



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-322181-25

Development	Protected Structure: Alterations to railings and granite wall, new vehicular entrance and gate pier with associated works.
Location	18 Sydney Avenue, Blackrock, Co. Dublin, A94 NP73
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D25A/0022/WEB
Applicant(s)	Ursula McMahon & Sam Sengupta
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Ursula McMahon & Sam Sengupta
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	1 July 2025
Inspector	Natalie de Róiste

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	5
6.0 The Appeal	11
7.0 Assessment.....	13
8.0 AA Screening.....	16
9.0 Recommendation.....	17
10.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	17
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site, 18 Sydney Avenue (a protected structure), is located on the corner of Sydney Avenue and Green Road. It contains a three-bay two-storey end-of-terrace Georgian house, with a front and rear garden. To the front, there is a rendered plinth wall with granite coping and cast-iron railings, the latter largely obscured by hedging. There is a central matching pedestrian gate. There is a pedestrian gate to the rear garden of 18 Sydney Avenue, from Green Road.
- 1.2. The site has been subdivided, and the former mews house has been extended to provide a new house, 1a Green Road. The site is bordered to the west by 20 Sydney Avenue.
- 1.3. There is on-street permit parking to the front of the site, and to Green Road and to Sydney Avenue generally.
- 1.4. The site is 10 minutes' walk to Frascati Shopping Centre and Blackrock village, and c. 15 minutes' walk to Blackrock Dart Station.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. It is proposed to provide:
 - a new vehicular entrance of 2.6 metres width, by removing a stretch of the existing railings and constructing a new gate pier to match the existing, and providing matching double-leaf gates.
 - hard landscaping to provide parking for a single car.
 - A new electric vehicle charging point, surface mounted to the front wall of the house.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Refused, for the following reason:

1. The subject site is located within an 'Urban Neighbourhood' as defined in the 'Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements: Guidelines for Planning Authorities', where it is a Specific Planning Policy Requirement of the Guidelines to minimise, substantially reduce or wholly eliminate car-parking provision as detailed in SPPR 3 of the Guidelines. Having regard to (i) the proximity of the site to Blackrock Village, (ii) the proximity of the site to high quality public transport services including DART and bus services (iii) the existing on street parking spaces on Sydney Avenue and (iv) the rationale and justification submitted in support of the proposed car parking space, the Planning Authority is not satisfied that the need for a car parking space at this location has been adequately justified in accordance with the provisions of SPPR 3 of the Guidelines and Sections 5.5 and 5.6 of the Dun LaoghaireRathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028. Therefore, to permit the proposed development would be contrary to the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements: Guidelines for Planning Authorities and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

Planner's report dated 3 March 2025 raised the following issues:

- Zoning, departmental reports, and policy noted, including policy on electric vehicles.
- Provision of a vehicular access is not inconsistent with character of ACA, report from conservation department noted. No undue visual impact.
- Location and proximity to services and transport noted.
- Strong justification for the provision of an off-street space in this location has not been provided, as required by SPPR 3 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines, particularly given the loss of at least one on-street parking space.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Conservation department – precedent noted – no 20, 22, and 24 Sydney Avenue – no heritage objections

- Transportation Planning department – Ministerial Guidelines on Compact Settlement noted, in particular SPPR 3, which notes car parking should be minimised, substantially reduced, or wholly eliminated. Section 5.5 and Section 5.6 of Development Plan encourage a shift to more sustainable modes of transport. The proposed development is in close walking distance to shops and public transport. The development is not consistent with the policies and guidance mentioned, and should be refused.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No reports.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None on file.

4.0 Planning History

D19A/0549 – Permission was granted for extensions to existing house.

