



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-322443-25

Development	House extension
Location	Mont La Verna, 35 Bantry Road, Drumcondra, Dublin 9
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1275/25
Applicants	Joanne and Derek Mowlds
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission subject to conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party v. decision
Appellants	Catriona Mckeown and Thomas Mc Dermott
Observers	Margaret O'Connor and Kevin Hogan
Date of Site Inspection	30 July 2025
Inspector	B. Wyse

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. No.35 is a mid-terrace house on the western side of Bantry Road in the established inner suburb of Drumcondra. A particular feature of these properties is the very long rear garden. There is an existing single storey extension to the rear of the house. The property also appears to have access to a rear lane.
- 1.2. The adjoining house to the north, No.37 (the appellants), has a part two storey/part single storey rear extension. The adjoining house to the south, No.33 (the Observers) has a single storey rear extension.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises a part two storey/part single storey extension to the rear, an attic conversion and associated site works.
- 2.2. The two storey element actually comprises an upper floor extension over part of the existing single storey extension, and extending further to the rear, with the bulk of the existing extension being removed. A courtyard (and lightwell) would be created. The single storey element would extend beyond this further into the garden and spanning the full width of the garden. At ground level the extension would provide additional kitchen/dining/living space. At first floor level the extension would provide for a bedroom and ensuite.
- 2.3. The attic conversion would provide for a bedroom and ensuite. It includes a rear facing dormer structure.
- 2.4. The application documentation includes a Project Design Statement.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The decision to grant permission is subject to 11 conditions, mostly standard.

Condition 3 requires the depth of the first floor flat roof extension to be reduced to a maximum of 4.2m in order to protect the residential amenities of adjoining properties.

Condition 6 disallows the use of the flat roof as a balcony, terrace or private amenity area in the interest of neighbouring residential amenity.

Condition 7 states that the attic shall not be used for human habitation unless it complies with building regulations in order to provide for an adequate standard of development.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

Basis for planning authority decision. Includes:

- *The planning authority would consider there to be a loss of daylight to the existing bedroom window at first floor of the main dwelling with the provision of the first floor rear extension.*
- *Considering the neighbouring properties and relevant precedence for first floor rear extensions the internal depth of c.6m for the proposed rear extension at first floor level is considered excessive and would likely lead to overbearing and/or loss of daylight to the adjoining properties of No. 33 and No. 37. It is noted that a first floor extension providing a depth of c. 4.2m was permitted under web1011/21 at the adjoining property of No.37 Bantry Road. Another permitted first floor extension at 11 Bantry Road was restricted to a depth of 3.5m under 2100/16. Given the permitted first floor extension to the adjoining property at No. 37 and the depth of other permitted extensions in the vicinity it is considered reasonable to reduce the depth of the subject first floor rear extension to a similar depth of 4.2m. This can be achieved by way of condition.*
- *The submitted drawings show a floor to ceiling height of c.2.4m of the dormer extension, making this subject to non-habitable space only. The attic space is to be adequately lit by a proposed rear dormer window facing the rear garden space and a new rooflight positioned on the main pitched roof.*
- No requirement for appropriate assessment or environmental impact assessment or screening for same.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Division – no objection subject to standard conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Eireann – no report received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Two submissions received. Similar issues raised to those in the grounds of appeal and observer submission to the Commission – see Section 8.0 below.

4.0 Planning History

None in relation to the subject property.

PA Ref. WEB1011/21

This is a 2021 permission for development that included a part two storey/part single storey rear extension to No.37 Bantry Road (the adjoining house to the north and that of the appellants). The planning report on this case indicates that the two storey element has a depth of 4.2m with the bay window increasing this to 5.3m and that the single storey element extends to 8.3m. It is not stated if these measurements are internal or external. This development has been completed.

