



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-322186-25

Development	Section 254 license for telecommunications pole
Location	Public Grass Verge, Huntstown Way, (ITM E 705763.053 N 740236.455), Huntstown, Dublin 15
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	S254W/03/24
Applicant(s)	Cignal Infrastructure Limited
Type of Application	Section 254 Licence
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Licence
Type of Appeal	First
Appellant(s)	Cignal Infrastructure Limited
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	15/01/2026
Inspector	Darragh Ryan

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located on the grass verge along Hunstown Way, behind the existing footpath/cycle path at a site located directly across the road from the Sacred Heart of Jesus National School. The site is locally made up of a mix of community and residential uses, with commercial uses to the west of the site. Within the site vicinity there are several mature street trees, grass verge, traffic lights/signage and cycle paths and footpaths.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development is for the erection and operation of an 18m tall Alpha 2.0 Pole (c.406mm diameter) with 1 no shrouded antenna and 1 outdoor cabinet 1.64m tall X 1.16m length and 0.79m in depth)

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

- 3.1. **The planning authority issued a Decision to refuse the licence for a single reason as follows:**

The proposal has not demonstrated compliance with Objective DMS0222 and Objective IU054 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-29 which requires the co-location of antenna on existing structures or documentary evidence as to the non-availability of it. Having regard to the nature and height of the proposed communication infrastructure, the residential zoning of the site, its proximity to existing residential properties, the absence of protection measures in relation to the surrounding mature trees and presenting an obstacle to normal landscaping maintenance, the proposed mast would damage the visual and residential amenity of the area, would be contrary to the objectives of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023 – 2029 in respect of telecommunications antennae and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. There is a single Planning Report on file

The proposal is for a single operator occupied telecommunications pole. This is not in compliance with Objective DMS022 and Objective IU)54 which promotes co-location of telecommunication infrastructure. There is an existing EIR antenna circa 100m to the east of the application site. All new applications for telecommunications antennae are required to provide documentary evidence as to why co-location is not a viable option. The applicant has stated that none of existing locations (telecommunications poles) within 2km of the subject site have capacity to facilitate the proposed development. The applicant has stated why two sites within the 2km radius are not suitable but has not discussed any other locations which is required under Objective DMS0224 of the Fingal County Development Plan.

The planning authority is not satisfied that the applicant has looked at all reasonable alternatives. Although the applicant has mapped locations of all existing facilities within a 2km radius, no justification from eliminating them from consideration have been provided thereby the development is not in compliance with Objective DMS0224. There are two existing facilities located 100m east of the site and the applicant has not provided sufficient documentary evidence as to why co-location is not feasible.

The Parks and Green Infrastructure division are not in favour of erecting the 18m pole at this location as it would be located in close proximity to mature trees and the applicant has not proposed any tree protection measures at construction stage. The proposed development would pose an obstacle to normal landscape maintenance operations.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Parks and Green Infrastructure – not in favour of the erection of pole, potential damage to tree roots, issues with regarding maintenance of green area after.
- Transportation Planning Section – no objection subject to conditions.
- Water Services – no objection to the development

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- None

3.4. Third Party Observations

- None

4.0 Planning History

Adjacent Sites - 100m to the east

- ABP 314825-22 Reg Ref: S254W/03/22 The planning authority refused permission for a street pole solution by signal Infrastructure. This was upheld by An Coimisiun Pleanala on the 09/11/2023 as follows:
the height, scale and location of the proposed development in an area that is predominately residential in character and in proximity to an existing, similar freestanding streetpole, it is considered that the proposed development would be visually obtrusive and seriously injure the amenities of the area and of property in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- Reg. Ref. 254W/02/22 The Planning Authority granted a licence for a 15m high streetpole solution and operator cabinet in July 2022 for a five-year period. ABP-314825-22 Inspector's Report Page 5 of 17 The subject site is roughly 10m to the west of this streetpole, which has since been constructed and is now operational.
- ABP Ref. 308369-21 (Reg. Ref. S254W/05/20): The Board refused permission in February 2021 for a proposed Section 254 Licence for the installation of telecommunications infrastructure comprising a 15m streetpole, antennae, internal cabling and an associated equipment cabinet. The reasons for refusal were due to the nature and height of the proposed development, its location in a residential area and that insufficient evidence had been provided in respect of alternative sites to support the location of the development. It was therefore considered that the proposed development would be contrary to

the government guidelines and the residential zoning for the site as per the Fingal Development Plan (2017-2023). The Planning Authority refused the proposal for similar reasons in December 2020.

