



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-322348-25

Development	Use as habitable accommodation
Location	Rear of No.20 Victoria Road, Terenure, Dublin 6
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1190/25
Applicant	Brian Sugrue
Type of Application	Retention permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse retention permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant	Brian Sugrue
Observers	None
Date of Site Inspection	14 July 2025
Inspector	B. Wyse

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. Victoria Road in Terenure is a mature residential street comprising mainly terraces of Victorian redbrick houses. No.20 is the second last house at the western end of the terrace along the northern side of the road. The rear garden of No.20 is somewhat unusual in that it is L-shaped, wrapping around the curtilage of the neighbouring house, No.19. The structure the subject of this appeal is located in the northwest corner of the garden. A lane runs along the side of No.19 and provides access to the rear of No.s 19-24 (6 houses) and to the subject structure. There is a gate at the end of the lane that appears to be a rear access to adjacent school grounds (Stratford College). On the day of inspection the gate at the entrance to the lane had been removed. The lane is quite narrow and of varying width and is somewhat overgrown. It does not appear to be in use for vehicular traffic.
- 1.2. The site as outlined in red on the application drawings has a stated area of 74.25 sqm and corresponds largely to the footprint of the subject structure. Though the site layout plan refers to the site area as 726.3sqm this area actually refers to the entire property at No.20, that is the main house and all associated gardens, including the subject structure, all outlined in blue. The application form refers to the site area as 0.072has (720sqm) (Q.11) and the gross floor space of the subject structure as 74.25sqm (Q.12).
- 1.3. The drawings indicate the subject structure as a single storey house. It has a kitchen/living room, two other rooms and a WC/bathroom. Though part of the structure has the appearance of having been a double garage, opening onto the lane, the steel doors have the appearance of being permanently closed and the front door of the house opens from the east elevation into an enclosed the garden area. This garden area is enclosed along its eastern side (the rear garden of No.20) by c.2m high timber panel fencing and along its southern side by the common boundary with the rear garden of No.19, comprising a wall and timber fencing to a height of c.2m and some trees/hedging. The lane frontage (western side) is defined by high hedging and includes a pedestrian gate access. The application drawings make no reference to the enclosed garden area or the fencing that separates it from the rear garden of No.20 or the pedestrian gate onto the lane.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The application is for the retention of the use of the structure for habitable accommodation only. There are no works involved.
- 2.2. Question 15 on the application form indicates that the pre-existing use of the structure was as a studio and garage and that the use to be retained is as a two bedroom dwelling.
- 2.3. The application included the following documentation:
- Planning Report – this refers to the development as the retention of the structure as a habitable mews dwelling.
 - Civil Planning Report (Water, drainage etc.)
 - Transport Statement
 - Flood Risk assessment
 - Swept Path Analysis Drawing (indicating access arrangements for fire and refuse trucks)

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The decision to refuse permission cites the following reasons:

1. Having regard to the restricted nature of the lane to accommodate vehicular traffic, and the fact that access for emergency vehicles and general servicing needs have not been adequately demonstrated, it is considered that the retention of the mews dwelling would be contrary to the aims and objectives of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, Chapter 15.13.4 and Appendix 5, Section 2.4 and Section 4.3.8 of in terms of the width of the laneway and the provision of safe access and egress for all vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists. The retention of the mews dwelling would create an undesirable precedent for similar type development and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The proposed provision of a separate unit of residential accommodation with no designated private open space would be contrary to the standards set out in Section 15.11 and 15.13.5.1 of the current Dublin City Development Plan (2022-2028) and in the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage) (2024). The proposal, in itself and in the precedent it would set in this regard, would result in substandard development which would be seriously injurious to the residential amenities of future occupiers and to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. The proposed subdivision of the site would result in windows to habitable rooms facing directly into the rear garden of the main dwelling at No. 20 Victoria Road, creating an unsatisfactory relationship between occupiers of the new dwelling and the main dwelling, with lack of privacy as a result of overlooking between the two dwellings. The proposal, in itself and in the precedent it would set in this regard, would therefore be seriously injurious to the residential amenities of occupants of the existing and proposed dwellings, and to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

Basis for planning authority decision. Includes:

- The previous use of the two adjoining structures is not stated; however, the northern structure would appear to have previously been a double garage or shed. The southern structure has the appearance of a single storey house with a pitched roof and a number of windows. It is not clear when this structure was constructed or whether planning permission was ever granted.*
- No details are given in relation to the current occupancy of the unit. From the drawings it may be interpreted as comprising a self-contained dwelling, which would include sleeping accommodation.*