D08A/0049 – Permission granted for alterations and extensions to mews to rear of 18 Sydney Avenue, and new vehicular entrance and car parking space off Green Road.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-28

- 5.1.1. The Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022–2028 (CDP), categorises the site as zoning objective ‘A’, which seeks *‘to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities’*.
- 5.1.2. The appeal site is a protected structure (ref 304), as are the majority of houses on Sydney Avenue. The site lies within the Sydney Avenue Architectural Conservation Area (ACA).
- 5.1.3. Chapter 3 Climate Action contains the following:

Policy Objective CA17: Electric Vehicles

It is a Policy Objective to support, the Government's Electric Transport Programme by progressively electrifying our mobility systems by facilitating the rollout of Electric Powered Vehicle Recharging Parking Bays across the County and on public roads and other suitable location. The provision of e-bike chargers will be supported subject to the availability of Funding. (Consistent with NSO 4 of the NPF and RPO 7.42 of RSES)

Chapter 5: Transport and Mobility

Policy Objective T19: Carparking Standards It is a Policy Objective to manage carparking as part of the overall strategic transport needs of the County in accordance with the parking standards set out in Section 12.4.5.

This section (Section 5.7.4) continues to state that the council will provide for the short-term and long-term parking needs of local residents, rather than long-term commuter parking requirements.

- 5.1.4. Chapter 11: Heritage and Conservation provides guidance on heritage through protection, management, sensitive enhancement, or appropriate repurposing. Relevant sections include:

Policy Objective HER8: Work to Protected Structures

Policy Objective HER13: Architectural Conservation Areas

- 5.1.5. Chapter 12: Development Management provides guidance on standards to be applied to proposed developments. Relevant sections of this chapter include:

- 5.1.6. *Section 12.4.5 Car Parking Standards*

- 5.1.7. This section sets standards for car parking for new residential developments.

- 5.1.8. *Section 12.4.8 Vehicular Entrances and Hardstanding Areas.* Of particular relevance are the following:

12.4.8.4: ACAs/Protected Structures - Boundary features such as walls, railings and gardens contribute to character and setting of Protected Structures and those areas which have been identified as ACAs and cACAs. Poorly designed off-street parking which involves the removal of boundary walls, gate piers, railings and gates can have an effect on the setting and appreciation of the building, groups of buildings

and the wider streetscape and will not generally be permitted. In areas characterised predominately by pedestrian entrances, new or widened vehicular entrances will be resisted. Where existing rear site vehicular access exists or can be easily provided, off-street parking to the front will generally not be permitted. All proposals for off-street parking will be considered on a case-by-case basis and should:

- Minimise loss of original boundary treatment.*
- Retain a significant amount of soft landscaping and planting to reduce the visual impact of the parked car. The vehicular entrance and hardstanding area should not dominate a property's forecourt or result in the loss of traditional finishes such as granite setts and flags.*
- Provide surface treatments of a high quality using traditional materials compatible with the surrounding context. Bituminous and concrete surfacing are not acceptable.*
- Where favourable site conditions exist minimum intervention, integration and reuse of materials will be the key considerations.*

All other criteria for car parking within Section 12.4.8 shall also apply to parking within ACAs/ Protected Structures.

5.1.9. Section 12.4.8.5 Financial Contributions

5.1.10. *The loss of on street car parking to provide for vehicular entrances shall be considered having regard to overall parking in the general area. Where an existing on-street car parking space requires removal to facilitate a new or widened vehicular entrance, and cannot be conveniently relocated within the public domain, then a financial contribution will be required in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Transportation Section and Water Services Department. Likewise, where a tree, located on-street, requires removal to facilitate a new or widened vehicular entrance and cannot be conveniently relocated within the public domain then a financial contribution will be required in lieu.*

5.1.11. *Section 12.4.11 Electrically Operated Vehicles addresses the provision of EV charging points and infrastructure. This notes 'when detailed Guidance for EV vehicles which is currently in preparation by DLR in association with the other Dublin local authorities becomes available it shall replace the above standards.'*

5.1.12. *Section 12.11 – Heritage* includes guidance for assessing applications for works to a protected structure, having regard to national guidance.

5.2. **Regional Guidance**

5.2.1. **Dublin Local Authority Electric Vehicle Charging Strategy (2022-30)**

5.2.2. This strategy has been prepared by the four Dublin local authorities as a coordinated approach to deploying EV charging infrastructure in order to support and accelerate the transition to electric vehicles as set out in the Climate Action Plan.