PA Ref. WEB2100/16, ABP Ref. 29N.246381

This is a 2016 permission for development that included a part two storey/part single storey rear extension to No.11 Bantry Road (a short distance to the south of the subject property). Condition 3 of the PA decision, restricting the depth of the first floor extension to 3.5m (external), was amended on appeal by the Board to a reduction in depth by 1m from the originally proposed 6m (external measurements) – so that the extension was permitted to a depth of 5m (external). In arriving at its decision the Board had regard to the existing character and pattern of development in the vicinity and the configuration of the rear of the existing dwelling vis a vis the neighbouring dwellings.

The Commission will note that this corrects the information in relation to this case as presented in the planning authority planning report (Section 3.2.1 above).

5.0 Policy Context

Development Plan

Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028

Appendix 18: Ancillary residential Accommodation

Section 1.0 Residential Extensions – includes:

.....this section sets out a number of general principles that should be addressed in all cases and which will be applied by the planning authority in assessing applications for permission. The guidelines should be interpreted in the context of the development plan Core Strategy, which promotes a compact city, sustainable neighbourhoods and areas where a wide range of families can live.

Section 1.1 General Design Principles – includes:

The design of residential extensions should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties and in particular, the need for light and privacy. In addition, the form of the existing building should be respected, and the development should integrate with the existing building through the use of similar or contrasting materials and finishes.

Innovative, contemporary design will be encouraged. A contemporary or modern approach, providing unique designs, can offer a more imaginative solution. However, such proposals are still required to take account of the design issues outlined in this document.

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*

Section 1.2 Extensions to Rear – includes:

Ground floor rear extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining. The extension should match or complement the main house.

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*

Section 1.4 Privacy and Amenity – includes:

Extensions should not result in any significant loss of privacy to the residents of adjoining properties. Generally, windows overlooking adjoining properties (such as in a side wall) should be avoided.

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.

Section 1.6 Daylight and Sunlight – includes:

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. Consideration should be given to the proportion of extensions, height and design of roofs as well as taking account of the position of windows including rooms they serve to adjacent or adjoining dwellings.

5.1. Natural Heritage Designations

None relevant.

6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

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. 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, small scale and location of the proposed development 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 appeal is lodged on behalf of Joanne and Derek Mowlds, 37 Bantry Road, the adjoining house to the north. The main grounds can be summarised as follows:

- The planning authority condition restricting the depth of the first floor extension to 4.2m is accepted as is the approval of the attic dormer extension.
- The appeal is in relation to the impacts of the proposed ground floor extension on the residential and visual amenities of the appellants home.
- The ground floor extension does not comply with development plan standards, specifically Appendix 18, Sections 1.1, 1.2, 1.4 and 1.6.
- The proposed extension, which includes the removal of the existing extensions, would project 12.5m from the original rear boundary wall of the

house. This is an increase of between 8m and 9.3m over the current extensions.

- The ground floor extension to No.37 projects 7.5m from the original boundary wall, with bay window set back from the side boundaries. The extension contains the primary living space of the house with a patio located immediately outside and steps up to the garden from the patio. The party boundary between the properties comprises a 900mm blockwork wall with a concrete capping. The appellants erected a timber screen approximately 1.8m high for several metres along its length.
- The proposed extension would extend 5m beyond the appellants extension. There would be a 3.35m high blank wall along the southern boundary of their patio. This would give rise to overshadowing of the patio area and diminish light penetration to the primary living space during Autumn, Winter and Spring when the sun's angle is low. Sketch drawings illustrating the impacts included.
- There would be a significant adverse impact on the outlook from the primary living space of No.37.
- The length of the proposed extension is excessive relative to the scale of the original house (just 7.5m front to back) and the scale of surrounding extensions (typically 6.5m to 7.5m deep). The length is further exacerbated by the 0.5m overhang to the end that serves no purpose in terms of shading. The extension would be disproportionate in scale to the existing house.
- Ground levels indicated on the drawings suggest that the effective height of the extension relative to the appellants patio could be as much as 4m.
- The parapet height may have to be raised to properly accommodate the structural elements of the proposed green roof.
- There is a lack of effort to mitigate the impact of the extension by, for example, sloping away from each boundary, stepping the roof in the centre portion or selecting a more modest ceiling height. The extension would extend the full width of the property for the full 12.5m of its length.

