



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-322437-25

Development

Conversion of attic to bedroom/storage with an increased ridge height of 430mm to 5530mm, dormer extension to rear, 2 No. proposed velux windows to the front of the dwelling, removal of ground level rear window, 1 no. opaque window to rear.

Location

28 Daniel Street, Portobello, Dublin 8,
D08 X7DD

Planning Authority

Dublin City Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

WEB2301/24

Applicant(s)

Niall Vaughan

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant(s)

Lesley & Declan Carolan

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

11th July 2025

Inspector

Barry Diamond

Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	4
2.0	Proposed Development.....	4
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0	Planning History	7
5.0	Policy Context.....	8
6.0	EIA Screening.....	10
7.0	The Appeal.....	10
8.0	Assessment.....	12
9.0	AA Screening.....	16
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	16
11.0	Recommendation	17
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	18
13.0	Conditions	18

Appendix 1 –EIA Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site comprises a small single storey cottage which sits within a terraced row of similar style dwellings to the western side of Daniel Street. The existing dwelling is finished in render and has a natural slate finish to the roof with an overall ridge height of 5.1 metres. The building has a compact footprint of 34.2m² metres with the floor layout indicating an existing layout for a livingroom, kitchen, bedroom, W/C and a small external yard.
- 1.2. The surrounding area is defined by similar residential terraces along Daniel Street and Harty Place which form a compacted looped cul-de-sac off Cranbrasill Street. There is further residential development located to the rear of the site along Janeville.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises a number of different elements:
 - An increase in the ridge height of the dwelling by 430mm to 5530mm;
 - The creation of a first floor dormer extension to the rear to form a bedroom/storage to include 1 no. opaque window to the rear;
 - The inclusion of 2 No. skylight windows to the front of the dwelling; and
 - The removal of ground level rear window.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On the 10th April 2025 the Planning Authority decided to grant planning permission subject to conditions.

3.1.1. Conditions

- 3.1.2. The attic space hereby permitted shall not be used for human habitation unless it complies with current Building Regulations.
Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

- 3.1.3. This condition is considered within the assessment and is not considered necessary as building regulations are evaluated under a separate legal code and does not need to concern the Commission for the purposes of the appeal.
- 3.1.4. The extension roof shall not be used as a balcony or external seating area.
Reason: To protect the amenities and privacy of adjoining residents.
- 3.1.5. This condition seeks to restrict the use of a flat roof to the rear of the building at first floor level. While it requires more precise wording the condition is necessary to prevent overlooking of an adjoining neighbouring property.
- 3.1.6. The trellis screen shall be set within the site boundary.
Reason: in the interests of orderly development and residential amenity
- 3.1.7. This condition is not required as the trellis screen is not considered necessary.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning Reports
- 3.2.2. The decision of the planner reflects the need for amendments during the processing of the application and the decision to grant planning permission. It includes the following points:
- The current proposal differs from the previous refusal on the site (WEB 1414/24) as it has been reduced to one rear facing bedroom window;
 - Other rear facing dormer windows have been approved at Nos. 23 and 43 Daniel Street;
 - The existing dwelling at 28 Daniel Street is very small in size and the additional bedroom would improve the standard of residential amenity;
 - There is no coherent ridge line in the area anymore and a number of properties have seen an increase in ridge levels;
 - The proposed ground floor extension is small in scale and, in itself, is not considered to result in any undue adverse impacts on neighbouring amenities;
 - The addition of a skylight window in the flat roof to allow for natural light penetration, combined with the frosted glass and trellis with climbing plants is considered acceptable in the context of the existing constrained footprint of the dwelling; and

- The trellis should not cause adverse impact on the amenity of the rear garden area of No. 1 Janeville when considered in the context of this inner urban location.