5.2.3. The key focus of this strategy is neighbourhood charging (charging near to the driver's house, typically overnight, by residents without off-street parking), with the delivery of infrastructure led by the council. Residential charging hubs, en-route charging, and destination charging are also a focus of the strategy as councils may play a role in their delivery. Home charging by residents with off-street parking is not a focus of the strategy.

5.3. **Relevant National Guidance**

5.3.1. **Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht 2011).**

Chapter 13 deals with works in the curtilage and attendant grounds of a relevant structure, with specific sections on boundary features, basement areas, hard landscaping, gardens, and car parking.

5.3.2. **Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2019)**

Section 4.4.9 On-Street Parking and Loading

On-street parking, when well designed can:

- *Calm traffic by increasing driver caution, visually narrow the carriageway and reduce forward visibility.*
- *Add to the vitality of communities by supporting retail/commercial activities that front on to streets through the generation of pedestrian activity as people come and go from their vehicles.*

- *Contribute to pedestrian/cyclist comfort by providing a buffer between the vehicular carriageway and foot/cycle path.*
- *Reduce the need or temptation for drivers to kerb mount and block foot/cycle paths.*
- *Provide good levels of passive security as spaces are overlooked by buildings.*

It notes that on-street parking has a finite capacity, and in higher density residential areas, off-street parking will be required. It notes that on-street parking on public streets should not be allocated to individual dwellings, to allow for a more efficient turnover of spaces.

5.3.3. **Sustainable and Compact Settlements: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).**

Section 5.3.4 *Car Parking – Quantum Form and Location* deals with car parking, and SPPR 3 is as follows:

SPPR 3 - Car Parking

It is a specific planning policy requirement of these Guidelines that:

- (i) *In city centres and urban neighbourhoods of the five cities, defined in Chapter 3 (Table 3.1 and Table 3.2) car-parking provision should be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated. The maximum rate of car parking provision for residential development at these locations, where such provision is justified to the satisfaction of the planning authority, shall be 1 no. space per dwelling.*
- (ii) *In accessible locations, defined in Chapter 3 (Table 3.8) car- parking provision should be substantially reduced. The maximum rate of car parking provision for residential development, where such provision is justified to the satisfaction of the planning authority, shall be 1.5 no. spaces per dwelling.*
- (iii) *In intermediate and peripheral locations, defined in Chapter 3 (Table 3.8) the maximum rate of car parking provision for residential development, where such provision is justified to the satisfaction of the planning authority, shall be 2 no. spaces per dwelling*

Applicants should be required to provide a rationale and justification for the number of car parking spaces proposed and to satisfy the planning authority that the parking levels are necessary and appropriate, particularly when they are close to the maximum provision. The maximum car parking standards do not include bays assigned for use by a car club, designated short stay on–street Electric Vehicle (EV) charging stations or accessible parking spaces. The maximum car parking standards do include provision for visitor parking.

This SPPR will not apply to applications made in a Strategic Development Zone until the Planning Scheme is amended to integrate changes arising from the SPPR. Refer to Section 2.1.2 for further detail.

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

South Dublin Bay SAC – 560 m north

South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA – 560 m north

South Dublin Bay pNHA – 560 m north

5.5. EIA Screening

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

5.6. Water Framework Directive Screening

- 5.6.1. The subject site is located in a built up area in the Greater Dublin Area, c. 100 metres east of the Brewery Stream, within the Brewery Stream_010 sub basin (IE_EA_09B130400). The site is located on top of the ground water body Kilcullen (IE-EA-G-003).
- 5.6.2. The proposed development comprises the provision of a vehicular entrance and car parking space.
- 5.6.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

- 5.6.4. I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. 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 surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- 5.6.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- the small scale and nature of the development
 - the distance from the nearest water bodies and the lack of hydrological connections
- 5.6.6. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

One appeal was received, from the first party against refusal. Issues raised were as follows:

- The proposed development is permitted in principle in the zoning, and satisfies the Policy Objective CA17 Electric Vehicles
- The vehicular entrance complies with the standards set out in Section 12.4.8.1 and 12.4.8.1, with regard to the size of the opening (2.6 metres) and inward opening matching gates, and the development would not affect visual or residential amenity.
- Numerous precedents exist, at no.'s 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 20, and 25 Sydney Avenue, (no 20 adjoining having a recent grant for 2 off-street parking

spaces), and as such the development is in keeping with the character of the ACA.

