



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

### ABP-322233-25

<b>Development</b>	Two-storey extension to the rear and side of the house and all associated site works.
<b>Location</b>	3 Dunloe Park, Windtown, Navan, Co. Meath, C15VX5C
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Meath County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	2560093
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Aleks & Julia Gasperovics
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Refuse
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Aleks & Julia Gasperovics
<b>Observer(s)</b>	Jurji Bordiukov Jurgita Taukeviciute
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	22/06/2025.
<b>Inspector</b>	Darragh Ryan

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The existing site is located in the Dunloe Park residential estate at Windtown Navan, Co Meath. The site comprises a semi-detached dwelling and associated garage of 44sqm within the existing housing development known as 'Dunloe Park'. Dunloe Park contains two-storey, semi-detached dwellings with in-curtilage parking to the front and private amenity space to the rear.
- 1.2. Two storey, semi-detached dwellings at Dunloe Drive are located on the western side of the oval area of open space and oppose Dunloe Park. The subject site is located in a row of houses positioned in a half crescent style. The subject site has a stated area of 334 m<sup>2</sup> and accommodates a 2-storey, semi-detached dwelling with in-curtilage parking to the front.
- 1.3. Side access to the rear is provided along the eastern side of the house. The rear garden extends to a depth of approximately 20.1m and has a maximum width of 10.4m. A single storey detached structure which is identified as a domestic store/studio( 44sqm) is located at the southeastern rear boundary of the site, adjacent to the shared boundary with no. 4 Dunloe Park.
- 1.4. The site can be characterised as existing residential. The site is accessed from the internal road network of the development and the L3409 beyond that to the south. The subject site measures 0.03Ha in totality

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. Proposals seek to construct a two-storey extension to the rear and side of the existing dwelling and all associated site development works. The proposed extension shall accommodate an additional bedroom and utility room at ground floor level and an additional bedroom and storage space at first floor level.
- 2.2. The proposed extension is for a pitched roof two storey extension set back off the neighbouring boundary to the east by 800mm and to the west by 1.2m. The extension extends to a height of 7.59m and extends to the rear of the existing property by 5.85 meters and measures 5.78m in width. The extension is for a total area of 45.64sqm and will increase the total floor area up to 142.64sqm.
- 2.3. The finishes as proposed include for nap plaster finish and slate roof finish.

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

#### **3.1. The planning authority issued a Decision to refuse permission as follows:**

It is considered that the proposed development by reason of its height, scale and design would be contrary to DM OBJ 50 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027. If permitted, the proposed development would fail to integrate with the existing dwelling by virtue of the proposed height and scale, would negatively impact the residential amenities of adjacent residents and can be considered as dominant and overbearing.

Accordingly, to grant the proposed development would seriously injure residential amenities of adjacent properties in the vicinity and would represent piecemeal development, set a future undesirable precedent for similar developments of this nature and 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 report can be summarised as follows:**

- The subject development is located on lands in an established residential neighbourhood and is therefore zoned 'A1 – Existing Residential' in the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027. The zoning objective for 'A1' zoned lands is: 'To protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities.' – Principle considered acceptable.
- Regarding design - The Planning Authority has concerns with the development as presented. In the first instance, the Planning Authority recognises that, given the two-storey nature of the proposed extension, there is potential for overlooking and subsequent loss of privacy for neighbouring properties. Furthermore, the extent to which the proposed extension would project from the rear of the dwelling, some 5.85metres, would exacerbate the loss of privacy. The proposed elevations received depict 2no. windows at first-floor level of the extension facing southeast (to the rear). Given the density of

the existing housing development and proximity of neighbouring properties the potential for overlooking and subsequent loss of residential amenity is considered likely. Based on the foregoing the Planning Authority considers the proposals as presented to be contrary to the provisions of DM OBJ 50 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027.

- If permitted, the proposed development would be injurious to neighbouring residential amenities given the likely loss of privacy from overlooking. The development projects between 4.34metres to 5.85metres from the rear of the existing dwelling and would be two-storey in nature. These characteristics coupled with rear-facing first-floor windows would give rise to overbearance and a loss of privacy in neighbouring rear gardens

#### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- None

#### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- None

#### 3.4. Third Party Observations

There were two valid submissions on file. The issues raised are also raised in the submission submitted to the Board. The main issues can be summarised as follows:

- Overlooking and loss of privacy,
- Overdevelopment of a compact site,
- Structural concerns for neighbouring properties,
- Non-compliance with local, regional and national planning documents and directives,
- Negative impact on property values,
- Negative visual impacts

## 4.0 Planning History

PA reg ref – 24/93 – Granted by Meath County Council overturned on Appeal to An Bord Pleanala (reg ref 320188-24). Reason for refusal as follows:

The Bord having, considered the details of the file, concurred with the Inspector that the proposed dormer extension would contravene objective DM OBJ 50 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021 -2027, but did not accept the Inspectors recommendation to grant permission for the two-storey extension to the rear and side.