- *Having regard to the location in a rear garden, the standards set out in the development plan for backland housing would therefore apply.*
- *The applicant's submission refers to the structure as a mews development and cites examples of permissions granted for mews development in the general vicinity of the site.*
- *A mews dwelling is generally a separate self-contained dwelling which is accessed independently of the main house.*
- *Pedestrian access to the proposed residential unit is via the rear garden of No. 20. No pedestrian access is shown in the elevation fronting the side laneway or the rear laneway.*
- *The structure which is the subject of this application has a stated floor area of 74.25m². Based on the figures submitted, the proposal provides for a plot ratio in excess of 1.0 and site coverage in excess of 100%. The drawings show that the unit to be retained occupies the entire site area.*
- *The lane is not an established mews lane and there does not appear to be any other independent residential structures on the lane.*
- *The stated floor area complies with the minimum floor area requirement of 60m² for a single storey two-bedroomed three-person house as set out in the 2007 Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Guidelines. It is noted that the dwelling as shown on the floor plans would appear to have a floor area of c.50m² which is smaller than the stated area. This discrepancy would need to be addressed in the event of permission being considered.*
- *The proposal provides for an aggregate living area of 22m² and aggregate bedroom area of 21.7m² in the event of the two unlabelled rooms being used as bedrooms. The 22m² living area is below the 28m² required in the 2007 guidelines and is marginally below the aggregate living area required for a one-bedroomed house. In the event of permission being considered, no more than one bedroom should be permitted.*
- *No private open space is proposed. A two-bedroomed house would require a minimum of 30m² of private open space under the 2024 Compact Settlement guidelines, while a one-bedroomed house would require 20m².*

- *There is concern that the proposed provision of access via the rear garden of No. 20 would result in an unsatisfactory relationship between the two dwellings.*
- *No details of refuse storage independent of the main house have been submitted.*
- *In the event of permission being considered, access could potentially be provided from the laneway. However, the laneway is a private gated laneway with no footpaths and would therefore be unsatisfactory as the sole means of independent pedestrian access to the proposed residential unit.*
- *There are also concerns in relation to the lack of separation between the structure as an independent residential unit and the rear garden of the existing house at No. 20. In addition to the main pedestrian entrance there are several windows on the boundary, including three windows to the kitchen/living room and two high level windows to the two other main rooms. This would also result in an unsatisfactory relationship between the two dwellings, with mutual overlooking.*
- *The high level windows would not provide for an acceptable standard of residential amenity in the event of the two rooms being used as bedrooms.*
- *No car parking is shown to the proposed dwelling. This is justified by the applicant on the basis of the proximity to a number of bus routes in the general area.*
- *No details are given in relation to cycle parking or access for refuse or servicing vehicles.*
- *No requirement for appropriate assessment or environmental impact assessment screening or environmental impact assessment.*

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

3.2.3. Transportation Planning Division. Includes:

- *The Development Plan 2022-2028, Section 15.13.5.4 outlines access requirements for mews dwellings, and requires adequate accessibility in terms of private vehicular movements, emergency and refuse vehicles. All mews lanes will be considered to be shared surfaces, and footpaths need not*

necessarily be provided. Furthermore, Section 4.3.8 of Appendix 5 in the Development Plan states that potential mews laneways must provide adequate accessibility in terms of private vehicular movements, emergency vehicles and refuse vehicles. A minimum carriageway of 4.8m in width (5.5m where no verges or footpaths are provided) is required. In circumstances where widths cannot be provided, safe access and egress for all vehicles and pedestrians must be demonstrated. An Access and Movement Strategy to justify that the proposed can be adequately served is required where access cannot be provided, Chapter 15, Table 15-1.

- Other than the subject site, the lane does not provide primary access to any dwellings. The lane is narrow, generally ranging in width from c. 2.5 to 3.0m, the width is 5.8m adjacent to the subject site is noted. There are no verges or footpaths. There are no turning facilities within the laneway. The main entrance of the mews dwelling, proposed for retention, is located c. 50m from the public road, i.e. the junction with Victoria Road. There is no public or private lighting on the laneway.*
- Limited details on vehicular access requirements have been provided or demonstrated, including servicing, deliveries, refuse and emergency.*
- The submitted Transport Statement includes Figure 8.1 which shows swept path analysis for both fire tender access and refuse collection; it is shown that refuse collection and fire tender access will be carried out from Victoria Road at the junction with the laneway. The Building Regulations, Technical Guidance Document B Volume 2 Dwellings House (TGD B Vol 2), Section 5.4.2 states that “for effective firefighting operations, fire brigade appliances should be able to get within 45m of the principal entrance to the dwelling”. The submitted swept path analysis shows the fire brigade access on Victoria Road, c. 50m from the main entrance of the dwelling, in excess of 45m. Fire tender access requires a width of 3.7m, therefore access is not possible via the laneway.*
- Other vehicular access requirements, such as servicing and deliveries, likely to be generated by the retention of the development would rely on the laneway for turning manoeuvring. However, as noted above there are no existing turning facilities within the laneway and safe access/egress cannot be*