- The planning authority refused permission due to the proximity to public transport and services, the Development Plan and Ministerial Guidelines policy, and the loss of at least one on-street parking space.
- The planning authority have selectively quoted from the Ministerial Guidelines, which allows for up to 1 space per dwelling, where justified to the satisfaction of the planning authority.
- The development is justified as follows:
 - there are no short-stay on-street EV charging stations on Sydney Avenue or in adjacent streets, and there are no proposals for providing same. As a result the applicants are obliged to fill their hybrid car with petrol.
 - The applicant requires the vehicle for trips which do not always coincide with Dart or bus routes. The parking of the car on-street or off-street has no effect on Dart, bus or bicycle usage.
 - A number of on-street parking spaces have been removed as council policy in recent years, and demand is high (due to proximity to local businesses and schools), requiring the applicant to circulate in search of a nearby car space.
 - The applicants have children, and elderly parents who visit, and the lack of convenient parking is less than ideal.
 - Off-street parking has security benefits
 - There is adequate space to replace any parking spaces lost, due to the removal of on-street parking in recent years.
- A pre-planning consultation request was made, and not responded to.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority's response referred the Board to the planner's report, noting the appeal did not raise any new matters which would justify a change in the planning authority's attitude.

6.3. Observations

None received.

7.0 Assessment

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

- Principle of Development and Compliance with Policy
- Impacts on Built Heritage
- Loss of on-street parking

7.2. Principle of Development and Compliance with Policy

7.2.1. The *Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities* (2024) superseded the Development Plan standards on car parking. The Development Plan set out standards for car parking within new developments; those standards did not apply to existing houses. The Compact Settlement Guidelines deal largely with standards for new housing; however, *SPPR 3 – Car Parking* does not specifically mention new housing, and refers to car parking provision in general. As such, it is of relevance here.

7.2.2. The site lies within 1 km of an existing high capacity urban public transport node (it is 850 metres' walk to Blackrock DART station), and is therefore located in an urban neighbourhood of Dublin city (having regard to Tables 3.1, 3.2, and 3.8). *SPPR 3* is clear in setting out that car parking provision should be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated in city centres and urban neighbourhoods of Dublin and other cities. However, it sets a maximum of 1 space per dwelling. As such, in the absence of any specific policy or plan by the Local Authority to further reduce or eliminate car parking in this specific area, a proposal for one car parking space for the dwelling can be considered on its merits, subject to compliance with *SPPR 3*.

- 7.2.3. SPPR 3 sets out that up to one space per dwelling can be provided, where justified to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority. The applicant sets out that they require off-street parking to facilitate the charging of their hybrid electric vehicle, as they cannot charge it in or around the family home. They further set out that they require off-street parking for family and security reasons.
- 7.2.4. The applicant has not set out why it is not possible to charge at public fast charging stations, nor have they set out any special circumstances that would require off-street parking, over and above the normal considerations. The benefits of off-street parking to the applicant needs to be considered against the loss of public on-street parking, discussed further below under that heading.

7.3. Impacts on Built Heritage

- 7.3.1. The proposed site is both a protected structure and located in an Architectural Conservation Area. The *Sydney Avenue Blackrock Architectural Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Recommendations* notes that of the nineteenth-century houses '*[a]bout three-quarters of the houses have iron railings mounted on the low walls that bound the front gardens, usually with granite copings on top of the plinth walls. Most of these are the traditional round-section vertical iron railings with flat bar horizontals in wrought iron and bosses and finials in cast iron*'. It notes that with a few exceptions, new vehicular entrances and parking areas have generally been carried out with care.
- 7.3.2. The development would minimise the loss of both the front boundary fabric (with an opening of 2.6 metres) and the planted area of the garden, with the majority of the soft landscaping retained. The proposed gates match the existing railings, with a proposal to reuse the railings for the upper section, and the proposed new pier is proposed to be rendered in lime mortar and painted to match the existing pier. Parts of the railings are badly rusted, and it is not clear if they are reusable. This could be addressed by condition in the event of a grant of permission, with a condition to provide gates of appropriate character. The proposal largely complies with the standards set out in the Development Plan at 12.4.8.4 for Vehicular Entrances and Hardstanding Areas in ACA's and for Protected Structures. No information is

provided on material for hard landscaping, but again, this could be addressed by condition in the event of a grant. This would also address the issue of SuDS.