3.2.3. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Division: no objection subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- Uisce Éireann– No response.
- National Transport Authority – No response.
- Transport Infrastructure Ireland - The proposed development falls within an area set out in a Section 49 Levy scheme for Light Rail. If the above application is successful and not exempt, as a condition of the grant please include for the Section 49 Contribution Scheme Levy.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1 The First Party to the appeal who owns a dwelling to the rear of the appeal site (No. 1 Janeville) raised three observations during the processing of the planning application which are attached to the file. I consider that some of the issues raised in their submissions to the Commission correlate with the issues raised, however, the additional issues raised in the observations to the Planning Authority are as follows:

- The drawings indicate a balcony area which would impinge on the privacy of No. 1 Janeville;
- The current drawings are too vague;
- Double patio doors should not be constructed;
- A similar proposal at 21 Daniel Street was refused permission by the Planning Authority and An Bord Pleanála;
- The site plan map is not accurate and fails to properly reflect ownership boundaries resulting in the site notice not being accurate;
- The existing dwelling on the appeal site has a window built into the boundary wall shared with No. 1 Janeville which needs to be removed;

- The boundary wall between the appeal site and No. 1 Janeville is cracking and it is alleged that this is due to No. 28 Daniel Street being built right up to the wall;
- The attic space should not be used for human habitation unless it complies with building regulations;
- The drainage needs to comply with the Greater Dublin Code of Practice for drainage works;
- Any heating vents, extraction fans need to be located inside the final site boundary;
- Construction activities should only be undertaken between 7am to 6pm on Mon-Fri, 8am to 2pm on Saturdays and no works on a Sunday.
- The proposed development needs to comply with Z1 zoning objective and the provisions of Appendix 18 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028;
- The proposed development needs to comply with the various criteria in Appendix 17 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022;
- The rear window is too close to the private amenity areas of No. 1 Janeville resulting in a loss of privacy and overlooking; and
- The proposed trellis may be encroaching on the shared boundary with No. 1 Janeville.

3.4.2 Any observations which were of a similar nature or form part of the appeal observations have not been replicated in this section.

4.0 Planning History

4.1 Site

4.1.1 WEB 1414/24: Permission refused for the conversion of attic to bedroom/storage with an increased ridge height of 430mm to 5530mm, dormer extension to rear, three velux windows to front and associated site works. The reason for refusal was as follows:

'Having regard to the proximity, size, and extent of glazing on the rear first floor dormer extension, it is considered that this would lead to significant overlooking and

loss of privacy to the adjoining property at number 1 Janeville, which would seriously injure their residential and visual amenities. The proposed development would not, therefore, be in accordance with the Z1 zoning objective pertaining to the site which seeks to protect, provide and improve residential amenities, would fail to comply with the provisions, as set out in Appendix 18 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 in respect of residential extensions, and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.'

4.2 Setting

- 4.2.1 2156/21: Permission granted for the retention of a dormer to existing rear roof, with a section of the ridge line increased in height to accommodate dormer with ancillary works at 26 Daniel Street.
- 4.2.2 2252/15: Permission granted for the erection of a new two storey flat roofed extension at rear, internal renovations to the existing cottage, extension of the front roof profile at ridge level, provision of an escape rooflight to the front roof profile & ancillary works to the existing dwelling at 23 Daniel Street.
- 4.2.3 WEB1982/22: Permission refused for the refurbishment of existing ground floor cottage and an additional new two-storey rear extension to include raising the ridge of the pitched roof to provide a first floor bedroom with velux roof lights to the front and rear at 21 Daniel Street.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1 The Dublin City Development Plan, 2022-2028 identifies that the site is located within an area zoned 'Z1 – Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods'. The relevant zoning objective is 'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities'.
- 5.1.2 Chapter 5 of the Development Plan deals with the matter of quality housing and sustainable neighbourhoods while Chapter 15 sets out Development Standards.
- 5.1.3 Appendix 18 – Ancillary Residential Accommodation

1.1 General Design Principles

Applications for extensions to existing residential units should:

- Not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling.

- Not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, outlook and access to daylight and sunlight.
- Achieve a high quality of design.
- Make a positive contribution to the streetscape (front extensions).

1.2 Extensions to Rear First floor

Rear extensions will be considered on their merits, noting that they can have potential for negative impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties, and will only be permitted where the Planning Authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities. In determining applications for first floor extensions the following factors will be considered:

- Overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking - along with proximity, height, and length along mutual boundaries.
- Remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability.
- Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries.
- External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing.