The Board disagreed with the opinion of the Inspector that the proposed low level, lean to pitched roof of the proposed two storey extension, would harmonise with the flat roof design to the front of the existing dwelling. The Board was also of the opinion that the proposed offset of the two-storey extension from the south-eastern boundary with number 2 Dunloe Park, by 0.25 meters, would not be adequate to provide a meaningful space for maintenance purposes.

Whilst accepting the capacity for a rear extension to the existing dwelling, the Board was of the opinion that the development as proposed, due to its height, extent and proximity to the boundary, resulted in overbearance.

The Board concluded that notwithstanding the angled arrangement of the dwellings at Dunloe Park, which present a crescent shape, the scale and mass of the proposed development would be dominant and overbearing, and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Meath County Development Plan 2021 -2027

#### 5.1.1. Land Use Zoning

The site is subject to land use zoning “A1” (Existing Residential) which has the objective “to protect and enhance the amenity and character of existing residential communities” in the Meath County Development Plan (herein referred to as the Meath CDP).

### 5.1.2. Alterations and Extensions

The policy regarding extensions and alterations to dwellings is set out in Section 11.5.25 of the Meath CDP.

Objective DM OBJ 50 sets out that all applications for residential extensions in urban and rural areas shall comply with the following criteria:

- High quality design which respects, harmonises and integrates with the existing dwelling in terms of height, scale, materials used, finishes, window proportions, etc;
- The quantity and quality of private open space that would remain to serve the house.
- Flat roof extensions, in a contemporary design context, will be considered on their individual merits;
- Impact on amenities of adjacent residents, in terms of light and privacy. Care should be taken to ensure that the extension does not overshadow windows, yards or gardens or have windows in the flank walls which would reduce a neighbour's privacy;
- Extensions which break the existing front building line will not normally be acceptable. A porch extension which does not significantly break the front building line will normally be permitted;
- Dormer extensions shall not obscure the main features of the existing roof, i.e. should not break the ridge or eaves lines of the roof;
- Proposed side extensions shall retain side access to the rear of the property, where required for utility access, refuse collection, etc.
- Ability to provide adequate car parking within the curtilage of the dwelling house.
- In all cases where diversion or construction over existing sewerage and/or water mains is required, the consent of Irish Water will be required as part of the application.

### 5.2. Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)

5.2.1. Section 5.3.7 relates to daylight and states the following:

*“a) The potential for poor daylight performance in a proposed development or for a material impact on neighbouring properties will generally arise in cases where the buildings are close together, where higher buildings are involved, or where there are other obstructions to daylight. Planning authorities do not need to undertake a detailed technical assessment in relation to daylight performance in all cases. It should be clear from the assessment of architectural drawings (including sections) in the case of low-rise housing with good separation from existing and proposed buildings that undue impact would not arise, and planning authorities may apply a level of discretion in this regard.*

*(b) In cases where a technical assessment of daylight performance is considered by the planning authority to be necessary regard should be had to quantitative performance approaches to daylight provision outlined in guides like A New European Standard for Daylighting in Buildings IS EN17037:2018, UK National Annex BS EN17037:2019 and the associated BRE Guide 209 2022 Edition (June 2022), or any relevant future standards or guidance specific to the Irish context.”*

Section 5.3.7 further states that: *“In drawing conclusions in relation to daylight performance, planning authorities must weigh up the overall quality of the design and layout of the scheme and the measures proposed to maximise daylight provision, against the location of the site and the general presumption in favour of increased scales of urban residential development. Poor performance may arise due to design constraints associated with the site or location and there is a need to balance that assessment against the desirability of achieving wider planning objectives. Such objectives might include securing comprehensive urban regeneration and or an effective urban design and streetscape solution.”*

### 5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (Site Code 004232) ~ 1.27Km to the east
- River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (Site Code 002299) ~ 1.27Km to the east

## 6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

## 7.0 The Appeal

### 7.1. **This is a first party appeal against the decision Meath County Council to refuse permission. The Grounds of Appeal can be summarised as follows:**

The proposed development and design has been fully redesigned to account for the previous refusal reason of An Bord Pleanala as follows:

- The flat roof has been omitted and the proposed extension has been set back off the boundary to a total of 800mm.
- The extension is now smaller and more compact than the previous refusal.
- While there will be some visual obstruction with a two storey extension, the second floor is aligned with the main wall of the house eliminating any protrusion.
- The granted block of apartments look much more dominant than the proposed extension.
- The need for extension is compatible with Development Plan Goals:
- The extension is vital to the provision of adequate and appropriate living space.
- The three bedroom development is no longer adequate for a family of 5 and an elderly parent. The extension directly addresses these needs. The existing upstairs bedroom accommodation is unsuitable for the applicants grandmother. The proposed ground floor extension will provide safe

accessible and suitable accommodation. This principle aligns with the Development Plans Age Friendly principles and universal design concepts.

- Three teenagers of different genders are required to live in one single bedroom. The current dwelling does not meet the needs of the family. The existing house is not fit for purpose and there are no alternatives.
- The revised design and scale aligns with Development Plan policies, namely the A1 zoning objective and DM objective OBJ 50 (Section 11.5.25).
- A number of signatures from neighbouring properties have been provided supporting the application.

## **7.2. Planning Authority Response**

- None

## **7.3. Observations**

There are two observations on file. The observations are from adjacent residents of Dunloe Park. The observations can be summarised as follows:

- Failure to disclose previous planning refusal – there is a significant planning history associated with the site which the applicant has not provided as part of the application.
- The proposed development would result in a significant increase in local construction traffic in the estate that would dramatically increase construction traffic in the estate. This is a safety concern for many young children who play outdoors.
- The proposed development is out of character with the existing properties in the area representing an unsuitable form of development and an overdevelopment of the site.
- The height and proximity of the proposed development would result in a severe loss of privacy and natural light for adjoining properties. The proposed rear extension would create a large and imposing structure directly along the

boundary line. The proposal will result in serious overshadowing and loss of natural light to rear windows and rear gardens of adjacent properties.

- The applicant has not addressed the primary reasons for refusal of Meath county Council.
- The development will present as a de-facto three storey extension. A de-facto attic level is included with dormer style window . The 3 storey element is not stated in the statutory notices. The new design raises significant concerns as it results in a larger side elevation facing the rear boundary of adjacent properties than what was refused by An Bord Pleanála. The dormer extensions shall extend the apex of the roof out at a height of 7.5 – this significantly alters the roof line and side elevation from the existing on site arrangement.
- The proposed side elevation is excessively long and provides for a cumulative length of dwelling addressing neighbouring property. It is also an unbroken elevation which is overbearing and out of context with existing estate. The extension is over scaled and overbearing on adjacent properties.
- Concerns with respect to construction works and potential risks to the structural integrity of other houses as a result of the development

#### **7.4. Further Responses**

- None

## 8.0 Assessment

8.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, inspected the site and having regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal relate directly to the reasons for refusal and can be assessed under the following headings:

- Principle of Development
- Design & Visual Impact
- Residential Amenity

### 8.2. Principle of Development

8.2.1. The proposed development is for a two storey extension to the rear of existing dwelling on a site which is zoned objective 'A1 – Existing Residential'. The objective of the A1 zoning is 'To protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential communities. 'To provide for house improvements, alterations and extensions and appropriate infill residential development in accordance with principles of good design and protection of existing residential amenity.'

I am satisfied that the principle of the development has been established on the site and the proposal is acceptable subject to the policies and objectives of the Meath County Development Plan. Development plan policies Section 11.5.25 and Objective DM OBJ 50 are of relevance to the subject appeal. Section 11.5.25 states that in areas zoned 'Existing Residential' house improvements, alterations and extensions and appropriate infill residential development will normally be permissible subject to appropriate design and fulfilling certain criteria as set out in the DM standards. Objective OBJ 50 states that High quality design will be required which respects, harmonises and integrates with the existing dwelling in terms of height, scale, materials used, finishes, window proportions, etc;

Generally the development plan policy supports development of extensions to existing properties whilst reinforcing the importance of existing residential amenity for adjoining properties.

I am satisfied that the principle of the development has been established on the site and is acceptable, and that the relevant planning issues relate to the potential impact

of the proposal on existing residential amenity in terms of loss of privacy, loss of daylight and/or sunlight and visual amenity. These issues will be addressed in the following sections.