7.3.3. Impacts on the built heritage are acceptable.

7.4. Loss of on-street parking

- 7.4.1. The drawings submitted with the proposed development do not show the on-street parking, but I observed on the site visit that there was ample room for two full size cars in the area in front of numbers 18 and 20, subject to considerate and efficient parking. The drawings of the development (drawing 941/100 Rev A) show a slight discrepancy, with the proposed elevation showing a stretch of c. 4.2 metres between the existing and proposed vehicular entrances, and the proposed plan showing a stretch of 3.7 metres between the existing and proposed vehicular entrances. In any case, this is less than the 6 metres required for a standard parallel parking space, and not sufficient to provide a parking space for a standard car, and the development would effectively result in the loss of two on-street spaces.
- 7.4.2. The Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets sets out a number of benefits of on-street parking over off-street parking. It narrows the carriageway and has a traffic calming effect. It provides a buffer between pedestrians and vehicles, and eliminates the risks from vehicles driving or reversing across the footway. It helps prevent pavement parking and kerb mounting. The carriageway here is some seven metres in width, and the removal of car parking would increase the effective design speed of the road, to the detriment of its residential character.
- 7.4.3. Additionally, on-street parking provides efficient turnover of parking provision, as spaces are not allocated to particular individuals, but useable by all residents and visitors as they become free. On this latter point, the appellant notes that there is considerable demand for on-street parking, with the spaces also used by those attending local schools and local businesses, as well as themselves. The proposed development would remove two flexible, on-street car parking spaces, and replace them with one space for the sole use of 18 Sydney Avenue. Such developments can have knock-on impacts, creating increased demand for driveways and vehicular entrances by neighbouring residents, due to a decrease in on-street parking, with

incremental impacts both on the character of the street and on the residential amenity of neighbours without the capacity for private parking.

- 7.4.4. The appellants note that the council has removed a considerable number of on-street car parking spaces in Blackrock in the past five years, and some of this could be reinstated to replace the spaces lost. No evidence is provided of nearby opportunities for additional on-street parking, and I did not observe any such areas in the immediate vicinity of the site.
- 7.4.5. I recommend a refusal of permission due to the loss of on-street parking.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. I have considered case ABP-322074-25 in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 8.2. The proposed development is located within a built-up area and comprises the creation of a vehicular entrance and parking area and all associated site works. The closest European Sites, part of the Natura 2000 Network are South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA 004024, and South Dublin Bay SAC 000210, both located 560 metres north of the proposed development.
- 8.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the proposed development I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.
- 8.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- 8.5. • Small scale of the development
- 8.6. • The location of the development in a serviced urban area, distance from European Sites and urban nature of intervening habitats, absence of ecological pathways to any European Site.
- 8.7. 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.
- 8.8. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 is not required.

9.0 Recommendation

I recommend permission be refused for the following reason:

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

The subject site is located within an 'Urban Neighbourhood' as defined in the 'Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements: Guidelines for Planning Authorities' where it is a Specific Planning Policy Requirement of the Guidelines (SPPR 3) to minimise, substantially reduce or wholly eliminate car-parking provision, with a maximum of 1 space per dwelling where such provision is justified to the satisfaction of the planning authority. The development, which would require the removal of on-street car parking provision, contrary to the guidance set out in the Design Manual for Urban Streets and Roads (DMURS), has not been justified, and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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.

Natalie de Róiste
Planning Inspector

9 July 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-322181-25
Proposed Development Summary	Protected Structure: Alterations to railings and granite wall, new vehicular entrance and gate pier with associated works
Development Address	18 Sydney Avenue, Blackrock, Co. Dublin, A94 NP73
In all cases check box /or leave blank	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

<p>development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p>

<p>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3) <i>[Delete if not relevant]</i></p>
<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3) <i>[Delete if not relevant]</i></p>

Inspector: _____ Date: _____