



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-322505-25

Development	Outline permission for a house and associated site works.
Location	Woodtown, Castlebellingham, Co Louth
Planning Authority	Louth County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560115
Applicant(s)	Aidan Shaw / Amy Sheelan
Type of Application	Outline Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party V Refusal
Appellant(s)	Aidan Shaw / Amy Sheelan
Observer(s)	None on file
Date of Site Inspection	5/8/24
Inspector	Ronan Murphy

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located in Woodtown, Castlebellingham, a rural area approximately 5.4km to the north-west of the town centre of Castlebellingham County Louth. The appeal site is accessed from the R-166 which is a two-way regional level road.
- 1.2. The site has a stated area of c. 0.202 ha and is irregular in shape. The appeal site is located on the north-western side of a larger agricultural field currently used for tillage.
- 1.3. The northern boundary comprises of a roadside hedgerow which consists of a mixture of species. The north-eastern and eastern boundary comprises of hedgerow separating the appeal site from their family home. The southwestern and southeastern boundaries are currently undefined.
- 1.4. In terms of topography, the appeal site is generally flat which a slight slope towards the south-west / north-west.
- 1.5. While the area is predominantly rural in nature, there are a number of dwellings along the R166, including to the immediate north-west of the site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. This application seeks outline permission for the following:
 - A dwelling.
 - A Klargestar BioFicient +1 Gravity Sewerage Treatment Plant and Soil Polishing Filter.
 - New vehicle access.
 - All associated site works.
- 2.2. As this is an application for outline planning permission, no details of the design of the proposed house have provided.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1 By order dated 17 April 2005 the Planning Authority decided to refuse outline planning permission for 1 reason as set out below:

1. The proposed development, by reason of the excessive removal of significant sections of roadside ditch and mature native hedgerow to facilitate the access and to provide for sightlines, would result in an obtrusive feature, would be unduly dominant in the rural landscape and would detract from the rural character and visual amenity of the area. Such development would militate against the preservation of the rural environment, would set an undesirable precedent for other such development in the vicinity and would be contrary to the policies HOU 42, HOU 47 and Section 13.9.14 (Access) of the Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027, as varied. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1 There is one planning report on file, dated 17th April 2025. The area planner notes that the appeal site is with Rural Policy Zone 2 (RPZ2) and is in an 'area under strong urban influence' and that there is a need to manage the development of rural housing in the open countryside by requiring applicants to demonstrate compliance with Local Needs Qualifying Criteria. The area planner is satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated a rural housing need.

3.2.2 With respect to the vehicle entrance, the area planner outlines concern with respect to the removal of roadside boundary hedging to facilitate the sightlines associated with the vehicular entrance to the land. The area planner considers that the removal of the hedgerow would have a significant and unwelcome visual impact on the landscape and the visual amenity of the area contrary to Section 13.9.4 of the *Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027*.

3.2.3 The area planner also outlined concerns that the removal of the hedgerow to the front of the site would expose the site and adjoining lands and would mean that any dwelling on site would not sensitively integrate into the landscape and would not comply with

Section 13.9.4 and policies HOU 43 and HOU 47 of the *Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027*.

3.2.1. Other Technical Reports

Physical Development Section: Report dated 4/4/25 requesting further information with respect to traffic hazard concerns with regard to the visibility from the vehicular entrance having regard to the bend in the road.

Environmental Section: Report dated 28/3/25 outlining no objection, subject to condition.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1 No reports on file.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1 No observations on file.

4.0 Planning History

Appeal Site

4.1 There is no planning history associated with the appeal site.

Surrounding area

4.2 **Reg. Ref. 20109.** Application for development to demolish an existing single storey detached house & construct new 1.5 storey detached replacement house incorporating a number of existing walls, install a wastewater treatment system with percolation area & all associated site works. Permission granted, subject to conditions.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1 The *Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027* is the operative plan for the area. The proposed development site is located within a rural area under strong urban influence (Rural Policy Zone 2). Relevant LCDP policies include:

HOU 41: to manage the development of rural housing in the open countryside by requiring applicants to demonstrate compliance with qualifying criteria relative to the rural policy zone set out in tables 3.4 and 3.5.

HOU 42: to manage the development of rural housing in the open countryside by requiring that any new or replacement dwelling is appropriately designed and located so it integrates into the local landscape and does not negatively impact or erode the rural character of the area in which it would be located.

HOU 47: requires all applications for one off rural housing to comply with the standards and criteria set out in section 13.9 of Chapter 13 “Development Management Guidelines Housing in the Countryside”. Sections 13.9.8 and 13.9.9 provide guidance in relation to house design and design, detailing and material finishes, respectively.

Section 13.16.17: Entrances and Sightlines table 13.13 and figure 13.1.

ENV38: Which seeks to retain and protect significant stands of existing trees/hedgerows/woodlands, and seek increased planting of native trees, where appropriate, in new developments

ENV 39: which seeks to protect and preserve existing hedgerows particularly species rich roadside townland boundary hedgerows where their removal is necessary during the course of road works or other works seek their replacement with new hedgerows of native species indigenous to the area.