demonstrated. As such, service and delivery proposals for mews developments within the laneway would generate reversing vehicles, both onto and from, Victoria Road. Reversing vehicles would not have line of sight of oncoming traffic, resulting in conflicts with pedestrians, cyclists and other vehicles at the Victoria Road junction, and creating a traffic hazard.

- The mews is proposed as a car free development. The Transport Statement notes the proximity to public transport, cycle routes and pedestrian facilities. This division notes the scale of the development, controlled parking in the vicinity, and proximity to amenities. A car free development would be considered acceptable in this instance.*
- The Transport Statement notes that bicycle parking will be provided within the back garden of no. 20 Victoria Road. As there is no private open space included within the redline boundary of the site, it is not clear to this division that cycle parking in no. 20 Victoria is a viable long-term solution. In the event further information is sought, clarification of the proposed private open space for the dwelling should be requested.*

3.2.4. Drainage Division – no objection.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Eireann – no response received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None.

4.0 Planning History

PA Ref. E0887/24 – this is an enforcement file in relation to the use of the structure as habitable accommodation.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028

Zoning: Objective Z2 - *to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.*

Section 5.11 House Developments

15.11.1 Floor areas

Houses shall comply with the principles and standards outlined in Section 5.3: 'Internal Layout and Space Provision' contained in the DEHLG 'Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities' (2007)

Section 15.13.5 Mews

Section 15.13.5.1 Design and Layout

Individual (mews) proposals..... will also be considered and assessed on a case by case basis.

Private open space shall be provided to the rear of the mews building to provide for adequate amenity space for both the original and proposed dwelling and shall be landscaped so as to provide for a quality residential environment.

The sensitive adaptive reuse of existing and new mews buildings for residential purposes will be encouraged and promoted.

Section 15.13.5.4 Access

Car free mews developments may be permitted in certain circumstances where there are specific site constraints and where alternative modes of transport are available. Each development will be assessed on a case by case basis.

Potential mews laneways must provide adequate accessibility in terms of private vehicular movements, emergency vehicles and refuse vehicles. Where access cannot be provided, an access and movement strategy must be provided to justify that the development can be adequately served. See Appendix 5 for further details.

All mews lanes will be considered to be shared surfaces, and footpaths need not necessarily be provided.

Appendix 5 Transport and Mobility: Technical Requirements

Section 4.3.8 Mews Parking

Potential mews laneways must provide adequate accessibility in terms of private vehicular movements, emergency vehicles and refuse vehicles. A minimum carriageway of 4.8m in width (5.5m where no verges or footpaths are provided) is required. In circumstances where these widths cannot be provided, safe access and egress for all vehicles and pedestrians must be demonstrated.

5.2. Relevant National Guidelines

Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities: Design Guidelines, Department of the Environment, Heritage, and Local Government, (2007)

Table 5.1 Space provision and room sizes for typical dwellings

For 2 bed/3 person one storey house indicates; target gross floor area 60sqm; minimum main living room 13sqm; aggregate living area 28sqm; aggregate bedroom area 20sqm; and storage 3sqm.

For 1 bed/2 person one storey house indicates; target gross floor area 44sqm; minimum main living room 11sqm; aggregate living area 23sqm; aggregate bedroom area 11sqm; and storage 2sqm.

Minimum area of single bedroom – 7.1sqm

Minimum area of double bedroom – 11.4sqm

Minimum area of main bedroom in dwelling designed for 3 or more persons – 13sqm

Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities, Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, (2024)

SPPR 2: minimum private open space for 2 bed house – 30sqm. For 1 bed house – 20sqm

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

None relevant.

6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

The proposed development does not come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA, that is, it does not comprise construction works, demolition or intervention in the natural surroundings. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 Water Framework Directive (WFD)

I have considered the proposed development in the light of the objectives of Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive, which seeks to protect and where necessary, restore surface and groundwater to reach good status and prevent deterioration. Having regard to the nature, comprising a change of use only, the small scale of the development and its location in a serviced urban area, I am satisfied that there is no conceivable risk to any water body from the proposed development. No further assessment is required.