- The proposed extension should be altered by condition to a depth of 7.5m (external) with the possibility of an additional bay window set off the party boundaries.
- A condition should also control the height of the extension relative to the ground floor of the existing house

8.2. Observation

This is submitted on behalf of Margaret O'Connor and Kevin Hogan, No.33 Bantry Road, the adjoining house to the south. Includes:

- Share concerns raised by appellants.
- The ground floor extension would project approximately 6m past the observers extension resulting in an overbearing blank façade directly on the boundary with an adverse impact on their residential amenity and outlook from their primary living space.
- A similar extension to the adjoining house to the south (No.31) would give rise to a tunnel effect to the observers house.
- Stepping back from the boundary and a reduced eaves height could have minimised the impact on neighbouring properties.
- Queries in relation to parapet height (sufficiency for proposed green roof) and ground levels that might give rise to a greater height than that stated.
- In relation to the proposed first floor extension endorsement of the planning authority condition 3.
- Endorsement of planning authority decision as modified by conditions suggested by the appellants. Alternatively permission should be refused.

8.3. Applicant Response

Includes:

- A shadow study that indicates that the proposed development (original proposal) does not significantly affect the daylight of sunlight received by No.37.

- The study shows minimal increase in shadow but no reductions in daylight or sunlight.
- Section 15.11 of the development plan indicates that guidance and standards in relation to residential extensions etc. are contained in Appendix 18.
- Section 1.2 of the Appendix refers to the considerations for ground floor extensions.
- Section 1.4, in relation to loss of privacy and effects on amenities of neighbouring properties, refers to 'significant' and 'unacceptable' effects implying that some effects can be acceptable.
- Section 1.6 also includes reference to a recognition that in the city some degree of overshadowing is inevitable and unavoidable.
- The proposed extension complies with development plan standards and will not have any adverse effect on the amenity of no.37.
- The proposed extension would only extend 5.5m beyond that of No.37.
- The extension at No.37 extends along the boundary with No.39 for 7.5m, thus having a greater impact on that property.
- The flat roof design maintains as low a roof as possible. While a pitched roof may have resulted in a slightly lower height along the boundary (about 300mm) it would have resulted in a significantly higher roof overall with greater overshadowing and loss of light.
- It is standard practice for ground floor extensions to be within 100mm of boundary walls.
- The extension does not have any windows affording new views not already available from the existing house.
- The Commission is requested to omit Condition 3 as attached to the planning authority decision. The impact on the neighbouring dwellings is negligible while the impact on the extension would be significant.
- An exempted development ground floor extension could be built with similar impact on neighbouring dwellings.

- There is nothing significant about neighbours having to live with a blank wall of a neighbouring extension. The portion of wall visible to them is not overly high or long.

8.4. Planning Authority Response

The Commission is requested to uphold the planning authority decision.

8.5. Appellants Response to Applicants Appeal Response

Includes:

- No.39 has a single storey extension to the rear and is part of the next terrace, separated from No.37 by a 2m gap and 1m between extensions.
- The reference to 'standard', in relation to the placement of the proposed extension within 100mm of the boundary, is not correct in this instance.
- A critique of the applicants shadow study which shows its findings to be incorrect.
- Similarly the assertion that the first floor extension would have no impact on daylight or sunlight has not been proven.

8.6. Observers Response to Applicants Appeal response

This essentially repeats the arguments previously made.

9.0 Assessment

- 9.1. The main issues in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal (and noting the similar issues raised in the observer submission) and the applicants response and I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise. The issues can be dealt with under a single heading:

- Residential Amenity

9.2. Residential Amenity

- 9.2.1. The issues raised relate to the potential impact of the proposed part two storey/part single storey rear extension on the residential amenities of the neighbouring

properties, No.s 37 and 33 Bantry Road. The amenity issues focus on overshadowing and outlook or overbearance. There is also the suggestion that the proposed extension is disproportionate to the scale of the existing house and to extensions in the vicinity and a query is raised in relation to finished height levels. The applicants appeal response includes a submission that the planning authority condition 3, restricting the depth of the first floor element of the extension to 4.2m, be omitted.