- Reg. Ref. S254W/03/20 The Planning Authority refused permission in February 2020 for a proposed Section 254 Licence for the installation of telecommunications infrastructure comprising a 15m streetpole, antennae, internal cabling and an associated equipment cabinet. The reasons for refusal were due to the nature and height of the proposed development, the residential zoning of the site, proximity to residential properties, such that the proposed development would be contrary to the objectives of the Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023 in respect of telecommunications infrastructure

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Planning Authorities on Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures issued (1996)

- 5.1.1. The 'Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures' (1996) set out government policy for the assessment of proposed new telecommunications structures ('the 1996 Guidelines'). The Guidelines state that the rapid expansion of mobile telephone services in Ireland has required the construction of base station towers in urban and rural areas across the country. This is an essential feature of all modern telecommunications networks. In many suburban situations, because of the low rise nature of buildings and structures, a supporting mast or tower is needed.
- 5.1.2. Section 4.3 of the Guidelines refers to visual impact and states that only as a last resort, and if there no viable alternatives, should free-standing masts be located in a residential area or beside schools. If such locations should become necessary, sites already developed for utilities should be considered, and masts and antennae should be designed and adapted for the specific location.
- 5.1.3. The support structure should be kept to the minimum height consistent with effective operation. The Guidelines also state that visual impact is among the more important

considerations that should be considered assessing a particular application. In most cases, the Applicant will only have limited flexibility as regards location, given the constraints arising from radio planning parameters, etc. Visual impact will, by definition, vary with the general context of the proposed development.

5.1.4. The Guidelines state that the approach will vary depending on whether a proposed development is in:

- a rural/agricultural area;
- an upland/hilly, mountainous area;
- a smaller settlement/village;
- an industrial area/industrially zoned land; or
- a suburban area of a larger town or city.

5.1.5. The Guidelines state that some masts will remain quite noticeable despite best precautions. For example, there will be local factors which have to be taken into account in determining the extent to which an object is noticeable or intrusive. This may include intermediate objects (buildings or trees), topography, the scale of the object in the wider landscape, the multiplicity of other objects in the wider panorama, the position of the object with respect to the skyline, weather, lighting conditions, etc. Softening of the visual impact can be achieved through a judicious choice of colour scheme and through the planting of shrubs, trees etc as a screen or backdrop.

5.2. **Circular Letter PL07/12**

5.2.1. Circular Letter PL07/12 revised elements of the 1996 Guidelines under Section 2.2 to 2.7. It advises Planning Authorities to:

- Cease attaching time limiting conditions or issuing temporary durations to telecommunications masts, except in exceptional circumstances.
- Avoid including minimum separation distances between masts or schools and houses in Development Plans.
- Omit conditions on planning permissions requiring security in the form of a bond/cash deposit.
- Not include monitoring arrangements on health and safety or to determine planning applications on health grounds.

- Include waivers on future development contribution schemes for the provision of broadband infrastructure.

5.3. Circular Letter PL11/2020

5.3.1. Circular Letter PL11/2020 'Telecommunications Services – Planning Exemptions and Section 254 Licences' was issued in December 2020. It advises Planning Authorities that:

- Section 254 of the Act outlines the provisions in relation to the licensing of appliances and cables etc on public roads. Where development of a type specified in section 254(1) of the Act is proposed to be carried out on a public road, approval for the works is required from a Planning Authority by means of the obtaining of a section 254 licence.

- A Section 254 Licence is required for overground electronic communications infrastructure and its associated works, and that such works are exempt from planning permission.

- The exemptions for telecommunications infrastructure along public roads do not apply:

(a) where the proposed development is in sensitive areas where there is a requirement for Appropriate Assessment.

(b) where the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard or obstruction of road users.

Section 254(5) of the Act outlines the criteria to which the Planning Authority shall have regard in assessing such proposals:

- a) the proper planning and sustainable development of the area,
- b) any relevant provisions of the development plan, or a local area plan,
- c) the number and location of existing appliances, apparatuses or structures on, under, over or along the public road, and
- d) the convenience and safety of road users including pedestrians.

5.4. Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029

11.8.4 Telecommunications The provision of telecommunications information is important in terms of the economic development of the County. To ensure appropriate telecommunications infrastructure is provided within the County, the Council will have regard to the Guidelines issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, Planning Guidelines for Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures 1996 and Circular Letter PL 07/12. The assessment of individual proposals will be governed by the Guidelines and the controls scheduled in Chapter 14 Development Management Standards of this Plan.