### 8.3. Design & Visual Impact

- 8.3.1. The reason for refusal relates to the design of the proposal which the PA contend is materially at odds in terms of height and scale and would be contrary to DM OBJ 50 of the Meath County Development Plan. It was considered that the extent to which the proposed extension would project from the rear of the dwelling, some 5.85metres, would exacerbate the loss of privacy. Given the density of the existing housing development and proximity of neighbouring properties the potential for overlooking and subsequent loss of residential amenity is considered likely. Observers on file have stated that the design of the proposed development is overbearing in such close proximity to neighbouring properties and the proposal is of a scale that is out of context with the local area.
- 8.3.2. The applicant sets out that the proposed new design is reflective of the architectural style of the area. It is stated that the pitched roof is to align with existing architectural context. The previous design as refused by An Bord Pleanala had a setback of 250mm from neighbouring boundary to the west which under the current design has increased to 800mm. Furthermore the floor area of the proposed extension has reduced from 62sqm to 45sqm. The second floor now aligns with the main wall of the house ensuring no visibility from the front of the house. The applicant contends that the revised design directly addresses the revised design as refused by An Bord Pleanala under reg ref 320188 -25.
- 8.4. The design as set out is for a two storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling. The pitched roof structure with a ridge height of 7.5m is in line with existing ridge height on site. The extension will extend out from the rear building line by 5.85m and will be 800mm from neighbouring boundary to the west. Given the site context, the scale of development and proximity to site boundaries I consider the proposal as set out would be overbearing in scale and form to be adequately accommodated within the development site. The site already has a large garage/store that is significantly larger than a standard garage at 44sqm. I consider the scale of development on site, in the context of existing development to be a

significant intervention that may significantly detract from the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. The extent and scale of the rear side elevation of the proposed extension is significant, and I would concur with the planning authority assessment that it would be overbearing from the perspective neighbouring properties. In my view an extension of more modest proposals could be accommodated on site that would not overbear on neighbouring properties to such a significant extent.

- 8.4.1. In my view the design of the development does not comply with Objective DM OBJ50 of the Meath County Development Plan as the proposal fails to provide a design of high quality design which respects, harmonises and integrates with the existing dwelling in terms of height and scale. I consider the extension as proposed is overbearing in the context of existing development on site and will result in a significant negative impact on amenities of neighbouring properties. Furthermore the previous refusal on site cited that the scale of the proposed development is excessive for the development site and would be overbearing in the context of neighbouring properties. I do not consider the distance from neighbouring boundary to the east of 800mm to be substantial a change that the result would not be significant overbearance. The proposed extension taken cumulatively with existing development in the rear garden space would in my view result in an overdevelopment of the site resulting in significant overbearance of existing neighbouring properties. In my view the design as submitted does not align with Objective OBJ 50 of the Meath County Development Plan.

8.5. Residential Amenity

Overlooking

- 8.5.1. The primary reason for refusal as set out by the planning was that the first floor rear windows would give rise to potential overlooking into neighbouring properties. It is stated that the first floor windows onto the extension in close proximity to neighbouring boundaries would increase the incidence of overlooking. The submissions on file also state that the proposed development would increase the risk of overlooking in to rear of properties.
- 8.5.2. In my view the extent of overlooking would not be significantly increased as a result of the proposed development. I note the density of development in the area however,

the proposed extension brings the overlooking 5m further from the rear wall of the existing dwelling. There is currently a potential for overlooking from first floor of existing dwelling and I do not consider the provision of a first floor extension would exacerbate the existing situation. Furthermore there are no windows on the side elevation of the proposed extension. Objective DM OBJ 50 states that new extensions shall not Impact on amenities of adjacent residents, in terms of light and privacy. Care should be taken to ensure that the extension does not overshadow windows, yards or gardens or have windows in the flank walls which would reduce a neighbour's privacy. While I consider there will be significant overbearing impact from the proposed development, I do not consider the extent overlooking to be so significant to warrant a reason for refusal in this instance.

#### 8.5.3. Overshadowing

Section 5.3.7 of the Meath County Development Plan deals with the sunlight/daylight analysis. The applicant has not submitted a sunlight/daylight shadow analysis report for the proposed development, however a report has been submitted under the previous application submitted to the Board under 320188 -25. In my view the assessment of sunlight/daylight analysis is required to determine the potential impact of the development on private amenity space of neighbouring properties of 2 & 4 Dunloe Park. The omission of a sunlight/daylight analysis prohibits a fair assessment of potential impact of the development proposal which has a pitched roof and therefore higher than the previous design refused by An Bord Pleanala.

I note the submission from the residents of No 4 Dunloe Park in relation to potential overshadowing taken from the website [suncalc.org](http://suncalc.org). The alleged shadow lengths generated by the proposed development as shown by the observer at no. 4 do not identify on plan the impact of the development on the amenity areas of existing properties. As such, I consider that the images from the website [suncalc.org](http://suncalc.org) do not contain the appropriate level of information in order to examine the shadow impact on existing amenity areas.