8.0 The Appeal

8.1. Grounds of Appeal

The main grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- Access for emergency and general service vehicles has been adequately demonstrated. Reference the Swept Path Analysis and the Transport Statement submitted with the application.
- The development would not create an undesirable precedent as each case must be decided on its merits.
- There are no first floor windows within the development. The high level angled rooflight in the pitched roof of the east elevation would not cause any overlooking of the amenity space of No.20.
- The proposal ensures sufficient and high quality private open space for residents of the subject property and the existing house. An amended site layout plan is submitted illustrating a private garden space of 180sqm for the

mews dwelling, fully compliant with relevant standards. The area in question is delineated in blue.

- The development does not negatively impact the neighbouring structures and acts as an infill dwelling suitable to the sites context.
- The submission cites several precedents for mews developments in the general vicinity.

8.2. Planning Authority Response

Includes:

- The Board is requested to uphold the decision of the planning authority.
- If permission is granted then conditions relating to a development contribution, social housing and naming/numbering should be attached.

8.3. Observations

None.

9.0 Assessment

- 9.1. The main issues in this appeal are those referred to in the planning authority reasons for refusal and I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise.
- 9.2. It is noted that application in this instance is for the retention of the residential use only and that no works are involved. The question of permission for the existing structure, and its legal/planning status, is not before the Commission for consideration and there is no evidence before the Commission to suggest that it is unauthorised.
- 9.3. The planning authority reasons for refusal all refer to technical issues and no question as to the acceptability in principle of the residential use of the subject structure is raised. I do not see any basis for raising such an issue in the appeal either. I note that the applicants refer to the structure as a mews and I am satisfied that the standards set out in the development plan for mews dwellings are the appropriate standards to apply in this case (see Section 5.0 above). I also note that

the planning authority planners report refers to other issues in relation to floor areas and room sizes. Though not raised in the appeal, for completeness I include some comments on these.

9.4. The main issues in the appeal can be addressed under the following headings:

- Private Open Space
- Overlooking of Garden of No.20
- Emergency and General Service Access
- Other Issues

9.5. **Private Open Space**

9.5.1. This issue, referred to in the planning authority reason for refusal No.2, is effectively dealt with in the appeal grounds which details the private open space available to the mews dwelling. An area of 180sqm is indicated on a revised site layout plan. The area in question appears to correspond to the garden area as identified on the date of inspection (see Section 1.3 above) and which is now separated from the rear garden of No.20 by a timber panel fence and which appears to be of relatively recent construction. The area in question easily exceeds the relevant minimum standards (see Section 5.1 above). There is also ample private open space still remaining to serve the main dwelling.

9.5.2. Though somewhat unusual that the garden area was not included within the original application red line, its inclusion within the blue line, that is within the applicants ownership or control, means that a condition can be attached requiring the retention of this area as the dedicated private open space for the mews dwelling. In the event of a grant of permission I would recommend the attachment of such a condition.

9.6. **Overlooking of Garden of No.20**

9.6.1. It follows from 9.5 above that this issue, referred to in the planning authority reason for refusal No.3, is also effectively dealt with.

9.6.2. For clarity it should be noted that, contrary to the assertion in the planning authority planners report, there are no high level windows in the mews save for a rooflight. That report also failed to acknowledge the existence of the pedestrian gate from the

mews garden directly onto the lane so that access to the property is and can be independent of the main house. The confusion here was likely caused by the somewhat unusual presentation of the application as previously referred to.

9.7. Emergency and General Service Access

- 9.7.1. This is the issue referred to in the planning authority reason for refusal No.1. It is clearly based primarily on the report of the planning authority Transportation Planning Division. The focus here is on the inadequate width of the laneway and the absence on a turning facility for vehicles. As indicated the lane is generally narrow, ranging from c2.5m to 3.0m over most of its length. The area directly in front of the original garage doors is about 5.8m in width. These lane width dimensions are considerably less than those specified in the development plan which states that a minimum carriageway width of 4.8m, and 5.5m where no verges or footpaths are provided, is required. In circumstances where these widths cannot be provided, the report indicates, as per the development plan, that safe access and egress for all vehicles and pedestrians must be demonstrated. The report also refers to the main entrance to the mews dwelling being c.50m from the public road and that there is no public or private lighting on the lane.
- 9.7.2. In considering the Transport Statement submitted with the application the report specifically refers to the swept path analysis at Figure 8.1 which indicates that refuse collection and fire tender access would be carried out from Victoria Road at the lane access. It then proceeds to consider certain provisions of the Building Regulations in relation to firefighting appliances and which suggest that these should be able to get within 45m of the principal entrance to a dwelling.
- 9.7.3. The report also refers to other servicing and delivery vehicles having to reverse out of the lane and thereby causing a traffic hazard on exit onto Victoria Road.
- 9.7.4. In their grounds of appeal the applicants refer back to the Transport Statement submitted with the application. In particular the grounds refer to Figures 8.1 and 8.2 which demonstrate the swept path analysis for refuse trucks and emergency vehicles, including fire tenders. For both scenarios the vehicles would service the mews from Victoria Road and without entering the lane. Bins would be placed at a collection point at the lane entrance and emergency personnel would access the

house on foot. These proposals are stated to align with the requirements of Section 15.13.5.4 of the development plan.