5.4.1. Objective IU048 – High Quality ICT Network and Appropriate Telecommunications Infrastructure

Promote and facilitate the provision of a high-quality ICT network and appropriate telecommunications infrastructure in accordance with the Fingal Digital Strategy 2020–23 (and any subsequent plan), and to support broadband connectivity and other innovative and advancing technologies within the County, whilst protecting the amenities of urban and rural areas.

5.4.2. Objective IUO52 – Telecommunications Infrastructure

Ensure that applications made in relation to the provision of overground telecommunications infrastructure, including planning applications and Section 254 licence applications, take into consideration and demonstrate compliance with the Guidance on the Potential Location of Overground Telecommunications Infrastructure on Public Roads 2015

5.4.3. Objective IUO53 – High-quality Design of Telecommunications Infrastructure

Ensure a high-quality design of masts, towers, antennae and other such telecommunications infrastructure in the interests of visual amenity and the protection of sensitive landscapes in the County

5.4.4. Objective IUO54 – Sharing and Co-location Of Digital Connectivity Infrastructure

Support the appropriate use of existing assets (i.e. lighting, street furniture etc) for the deployment of telecoms equipment and to encourage the sharing and co-location

of digital connectivity infrastructure in the interests of visual amenity and protection of the built heritage.

5.4.5. Chapter 14 Development Management Standards

Objective DMSO17 – Location of New Utility Structures Where possible, new utility structures such as electricity substations and telecommunication equipment cabinets should not be located adjacent or forward of the front building line of buildings or on areas of open space.

Objective DMSO18 – High Quality Design of New Utility Structures Require new utility structures such as electricity substations and telecommunication equipment cabinets to be of a high-quality design and to be maintained to a high standard by the relevant service provider.

Objective DMS 0222 – Co-Location of Antennae

Require the co-location of antennae on existing support structures and where this is not feasible require documentary evidence as to the non-availability of this option in proposals for new structures.

Objective DMSO223 – Location of Telecommunications Based Services

Encourage the location of telecommunications-based services at appropriate locations within the County, subject to environmental considerations and avoid the location of structures in fragile landscapes, in nature conservation areas, in highly sensitive landscapes and where views are to be preserved

Objective DMSO224 – Applications for Telecommunications Structures Require the following information with respect to telecommunications structures at application stage: "

- Demonstrate compliance with Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures – Guidelines for Planning Authorities issued by the Department of the Environment 1996 and Circular Letter PL 07/12 issued by the Department of the Environment and Local Government (as may be amended), and to other publications and material as may be relevant in the circumstances.
- Demonstrate the significance of the proposed development as part of a national telecommunications network.

- Indicate on a map, the location of all existing telecommunications structures within a 2 km radius of the proposed site, stating reasons why (if not proposed) it is not feasible to share existing facilities having regard to the Code of Practice on Sharing of Radio Sites issued by the Commission for Communications Regulations.
- The degree to which the proposal will impact on the amenities of occupiers of nearby properties, or the amenities of the area (e.g. visual impacts of masts and associated equipment cabinets, security fencing treatment etc.) and the potential for mitigating visual impacts including low and mid-level landscape screening, tree-type masts being provided where appropriate, colouring or painting of masts and antennae, and considered access arrangements.
- Ensure that when such licences are sought nearby property owners and occupiers are made aware of the application prior to Fingal County Council or An Bord Pleanála agreeing the licence.

5.5. Natural Heritage Designations

There are no designated European Sites directly affecting or in the vicinity of the appeal site.

5.6. 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.

6.0 The Appeal

- 6.1. **This is a first party appeal against the decision of Fingal County Council to refuse a Section 254 licence for an 18m Alpha streetpole to address identified mobile and mobile broadband coverage blackspots.**