- 8.5.4. However, owing to the high density nature of the development, I do consider that it is appropriate that a full sunlight/daylight shadow analysis of potential impact of the proposed extension on neighbouring properties be provided. Having regard to the level of detail supplied, I am not satisfied that the applicant has adequately

demonstrated that the proposed extension would not cause overshadowing into neighbouring properties. In my view, the applicant has not demonstrated that the proposal would not impact negatively on amenity of neighbouring properties, therefore the proposal as provided does not comply with objective DMJ 050 of the Meath County Development Plan.

#### 8.6. Other Matters

- 8.6.1. Observers on file have outlined concerns regarding the construction of the proposed development and associated impacts on noise and construction safety. Noting the quantity of development proposed, I consider that where the Board are minded to grant permission, I recommend a permission for the inclusion of a construction and environmental management plan to be submitted by way of condition.

##### 8.6.1. Water Framework Directive

I have assessed the proposed development for the construction of an extension on zoned lands at Dunloe Park, Navan Co Meath 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 a surface water

- 8.6.2. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The limited nature of construction on brownfield lands and number of best practice standard measures that will be employed to prevent groundwater and surface water pollution from the site.
- The brownfield nature of the development

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.

## 9.0 AA Screening

I have considered the proposed development for a domestic extension in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located in a backland site in a suburb of Bray, Co. Wicklow and is approximately 0.6km overland from the nearest European Sites which is River Boyne and River Blackwater SPA (Site Code 004232) ~ 1.27Km to the east and River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (Site Code 002299) ~ 1.27Km to the east

The proposed development comprises a two storey extension to the rear of existing dwelling house in an urban area. 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 it could not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small-scale nature of the development and the nature of the works proposed.
- The location of the site and its distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.

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

## 10.0 Recommendation

I Recommend that planning permission be refused for the following reason:

## 11.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the pattern of development in the area and the scale of development proposed, it is considered that the proposed extension, by reason of its scale, bulk and proximity to site boundaries, would seriously injure the

residential amenities of adjoining properties and would be contrary to DM OBJ 50 of the Meath County Development Plan 2021 -2027 by reason of visual obtrusion and overbearance. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Furthermore, in the absence of sunlight/daylight shadow analysis of potential impact of the proposed extension on rear amenity space of neighbouring properties, it is considered that it has not been adequately demonstrated that the proposal will not result in significant negative impact on amenity of neighbouring properties. Therefore, the proposal would seriously injure the residential amenities of the existing and future occupants of nos 2 & 4 Dunloe Park. As such, the proposal would contravene Objective DM OBJ 50 of the Meath County Development Plan which seeks to ensure avoidance of undue overshadowing of private open space and would therefore be contrary the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 12.0 Conditions

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.

---

Darragh Ryan  
Planning Inspector

1<sup>st</sup> July 2025

### Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	322233-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Construction of an extension
<b>Development Address</b>	3 Dunloe Park, Windtown, Navan, Co. Meath, C15VX5C
	<b>In all cases check box /or leave blank</b>
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>  (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.  <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 150px; width: 100%;"></div>
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.  <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	Class 10(b) Infrastructure Projects
<input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>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?</b>	
<input 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><b>No Screening required.</b></p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p><b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b></p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p><b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b></p>	<p>Appropriate thresholds in accordance with Class 10(b): -</p> <p>Class 10(b)(i) – more than 500 dwelling units.</p> <p>Class 10(b)(iv) – urban development in an area greater than 10ha.</p>

<p><b>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)?</b></p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b></p> <p><i><b>[Delete if not relevant]</b></i></p>

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

## Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

<b>Case Reference</b>	322233-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Construction of an extension
<b>Development Address</b>	3 Dunloe Park, Windtown, Navan, Co. Meath, C15VX5C
<b>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</b>	
<b>Characteristics of proposed development</b>  (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	The area is exclusively residential. There would be no construction impacts beyond that for the construction of a single dwelling.
<b>Location of development</b>  (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	The site is located at a distance removed from any water body. The site is 1.25km from nearest European site. There is no likely significant effect on any European site as a result of the proposed development.
<b>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</b>  (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	The site is located within a brownfield site within an sub-urban environment. There is no concern in relations to a cumulative or transboundary effect owing to nature and size of the proposed development which is located on a limited site.

Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA <i>[Delete if not relevant]</i>
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	

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

DP/ADP: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)