.3m (excl. roof finish), a depth of 8.2m and width of 4.4m, resulting in potential impacts on overshadowing and visual impacts from perceived overbearing.
- The proposal does not comply with development plan guidance or the zoning objective.
- Visual impact arising from the overbearing nature and inconsistency with the architectural form of existing built form will result in impacts on the quality of the immediate residential environment and the public realm on Tivoli Terrace East and set a poor precedent.
- The proposal will result in overshadowing negatively impacting the usability and quality of the rear amenity space at No. 13 and will significantly impact daylight access and result in unacceptable levels of overshadowing.
- The increased floor area will result in a larger number of children on site resulting in increased noise. If permission is granted, a condition is requested to be included to limit the usage of the external amenity spaces.
- The proposed extension will result in the removal of 4 no. windows to the rear which are considered to have high architectural value and contribute to the structure's architectural heritage and fails to comply with Development Plan Policy Objective HER21 and guidance relating to the protection of the County's architectural heritage.
- There is precedent in the area for suitably scaled rear extensions.
- The proposal will negatively impact the property value and development capacity of no. 13.



## **6.2. Applicant Response**

None received.

## **6.3. Planning Authority Response**

A response from the planning authority states that the grounds of appeal do not raise any new matters which would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

## **6.4. Observations**

None received.

## **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 inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issue in this appeal are as follows:

- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Visual Impacts
- Principle of Development
- Other Issues

7.2. I note that the concerns raised in the appeal relate to the rear extension and that no concerns were raised in relation to the proposed internal alterations and widening of the vehicular entrance and that the planning authority was satisfied with this aspect of the development. I am satisfied that these aspects of the application are acceptable and that the main issue for consideration in the appeal is the proposed rear extension.

7.3. Permission was sought for a rear extension with a floor area of 74.94 sq.m which was proposed to extend the existing centred rear return to the west so that it would

adjoin the boundary with no. 13, and to provide for an additional floor above the existing and proposed rear extension. The planning authority requested further information relating to concerns that the proposed siting of the rear extension would result in overbearance and overshadowing impacts on no. 13 Tivoli Terrace South and would be inconsistent with the established centred rear return design features of the other period dwellings that comprise the Terrace. The applicant was also requested to revise the proposed bulk to minimise any potential overbearance and overshadowing impacts on the streetscape of Tivoli Terrace East.

- 7.4. In response to the further information request the proposed extension was revised to omit the proposed south westerly element of the extension and replace it with an extension with a 2.8m depth and 4.367m width on to the rear of the existing centred rear extension. The proposed first floor extension was revised to align with the existing and proposed basement and ground floor extension.
- 7.5. The existing rear extension extends approximately 5.3 m from the main rear façade and has a width of approximately 4.4m. The proposed extension will extend a further 2.6m beyond the existing extension and will extend over two floors above basement. The overall extension will extend approx. 8 m from the rear main façade and will include the addition of a new floor above the ground floor level. The proposed extension will be set back approximately 3.1m from the western shared boundary with no.13 and 3.5m from the eastern boundary which adjoins Tivoli Terrace East. The eaves height of the proposed extension will be approximately 0.5m below the eaves height of the existing building and a hipped roof is proposed.

### **Impact on Residential Amenity**

- 7.6. The appeal raises concerns in relation to residential and visual amenity impacts arising from the proposed extension as a result of the scale, massing and design proposed which the third party consider will give rise to overbearing impacts, overlooking, overshadowing and loss of daylight.
- 7.7. The existing structure on the appeal site is located at the end of a terrace of 4 similar structures which are relatively large period properties. The existing main building on the appeal site has a stated floor area of 294.32 sq.m., a ridge height of 11.95m and an eaves height of 9.8m. The proposed extension as amended in response to the further information request has an overall floor area of approximately 58 sq.m. and

an eaves height of 9.28m which is below the eaves height of the existing building. I consider the scale of the extension proposed is acceptable, noting the relatively large scale of the existing building on the site and the location of the proposed extension which is centred to the rear. I note the proposed extension will be set back 3.1m from the shared boundary with no. 13 and 3.5m from Tivoli Terrace East in line with the existing extension. I consider the proposed scale and massing is appropriate and in keeping with the existing development on the appeal site and I am satisfied that adequate distances from site boundaries are provided for and that the proposal will not give rise to unacceptable overbearing impacts when viewed from no. 13 to the west and Tivoli Terrace to the east.