Grounds of Appeal

- Dual use operation – Fingal County Council are incorrect in their assertion that the proposed development is for use by a single operator. The proposed streetpole and antennae is for a dual operator solution. It is submitted to the Coimisiun that the proposed development is to address a blackspot which they are trying to resolve by providing a solution within the 300m search ring provided by their own radio engineers. There is no point in providing a solution outside of this search ring as it defeats the purpose. The requirement to look for solutions within a 2km radius does not provide relevant information. The area of 300m radius is the blackspot.
- Design - The proposed design and height of the proposed structure (18m) is not unusual for this type of infrastructure and is common throughout the country. It is submitted that given the fact that the street pole will read as a typical element of street furniture and given the findings of the Visual Impact Assessment submitted with the application it is refuted that the proposed development will be visually obtrusive at this location. A number of precedent cases for granting street poles have been provided by the applicant. It is submitted the proximity of streetpoles 100m and 120m to the east of the site does not result in cumulation of street furniture. As a result of slender design of the street poles, these quickly become part of the backdrop of the area. There is no impact on residential dwellings as a result of the proposed development.
- Mature trees/Landscaping – the proposed street pole location is away from any mature trees and root protection area. The proposal is on a grass verge close to existing bus stop. The applicant seeks a condition for a construction management plan to be agreed with the Council prior to commencement of

development. There is only a minor part of the grass verge that will be affected by maintenance.

6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

A response to the appeal was submitted by Fingal County Council dated 28th of April 2025

- The applicant in their appeal documents refer to drawings that are in reference to a different licence application under S254W/0624. The documents submitted as part of the application do not explicitly state the application is for a dual operator as referenced in the appeal documentation.
- The planning authority is not satisfied the applicant has looked at all available alternatives, namely the two alternatives 100m and 120m to the east of the site. The applicant has not provided in the appeal any documentation as to why co-location is not feasible at these locations as per Objective DMS0222 and ObjectiveU054.

6.3. **Observations**

- None

6.4. **Further Responses**

- None

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1.1. Having examined the licence application details and all other documentation on the appeal file, including the appeal submission, and inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local, regional and national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this licence appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal. The issues can be addressed under the following headings:

- Principle of Development
- Co-Location

- Visual Impact
- Appropriate Assessment

7.2. Principle of Development

- 7.2.1. The proposed development comprises the erection of an 18-metre monopole telecommunications structure located on the southern side of Hunstown Way, within the grass verge. The development consists of an Alpha 2.0 monopole (approximately 406mm in diameter), accommodating one shrouded antenna, together with one outdoor equipment cabinet measuring 1.64 metres in height, 1.16 metres in length and 0.79 metres in depth.
- 7.2.2. The site is located on lands zoned RS – Residential under the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029. The zoning matrix applicable to RS lands identifies utility installations as uses that are open for consideration, subject to compliance with relevant development management standards and policy objectives.
- 7.2.3. Section 11.8.4 of Chapter 11 of the Development Plan seeks to support the provision of telecommunications infrastructure, having regard to the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures (1996), together with subsequent circulars. Policy IUP36 further seeks to facilitate the coordinated provision of telecommunications infrastructure at appropriate locations. Development management standards relating to telecommunications infrastructure are set out in Chapter 14 of the Plan.
- 7.2.4. I note that Fingal County Council raised no objection to the proposal on the grounds of principle. Having regard to the zoning of the site, the policy support for telecommunications infrastructure, and the absence of any policy-based objection to the principle of development, I consider that the provision of a telecommunications structure at this location is acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with all relevant development management standards.

7.3. Co-location and Compliance with Development Plan Objectives

- 7.3.1. The planning authority's primary reason for refusal relates to the applicant's failure to adequately address the potential for co-location with existing telecommunications infrastructure in the vicinity of the site. Specifically, it was concluded that the

proposal does not comply with Objectives DMS0222 and DMS0224 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023–2029.

7.3.2. The applicant has submitted additional documentation at appeal stage indicating that the proposed structure would itself facilitate co-location. This information was not before the planning authority at the time the decision was made. The applicant further asserts that a requirement to justify the proposal by reference to facilities within a 2 km radius is unreasonable in this instance, as the identified coverage deficiency relates to a much smaller area, described as a radius of approximately 300 metres.

7.3.3. Objective DMS0222 requires that antennae be co-located on existing support structures where feasible and, where this is not possible, that proposals for new support structures be accompanied by documentary evidence demonstrating the non-availability or unsuitability of existing structures. Objective DMS0224 further requires detailed information to be submitted with applications for telecommunications infrastructure, including:

- demonstration of compliance with the 1996 Guidelines and relevant circulars;
- confirmation of the proposal's role within the national telecommunications network;
- identification, on a map, of all existing telecommunications structures within a 2 km radius of the site, together with clear reasons why co-location with those structures is not proposed, having regard to the Code of Practice on Sharing of Radio Sites issued by ComReg;
- an assessment of impacts on residential and visual amenity and proposed mitigation measures; and
- confirmation that nearby occupiers have been notified of the proposal.