- 9.7.5. By reference to the wording of the reason for refusal, and noting the access provisions at Section 15.13.5.4 of the development plan, it is clear that there is no issue in relation to safe access to the mews for pedestrians and cyclists and that a car free dwelling as proposed is acceptable. The core issue relates to service and emergency vehicles.
- 9.7.6. The proposals in relation to refuse collection, in my view, are reasonable and replicate arrangements in place across many developments in the city. Other service vehicles, delivery vehicles etc., are, in my view, likely to adopt the same approach as I think it most unlikely that such vehicles would be driven into this lane as it is quite obvious at the entrance that the lane is narrow.
- 9.7.7. This leaves the question of fire tender access. The planning authority Transportation Planning Division position on this is based on a provision of the Building Regulations. While these Regulations are separate to the planning code and outside the scope of this assessment or the Commission's decision in this case there is clearly an overlap that is relevant in planning terms. In this regard the only information before the Commission to demonstrate that the development can be adequately served by emergency vehicles, and as required by the development plan, is that provided in the report of the planning authority Transportation Planning Division. The grounds of appeal do not address the matter. They simply assert that the swept path analysis demonstrates compliance with the development plan provisions but without addressing the underlying reason why the planning authority came to its conclusion and which, as indicated, is based on a provision of the Building Regulations.
- 9.7.8. In the circumstances I consider that the planning authority reason for refusal No.1 should be upheld in so far as it refers to an inadequate demonstration of adequate servicing by emergency vehicles (fire tenders).

9.8. Other Issues

- 9.8.1. The planning authority planners report refers to a discrepancy between the stated overall floor area of the mews and the floor area as calculated from the drawings submitted. It also refers to issues in relation to room sizes and the standards indicated in the guidelines.

- 9.8.2. The application form indicates a gross floor area for the mews as 74.25sqm (see Section 1.2 above). However, approximating from the dimensioned floor plans submitted the gross floor area seems to be less than this, in the region of 66sqm. While more than the c.50sqm estimated in the planning authority planners report, this is a significant difference. It does still exceed the guideline target gross floor area of 60sqm for a 2 bed, single storey, 3 person house (see Section 5.2 above).
- 9.8.3. The drawings indicate a kitchen/living area of 22sqm, significantly less than the aggregate living area suggested in the guidelines of 28 sqm for a 2 bed house and slightly less than the 23sqm for a 1 bed house. The indicated bedroom areas align with the guidelines for a 2 bed house, with a slight shortfall for the main bedroom but an exceedance in relation to the second bedroom as a single room. There is, however, a difficulty in interpreting these dimensions accurately if the overall floor area of the mews is in fact significantly overstated. As suggested in the planning authority planners report these matters would need to be clarified in the event of a grant of permission being considered.
- 9.8.4. The planning authority reasons for refusal did not refer to these matters and the applicants did not address them in their grounds of appeal. Strictly speaking, therefore, they are new issues in the appeal. In the circumstances, I recommend that a note be attached to the Commission Order or Direction drawing attention to them.

10.0 Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening

- 10.1. The proposed development comprises the retention of the use of an existing small structure for habitable accommodation on an established suburban site where mains services are readily available.

No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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

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. Appropriate Assessment, therefore, is not required.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that permission be refused for the following reasons and considerations.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

The structure in relation to which permission is sought to retain its use for habitable accommodation is located on a narrow lane. Having regard to the relevant requirements for access to mews dwellings as set out in Section 15.13.5.4 and Appendix 5, Section 4.3.8 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, the Commission is not satisfied that it has been demonstrated that the development can be adequately served by emergency vehicles (fire tenders). The retention of the use of the structure for habitable accommodation would, therefore, 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.

B. Wyse
Planning Inspector

18 July 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of use for habitable accommodation
Development Address	Rear 20 Victoria Road, Terenure, Dublin 6
	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"/> X No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, 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 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 type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of	

<p>proposed road 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)</p>
<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: ____ **B. Wyse** **Date:** ____ **18 July 2025**

INTENTIONALLY BLANK