- 9.2.2. This assessment firstly considers the extension as originally proposed before then considering the issue of condition 3.
- 9.2.3. It is useful in this instance to firstly clarify a few key external dimensions. As indicated the proposed extension is part two storey/part single storey. The two storey or first floor element would extend approximately 6.2m from the rear wall of the house. It would be approximately 4.3m wide, extending across about three quarters the width of the house. The flat roof (parapet) height would be just over 8m, cutting into the house roof above eaves level. The single storey or ground floor element would extend approximately 12.5m from the rear wall of the house. The bulk of this extension extends across the full width of the garden. The flat roof (parapet) height would be 3.35m. In relation to the latter the section drawings clearly indicate the extension maintaining the existing floor levels within the house so I do not see any basis to the concerns raised about the actual finished height.
- 9.2.4. The appellants at No.37 indicate that their extension, at ground floor level, extends 7.5m. By reference to the planning permission (Section 4.0 above) the bay window appears to push the total length out to at least 8.3m. The first floor element of the extension appears to extend to at least 4.2m with the bay window pushing this out to about 5.3m. The extension extends across the full width of the house and includes a pitched roof profile. The single storey extension at No.33 appears to extend to just over 6m from the rear wall of the house alongside the party boundary with No.35. It extends the full width of the house and includes a part mono-pitch roof and parapet wall to the party boundary.
- 9.2.5. I do not consider that there is any basis to the argument that the proposed extension would be disproportionate in scale either in relation to the existing house or to existing extensions in the vicinity. While the original houses were modest in scale the

large plot sizes afford a considerable development potential that has clearly been recognised in several instances to date and where extensions added are often substantial.

- 9.2.6. In relation to the issue of overshadowing the appellants (No.37) contest the impact from the ground floor element of the extension and also endorse the planning authority condition 3 restricting the depth of the first floor element to 4.2m. No.37 is immediately due north of the subject property so some element of overshadowing can be expected.
- 9.2.7. It is accepted that the shadow studies submitted by both sides are schematic in nature but this is sufficient, in my view, for small scale developments. In combination the studies provide a reasonable approximation of the likely effects from the proposed development on No.37. In relation to the ground floor extension it is clear that the concern relates only to the winter period – there is agreement that any effects during summer, if any, would be negligible. Given the westerly orientation of the rear gardens the critical period is the early afternoon during winter.
- 9.2.8. Looking at the appellants two submissions, which taken together consider both ground and vertical planes for the winter solstice (December 21st) and the ground plane for the equinoxes (21st March and 21st September), I consider, contrary to the assertions made, that they demonstrate that the extent of overshadowing likely to arise would not be unduly severe.
- 9.2.9. It appears that, at the winter solstice, the worst case period, there would only a slight increase in the ground area of shadowing compared to the existing situation that arises from the current boundary wall/fence at 1.8m in height. The vertical plane analysis illustrates the corresponding change likely to occur, also during this worst case period. While the impact here may appear more severe a number of other factors need to be taken into account. Firstly, the period in question is mid-winter. It is relatively short-lived and the impacts either side would be less severe. Secondly, significant shadowing would only occur during periods of sunshine whereas winter time in Ireland is characterised by long periods of extensive cloud cover. Thirdly, the extent of the effects as demonstrated are not dissimilar to those that might be expected to arise from the erection of fencing or the planting of trees or hedging in a neighbours garden. Fourthly, it is the case that development plan guidelines explicitly

acknowledge that in an urban environment some degree of overshadowing is to be expected when properties are extended (Section 5.0 above).