7.3.4. While the applicant has submitted a map identifying telecommunications infrastructure within a 2 km radius, I note that there are two existing street pole antennae located approximately 120 metres east of the subject site. These structures fall well within the 300-metre radius identified by the applicant as the area experiencing a coverage deficit. However, no site-specific or technical justification

has been provided to demonstrate why co-location on either of these existing structures is not feasible.

- 7.3.5. The applicant's assertion that the proposed structure will itself allow for co-location does not address the central policy requirement, which prioritises co-location on existing infrastructure in advance of the erection of new support structures. The Development Plan requires a clear justification for the need for a new monopole, supported by documentary evidence demonstrating that co-location alternatives have been fully explored and discounted. On the basis of the information submitted, I am not satisfied that this requirement has been met.

7.4. Visual Impact

- 7.4.1. The Planning Authority has cited, as a secondary reason for refusal, that the location of the proposed development would result in a negative visual impact within a predominantly residential area, thereby adversely affecting the residential amenity of local residents. In response, the applicant has submitted a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) as part of the proposal. The VIA identifies and assesses a number of representative viewpoints along Hunstown Way, including those in closest proximity to the site.
- 7.4.2. The nearest residential property is No. 28 Hunstown Green. The front elevation of this dwelling faces west, while the rear elevation is located approximately 26 metres from the proposed development site. The rear elevation is partially screened by an existing boundary wall, which serves to limit direct visual interaction with the proposed structure. Having regard to the level of detail and analysis provided within the Visual Impact Assessment, I do not consider that the visual impact of the proposed development would be significant. The structure is designed as a tall, slender column, and its visual presence would not materially differ from that of existing urban infrastructure such as CCTV poles or public lighting columns. In this context, the form and scale of the proposal are considered to integrate naturally into the existing urban environment. Furthermore, it is noted that the proposed structure would be positioned behind an established line of trees along Hunstown Way. This existing vegetation would provide additional visual screening and contribute to the absorption of the structure into the surrounding urban landscape. As such, I consider

that the proposal would not result in a significant adverse impact on local visual amenity.

7.4.3. It is also noted that the site is not located within an Architectural Conservation Area, nor would the proposal impact upon any protected structures. The development would not obstruct any protected views or areas of high visual or environmental amenity.

7.4.4. In light of the foregoing, I do not consider that the visual impact of the proposed development would be so substantial as to warrant a reason for refusal in this instance.

7.5. Other Matters

Landscaping and Maintenance

The Parks Department of Fingal County Council have made an objection to the proposal on the grounds of potential impact on route protection systems in the local area and the proposal would impact maintenance of grass verge once constructed. I note that the location of the proposed telecommunications pole is located away from existing trees and the potential for impact on any tree routes is negligible. The street trees are to be located to the north immediately adjacent to Hunstown Way, the proposed structure will be behind these trees and at a distance outside of root system.

The maintenance of the grass verge is acknowledged to be an issue, however, I consider it reasonable that the applicant be conditioned to maintain the immediate area around the structures to the required standard of Fingal county Council. Where the Coimisiun is minded to grant a licence, I recommend a condition attach requiring the maintenance of the grass verge around the proposed structures to the required standard of Fingal County Council. A construction management plan should also be submitted prior to commencement of development.

7.6. **AA Screening**

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, which is for telecoms infrastructure consisting of a 18m high street pole and operator cabinets in an established and serviced urban area, the distance from the nearest European site, no appropriate assessment issues arise. Therefore, it is not considered that the

proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect, individually, or in combination with other plans or projects, on a European site.

8.0 Recommendation

I recommend that a Section 254 licence be refused for the following reasons:

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

The applicant has not demonstrated compliance with Objective DMS0222 and Objective IU054 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-29 which requires the co-location of antenna on existing structures or documentary evidence as to the non-availability of it. Having regard to the proximity of other telecommunications structures within close proximity to the proposed site and the failure to justify why these structures are not suitable for co-location, along with the potential cumulation of similar structures in a residential zoning the proposed mast would damage the residential amenity of the area, would be contrary to the objectives of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023 – 2029 in respect of co-location of telecommunications antennae 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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

Darragh Ryan
Planning Inspector

26th of January 2026

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	322186-25
Proposed Development Summary	S254 – License for 18m Streetpole
Development Address	Public Grass Verge, Hunstown Way, Hunstown, Dublin 15
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 type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a ‘Project’. Proceed to Q2.
	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3) <i>[Delete if not relevant]</i></p>

Inspector: _____ Date: _____