1.4 Privacy and Amenity

It is important to make sure that any extension does not unacceptably affect the amenities of neighbouring properties. This includes privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight. It is advisable to discuss proposals with neighbours prior to submitting a planning application.

1.5 Separation Distances

In cases where the back or gable of one dwelling faces onto the rear of another a certain degree of separation is required to avoid an overbearing impact. The requirement for 22 metre separation in such cases may not be applicable and reductions may be acceptable subject to a high design standard with particular regard to the inter-relationship between buildings. Extensions should not dominate or appear overbearing when viewed from adjoining properties.

1.6 Daylight and Sunlight

Large single or two-storey rear extensions to semi-detached or terraced dwellings can, if they project too far from the main rear elevation, result in a loss of daylight to neighbouring houses. Furthermore, depending on orientation, such extensions can

have a serious impact on the amount of sunlight received by adjoining properties. On the other hand, it is also recognised that the city is an urban context and some degree of overshadowing is inevitable and unavoidable.

Section 4.0 of Appendix 18 deals with the matter of alterations at roof level.

Section 5.0 of Appendix 18 deals with the matter of dormer extensions.

- 5.1.4 There are no conservation objectives related to the site or the immediate surroundings.

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines (where relevant

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

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

None relevant to this site.

6.0 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. 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 my report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The First Party’s ground of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The increase in ridge height and massing of the building will disrupt the cohesive appearance of the existing terrace and the conservation value of the neighbourhood;
- Overdevelopment of the site resulting in an adverse effect on the visual amenity of the streetscape;

- Overlooking from the rear dormer window onto the residential property to the rear;
- The proposal will set an unwelcome precedent for the area;
- The details of the trellis screen are vague and therefore how it will mitigate overlooking is unclear;
- Insufficient description of development lacking enforceable design specifications or a maintenance plan;
- Dormer window is disproportionate to the scale of windows on the remainder of the property; and
- Lack of enforcement regarding works to a nearby property which were allegedly carried out without the grant of planning permission.

7.2. **Applicant Response**

A submission was made by O'Neill O'Reilly & Associates on behalf of the applicant which raises the following points:

- The proposal is a modest intervention which retains the form of the house and preserves the character of Daniel Street;
- The rear facing window has been designed to mitigate any impacts of overlooking through obscure glazing, while the timber trellis with climbing vegetation will prevent any perception of overbearing or intrusion;
- The roof lights will allow natural light to penetrate the proposed first floor bedroom;
- The increase in ridge height of 430mm is subtle and proportionate and the rear dormer is visually subordinate to the existing roof profile;
- The current application is substantively different from that which was refused under WEB1414/24;
- There is no damaging precedent; and
- The site notice was correctly published and any issue with boundary ownership are civil matters which lie outside planning legislation.

7.3. **Planning Authority Response**

- None

7.4. **Observations**

None

7.5. **Further Responses**

None

8.0 **Assessment**

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

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Residential Amenity
- Detail of the plans
- Other Matters

82 **Principle of Development**

8.2.1 The proposed development comprises a rear extension and alterations to the ridge height of the dwelling, including a rear first floor dormer window which is acceptable in principle at this location, which is within the Z1 'Sustainable Residential Neighbourhood' zoning objective.

8.2.2 I note that the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 is supportive of residential extensions. In this regard Section 1.1 'General Design Principles' of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 acknowledges that such developments play an important part in promoting a compact city as well as facilitating sustainable neighbourhoods where a wide variety of families can reside.