- 7.8. In relation to concerns regarding overshadowing and loss of light, I note that the orientation of the site is east of the third party appellants property at no. 13 which has a south facing rear garden. I note the revised design submitted in response to the further information request provides for a separation between the proposed extension and the appellants property at no. 13 and while some additional overshadowing will likely occur in the morning hours, having regard to the scale and layout of the proposed extension I am satisfied that adjacent dwellings and amenity spaces will not be adversely affected by the proposal in terms of a loss of daylight or sunlight. I do not consider a technical assessment of daylight and sunlight is required in relation to the proposed development.
- 7.9. In relation to concerns regarding overlooking, I note that no windows are proposed on the west elevation facing the appellants property. Windows serving a staff canteen are proposed on the rear, south facing elevation facing the rear boundary wall, beyond which is a car sales outlet and which I consider will not give rise to overlooking into surrounding properties. In this regard I do not consider that overlooking from the proposed development would negatively impact the residential amenity of adjoining residences.
- 7.10. The third party raise concerns regarding the absence of drawings of the side elevations relating to the revised design submitted in response to the planning authority's further information request. Having reviewed the drawings submitted with the planning application and the further information response, I am satisfied that there is sufficient information on the file to carry out a full assessment. In the interests of clarity, I consider it appropriate that a condition be attached requiring

drawings be submitted to the planning authority for written agreement prior to commencement of development if the Board decides to grant permission. I note that a revised site layout plan was not submitted with the further information response. Having reviewed the drawings submitted and having inspected the site I am satisfied that sufficient rear amenity spaces will be retained to the rear of the property to serve the childcare facility.

- 7.11. The appeal refers to noise from the outdoor play area and raises concerns that the increased floor area has the potential to result in increased use of the outdoor area resulting in impacts on residential amenity. I note the appellant did not raise concerns in relation to existing noise levels or submit any quantifiable information in relation to noise. The report on file from the planning authority Environmental Health Officer considered the proposal acceptable and recommended a standard condition that the development be so operated to avoid noise nuisance. In relation to a request that a condition be attached to limit the usage of the rear amenity space to address concerns relating to noise, I note the stated operating hours of the preschool service are between 9am and 2pm, that the service provides for 21 part time places and that the proposal does not provide for any increase in numbers attending the childcare facility. I therefore do not consider it appropriate or necessary to attach a condition to limit the usage of the rear amenity space. If the Board decides to grant permission I consider it appropriate to attach a standard condition in relation to noise control.

### **Visual Impacts**

- 7.12. In relation to concerns regarding the visual impact, the proposed extension will be in line with the set back of the existing extension from the western site boundary with no. 13 and the eastern boundary facing Tivoli Terrace East. I note the surrounding pattern of development includes the terrace of two storey over basement dwellings which the appeal site forms part of, as well as semi-detached and detached dwellings in a variety of styles, and a commercial development (car sales) to the south. I consider the proposed extension will be visible from Tivoli Terrace East, however I note that it is set below the height of the existing structure, is set back from the site boundaries, is of a scale that is subservient to the existing building and that the scale, massing and height of the extension is in keeping with the existing pattern of development and would not appear overly dominant or incongruous in the streetscape so as to negatively affect the visual amenities or the character of the

area. I note that a number of other properties within the terrace which the appeal site forms part of contain rear extensions and I consider the design, which proposes rendered external walls is in keeping with the design of the existing extension on the appeal site and is acceptable.

- 7.13. In relation to concerns raised regarding the design of the proposed extension and impact on the protection of architectural heritage, as noted above I am satisfied that the design proposed is appropriate. I consider the removal of windows to the rear is acceptable, noting that the structure on the appeal site is not within an Architectural Conservation Area nor is it included on the record of protected structures or the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage and a precedent appears to have been set at no. 13 where a rear extension has been permitted and constructed and appears to have resulted in the removal of windows on the rear elevation. I do not consider the proposed development will compromise the character of the existing structure on the site or that it will detract from the established setting of the terrace of buildings within which it is located. Having regard to the above, I am satisfied that the proposal complies with Policy Objective HER21: Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Buildings, Estates and Features relates to the appropriate development of exemplar nineteenth and twentieth century buildings.