- 9.2.10. While the shadow analyses presented focus on the ground floor extension there is no indication that the first floor element would give rise to overshadowing concerns.
- 9.2.11. Given that No.33 is located to the south of the subject property no overshadowing concerns arise in relation to it.
- 9.2.12. In relation to the issue of outlook or overbearance I agree with the applicants position. While it may not be a matter of standard practice there is nothing unusual about extensions built up to party boundaries. The proposed height of the single storey element of 3.35m to parapet level is not excessive, in my view. Noting the concerns raised that the roof structure may not be sufficient to accommodate the proposed green infrastructure, any planning permission granted would apply only to the height as stated in the application. Nor do I consider the extent of the extension beyond the neighbouring extensions to be excessive. Boundary hedging or tree/shrub planting could have a very similar structural effect or, alternatively, could be used to assimilate the structure into the surroundings.
- 9.2.13. In relation to the first floor element of the extension I do not accept that this would have any excessive outlook or overbearing impact on No.33. As indicated the latter has been extended at ground floor level across the full width of the house. The effect of this is to successfully mitigate any impact arising from the proposed first floor extension. Any effect arising would be confined to first floor level above the roofs of the ground floor level extension.
- 9.2.14. It follows from the above that I do not consider that there is a sound basis to the planning authority condition 3, restricting the depth of the first floor element of the extension to 4.2m. It is not stated if this refers to an internal or external measurement. By reference to the planning authority planning report I consider it reasonable to assume it refers to an internal measurement so that the corresponding external dimension would be about 4.5m. I agree with the applicants that the reduction in depth, amounting to about 1.7m (6.2m to 4.5m), would have a negligible impact in terms of the neighbouring properties but that it would have a very significant effect on the proposed bedroom accommodation. The extension would project just a small distance further than the first floor extension of No.37 (about 1m

beyond the bay window) and it would project a similar distance to the ground floor extension of No.33. Furthermore, as noted above, The Boards 2016 grant of permission under PA Ref. WEB2100/16, ABP Ref. 29N.246381, in relation to 11 Bantry Road, restricted the first floor extension to a depth of 5m and not the 3.5m stated in the planning authority planning report. In arriving at that decision the Board took account of the prevailing character and configuration of neighbouring dwellings. In other words it properly took account of the particular circumstances in that case and which is also the approach I am recommending here.

- 9.2.15. In conclusion, I consider that the proposed development has been designed in compliance with relevant development plan guidelines, that it would not have any undue impact on neighbouring properties and that the planning authority condition 3 is not warranted.

10.0 Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening

- 10.1. Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project within an established urban area, and taking account of the screening determination of the planning authority, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.
- 10.2. 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 granted subject to conditions.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the guidelines as set out at Section 1.0, Residential Extensions, Appendix 18 to the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, it is considered that the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of residential

properties in the vicinity and that the planning authority condition 3 is not warranted. The proposed development 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 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 existing dwelling and the proposed extension shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit and the extension shall not be used, sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.</p> <p>Reason: To restrict the use of the extension in the interest of residential amenity</p>
3.	<p>No part of the flat roof shall be used as a balcony, terrace or private amenity area.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.</p>
4.	<p>The attic space shall not be used for human habitation unless it complies with the Building Regulations.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure an adequate standard of development.</p>
5.	<p>All external finishes shall harmonise with the existing finishes of the house in respect of materials and colour.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>

6.	<p>Surface water drainage arrangements shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such services and works.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</p>
7.	<p>The developer shall prevent any mud, dirt, debris or other building material from being carried onto or placed on the public road as a result of the construction works and shall repair any damage to the public road arising from the works.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and amenity.</p>
8.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 0700 and 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 and 1400 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.</p>
9.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000. The contribution shall be paid prior to the commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to the Board to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000 that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.</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.

B. Wyse

Planning Inspector

5 August 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	
Proposed Development Summary	Domestic extension
Development Address	
	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"/> X 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.	State the Class here
<input type="checkbox"/> X 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"/> X 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>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X</p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____**B. Wyse** **Date:** ____**5 August 2025**

INTENTIONALLY BLANK