8.3 Design

- 8.3.1 The roofline of a building can be one of its most dominant features and needs careful consideration. Normally, rear extensions should be subordinate to the existing dwelling and should not extend beyond the roofline, however, this aspect needs to be balanced against the circumstances of the individual proposal on a case-by-case basis.
- 8.3.2 Firstly, the appeal building, like many of the other dwellings along Daniel Street and Harty Place have a compact footprint with little opportunity to incorporate rear extensions given the lack of rear amenity space. In such circumstances the only opportunity to provide modern living accommodation is to develop upwards and several properties in the area have had increases to their ridge lines including two properties either side of the appeal building (Nos. 26 & 30).
- 8.3.3 While Daniel Street did not have a unified ridge line, there was undoubtedly a consistency across terraces of dwellings which was intermittently interrupted by a stepped change in height due to a slight rise in the topography of the street from west to east. Over the years, the roof line along Daniel Street, on both sides has been interrupted with several increases in ridge height in order to accommodate modernisation of the dwellings.
- 8.3.4 While rear extensions should normally be subordinate, I consider that the proposed increase in ridge height would be necessary to accommodate additional living accommodation given the compact footprint of the dwelling and there would be no detrimental impact to the character of Daniel Street given the other similar extensions evident in the streetscape. The impact of such an extension in terms of impact on nearby properties needs to be assessed.
- 8.3.5 There are no external changes to the front elevation of the appeal building, however, there are two small roof lights proposed on the roof plane fronting onto Daniel Street which provide natural light into the proposed stairwell and a storeroom. The rooflights are not common in the streetscape, however, they do not dilute the character of the area and are considered acceptable.
- 8.3.6 A window is proposed in the rear elevation of the first floor which does not read with any other windows on the property and therefore does not disrupt the appearance of the building. An existing ground floor window is to be removed as part of the proposal and a further roof light is proposed on the first floor rear dormer extension.

While this rooflight has a higher degree of elevation, its set back from the ridge line would mean that it will not be readily visible.

8.3.7 During the processing of the application, amended plans were submitted to address concerns raised by the Council about the initial proposal. The amended plans which are those subject to the appeal do not show the existing chimney to the dwelling which it shares with No. 27. The chimney stacks are one of the unifying features of the character of the area. As the removal of the chimney is not within the description of development, it is assumed that this is an omission, however, a condition should be attached to ensure its retention.

8.3.8 I consider that the design of the proposed development is acceptable as it will not adversely affect the character of the building or that of the surrounding area.

8.4 **Residential Amenity**

8.4.1 There have been several observations on the impact of the first floor rear dormer extension on No. 1 Janeville which is located to the rear of the appeal building. The appeal building backs onto the garden of No.1 Janeville which has a sizeable amenity space. The proposed dormer window will increase the height of the appeal building by 430mm, however, the rear dormer is setback from the boundary by approximately 3.8 metres. In addition, the rear dormer is facing southeast limiting any impacts of overshadowing on the rear of No. 1 Janeville. I consider that the rear dormer would have no significant impact in terms of overshadowing, dominance or overbearing.

8.4.2 The rear facing window on the dormer is described as being in two parts, one part is fixed and finished in opaque glazing and other is top hung and finished in opaque glazing. As the window is necessary as a fire escape it must be capable of being opened to comply with building regulations. During the course of the application the Planning Authority raised concerns with overlooking and as a result the applicant submitted amended plans showing a vertical trellis with climbing plants to obscure views along with any perception of overlooking.

8.4.3 I concur with the observer to the appeal that there is little detail on the landscaping associated with the trellis and how it will be maintained making it difficult to enforce. The appeal building faces in a southeastern direction which has an oblique view of the western facing elevation of No. 1 Janeville. While a view of the windows would

be possible they are not directly opposing and the oblique view would not allow any significant view into any of the rooms in the observers property.

8.4.4 I consider that if the window was hung from the right hand side when viewed from within the bedroom it would further restrict any views of the windows of No. 1 Janeville. While views would be achievable of the rear amenity space, some element of overlooking in the urban environment is normally unavoidable. In addition, bedrooms are normally a low habitation room meaning that the potential for overlooking of the private amenity area is not significant.

8.4.5 I am of the view that the condition to erect the trellis imposed by the Planning Authority is not necessary and a condition to alter how the window should be hung would mitigate the concerns of overlooking. A condition, that the second frame of the window is fixed and that all glazing in the rear facing window to be opaque glazing meets the necessary tests for imposing a condition.

8.4.6 I am of the view that the proposal will not adversely affect the residential amenity of the nearby residential properties.