### **Principle of development**

- 7.14. The site is zoned Objective 'A' residential. Childcare service is a permitted in principle land use where the use will not have adverse effects on the 'A' zoning objective. I note that there is an existing permitted childcare facility on the site which is proposed to be extended and altered and that the proposal does not seek to increase numbers attending the service. The appeal raises concerns that the proposal will have adverse impacts on the residential and visual amenities of the area. Having regard to the zoning objective and to the assessment of residential and visual amenity above, I am satisfied that the principle of the development is acceptable and that the proposal would not result in unacceptable impacts on the visual and residential amenities of adjoining properties and is in accordance with the zoning objective.

## **Other Issues**

- 7.15. I note the concerns raised in the grounds of appeal in respect of the devaluation of neighbouring property due to a depreciation of residential amenity. Having regard to the assessment and conclusion set out above I am satisfied that the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area to such an extent that would adversely affect the value of property in the vicinity.
- 7.16. Noting the scale and extent of the proposed extension I do not consider the proposal will negatively impact the development capacity of the appellants property at no. 13.
- 7.17. In relation to development contributions, the planning officers report notes that the proposal is a registered charity and no contributions were applied. If the Board decides to grant permission I consider no conditions should be attached in relation to requirements for development contributions.

## **8.0 AA Screening**

- 8.1. I have considered the proposed development of an extension to an existing childcare facility and associated site works in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located approx. 1km from South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (site code IE0004024) and 1.2km from South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code IE0000210).

The proposed development comprises the development of an extension to an existing childcare facility and associated site works. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature and scale of the proposed development and associated site works.

- The location and distance from the nearest European sites and the lack of any hydrological connectivity between the application site and the SAC/SPA.
- Taking into account the screening determination by the Planning Authority.

I consider that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually, or in-combination with other plans and projects, on a European Site and appropriate assessment is therefore not required.

## **9.0 Recommendation**

9.1. I recommend that planning permission should be granted, subject to conditions.

## **10.0 Reasons and Considerations**

10.1. Having regard to the location and character of the site and surrounding area in a serviced urban area together with the provisions of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 including the 'A' zoning objective for the area and Policy Objective PHP6 relating to childcare facilities, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the scale and nature of the development would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenity of the area and would comply with the policies and provisions of the development plan and the Childcare Guidelines 2001; and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## **11.0 Conditions**

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of May 2024, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The roof of the rear extension element shall comprise an adjoining hipped roof profile, as indicated on submitted revised drawing: Proposed Attic Floor Plan View TT-15 modified by way of further information.

Reason: In the interest of orderly development.

3. Safe and secure bicycle parking spaces shall be provided within the site. Provision should be made for a mix of bicycle types including cargo bicycles. Details of the layout and marking demarcation of these spaces shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: To ensure that adequate bicycle parking provision is available to serve the proposed development, in the interest of sustainable transportation.

4. Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

5. During the operational phase of the proposed development the noise level shall not exceed (a) 55 dB(A) rated sound level between the hours of 0700 to 2300, and (b) 45 dB(A) 15min and 60 dB LAfmax, 15min at all other times, (corrected for a tonal or impulsive component) as measured at the nearest dwelling. Procedures for the purpose of determining compliance with this limit shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: To protect the residential amenities of property in the vicinity of the site

6. The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, management measures for



noise, dust and dirt, construction traffic management proposals and off-site disposal of construction waste.

Reason: In the interests of public safety and residential amenity.

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

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of property in the vicinity

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.

---

Bernadette Quinn  
Planning Inspector

04<sup>th</sup> March 2025

# Form 1

## EIA Pre-Screening

<b>An Bord Pleanála</b> <b>Case Reference</b>	ABP-320162-24		
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Construction of extension and attic conversion on an early years and family support centre, widening of vehicular entrance and all associated site works.		
<b>Development Address</b>	Barnardos, 14 Tivoli Terrace South, Dun Laoghaire, Co. Dublin, A96 Y008		
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b> (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		<b>Yes</b> <b>X</b>	Tick if relevant and proceed to Q2.
		<b>No</b>	Tick if relevant. No further action required
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>			
<b>Yes</b>		State the Class here.	Proceed to Q3.
<b>No</b>	X		Tick if relevant. No further action required
<b>3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?</b>			
<b>Yes</b>		State the relevant threshold here for the Class of development.	EIA Mandatory EIAR required

<b>No</b>	X		Proceed to Q4
<b>4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?</b>			
<b>Yes</b>			Preliminary examination required (Form 2)

<b>5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?</b>		
<b>No</b>	X	<b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q4)</b>
<b>Yes</b>		<b>Screening Determination required</b>

**Inspector:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_