8.5 Detail of the plans

8.5.1 I have concurred with the observer that the details of the proposed trellis are vague, however, I consider that the trellis is an unnecessary addition to the proposed scheme. While the observer raised concerns with the accuracy of the site location plan as it failed to accurately reflect additions to their property, I consider that map base layers are only periodically updated, a site inspection has been carried out and the position of the neighbouring buildings is understood. A matter was raised with the accuracy of the site notice which was linked to the ownership of the boundary wall and alleged cracking in the wall, however, any issue of ownership or damage to another persons property is a civil matter outside the scope and jurisdiction of this appeal. Overall, I am of the opinion that the detail in the plans is sufficient.

8.6 Other Matters

8.6.1 The observer raised concerns with the flat roof over the ground floor being used as a balcony and the Planning Authority imposed a condition restricting its use. I concur that such a condition is necessary, the appeal building has extremely limited external amenity space and it may be attractive to utilise this area. It is considered that the use of this area as an external amenity area should be prohibited by way of a

condition otherwise it could lead to overlooking and affect the private amenity of No. 1 Janeville.

- 8.6.2 In addition, there are no patio doors proposed, the ground floor rear window is shown to be removed and therefore I do not need to address these matters. Reference was made to Appendix 17 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 which has been superseded and is no longer material. The drainage for the scheme is to be addressed through condition.
- 8.6.3 The Planning Authority imposed a condition that the first floor should not be occupied until it complies with the Building Regulations. The issue of compliance with Building Regulations will be evaluated under a separate legal code and does not need to concern the Commission for the purposes of the appeal.
- 8.6.4 The previous appeal at 21 Daniel Street and the previous refusal of a first floor dormer window on the appeal building were raised as reasons to refuse the current proposal. Each case is assessed on its own merits and I consider that the current proposal is acceptable subject to the conditions listed below.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1 I have considered the house extension in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located at 28 Daniel Street, Portobello, Dublin 8, D08 X7DD no relevant designated sites are close by.
- 9.2 The proposed development comprises extensions and alterations to an existing dwelling. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Small scale and nature of the development
- Distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.

- 9.3 I conclude that 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 (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1 The subject site is located at 28 Daniel Street, Portobello, Dublin 8 which is located 0.28km from the nearest known watercourse. The proposed development comprises extensions and alterations to an existing dwelling. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

10.2 I have assessed the proposed extension and alterations to the existing dwelling and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seeks to protect and where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status) and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Small scale and nature of the development
- Distance from nearest water bodies and lack of hydrological connections.

10.3 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.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. That planning permission be granted for the reasons and considerations set out below and subject to the conditions set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 12.1 Having regard to the design, appearance of the proposed extension and conversion, and the pattern of development in the vicinity, I consider that, subject to compliance with conditions below, the development proposed would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area or residential amenities of property in the vicinity and would not adversely impact on the character of the area. The proposed development, therefore, would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the Planning Authority on the 18th day of February 2025 and the 18th day of March 2025, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The flat roof area over the ground floor shall not be used as a balcony or external seating area.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the amenities and privacy of adjoining residents</p>
3.	<p>The split window to the first floor rear window shall be one part non-opening and the other shall be side hung from the right hand side when viewed from within the bedroom. All glazing on the window will be manufactured opaque or frosted glass and shall be permanently maintained. The application of film to the surface of clear glass is not acceptable.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.</p>
4.	<p>The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.</p>

	Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interests of sustainable drainage.
5.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Friday inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
6.	<p>The chimney stack on the dwelling which is shared with No. 27 Daniel Street shall be retained.</p> <p>Reason: In order to preserve the character of the area.</p>

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.

Barry Diamond
Planning Inspector

17 July 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP – 322437-25
Proposed Development Summary	Conversion of attic to bedroom/storage with an increased ridge height of 430mm to 5530mm, dormer extension to rear, 2 No. proposed velux windows to the front of the dwelling, removal of ground level rear window, 1 no. opaque window to rear.
Development Address	28 Daniel Street, Portobello, Dublin 8, D08 X7DD
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a project for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, “Project” means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a ‘Project’. Proceed to Q2. <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <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.	
<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	An extension to an individual dwelling is not a class of development specified in Schedule 5.

<p>in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of 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>

Inspector: _____

Date: _____