IU16, IU17, IU18 relating to wastewater treatment system and water supply.

IU19 relating to surface water drainage.

Other Relevant Planning Policy:

5.2 National Planning Framework (2040)-First Revision April 2025

5.2.1 National Policy Objective (NPO) 28 states it is an objective to ensure, in providing for the development of rural housing, that a distinction is made between areas under urban influence, i.e., within the commuter catchment of cities and large towns and centres of employment, and elsewhere.

- In rural areas under urban influence, facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on the core consideration of demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area and siting and design criteria for rural housing

in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements.

5.3 Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) - Eastern and Midland Regional Assembly (EMRA)

5.3.1 Regional Policy Objective (RPO) 4.80 states that 'local authorities shall manage urban generated growth in Rural Areas Under Strong Urban Influence (i.e. the commuter catchment of Dublin, large towns and centres of employment) and Stronger Rural Areas by ensuring that in these areas the provision of single houses in the open countryside is based on the core consideration of demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area, and compliance with statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements.

5.4 Section 28 Guidelines

5.4.1 Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2005

5.4.2 The subject site is located within an 'Area under Strong Urban Influence' as identified in Map 1: Indicative Outline of the NSS rural area types in the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2005. The Guidelines note that in these areas the objective should be on the one hand to facilitate the housing requirements of the rural community, as identified by the Planning Authority in the light of local conditions, while on the other hand directing urban generated development to areas zoned for new housing development in cities, towns and villages in the development plan.

5.4.3 EPA Code of Practice Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems, population equivalent of less than 10, 2021.

5.4.3.1 This document provides guidance on the site characterization, design, operation, and maintenance of domestic wastewater treatment systems.

5.5 Natural Heritage Designations

5.5.1 There are no European designated sites within the immediate vicinity of the site. The nearest designated sites are the Stabannan-Braganstown SPA (Site Code: 004091), approximately 2.1 km to the southeast and the Dundalk Bay SAC (Site Code 000455) and Dundalk Bay SPA (Site Code 004026) located c. 6.4km to the east of the site.

5.5.2 In addition to this, the Stabannan-Braganstown pNHA is located c. 998m to the south-east of the site and the Dundalk Bay pNHA is located c.6.2km to the east of the site.

5.5.3 There is no connection to any European (Natura 2000) sites and no pathways.

5.6 EIA Screening

5.6.1 I refer the Board to the completed Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendix 1. Having regard to the nature, size, and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations, I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, therefore, is not required.

5.7 EU Water Framework Directive.

5.7.1 The purpose of the EU Water Framework Directive is an initiative aimed at improving water quality throughout the European Union. The Directive was adopted in 2000 and requires governments to take a new approach to managing all their waters; rivers, canals, lakes, reservoirs, groundwater, protected areas (including wetlands and other water dependent ecosystems), estuaries (transitional) and coastal waters.

5.7.2 An Coimisiún Pleanála and other statutory authorities cannot grant development consent where a proposed development would give rise to a reduction in water quality.

5.7.3 The subject site adjoins the Glyde_070 River Waterbody IE_NB_06G021230. In proximity to the appeal site, this waterbody is classified as moderate ecological status. This is illustrated on the EPA mapping (<https://gis.epa.ie/EPAMaps/agriculture>).

5.7.4 I have assessed the application for a dwelling, wastewater facility and associated site works for which outline permission is sought and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

5.7.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale and nature of the development; and
- The adequate treatment of wastewater with the site.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1 A third-party appeal has been received from Aidan Shaw; the grounds of appeal are summarised below:

- There are 31 houses on the R166 for 1km due east of the N52 and the proposed bungalow would not create a blot on the landscape or a planning precedent.
- The only obstacle to planning permission is the removal of the hedging to achieve the required sightline of 125m.
- Only a small section of the hedge requires removal.
- The hedge in question comprises of a 30m of the hedge was destroyed by way of a burning bale and an unused gate, a 30m stretch in close proximity to the family home comprising of ivy, wild periwinkle, and brambles and a 40m stretch in the middle which includes of various hedging and has a reasonable appearance.
- The hedge is in such a poor state that the landowner intends to replace it at the end of the nesting season. The new hedge should complement the Whitethorn hedge on the opposite side of the R166.
- The site map submitted with the application erroneously shows the site entrance next to the family home and a new entrance (shown in photos) is proposed c.30 to the east of the location shown in the site map submitted with the application.
- This stretch of the R166 in question is 280m of roadway with a slight bow which is favourable, and the apex of the bow is where the proposed the site entrance. The site map erroneously shows the entrance next to the entrance to the family home. This entrance would not be able to achieve a 125m sightline.

- The only thing which interrupts the proposed sightlines are the mishmash hedge, the gate piers of the family home and some overhanging tree branches.
- The report of the Physical Development Section of Louth County Council dated 4th April recommends that clarification be sought regarding the removal of hedging, this would appear to have been ignored, and a refusal decision issued summarily.
- This decision to refuse permission lacks proportionality and to give priority to a habitat of low intrinsic value which can be replaced with something more appealing over a family of four is wholly unreasonable.
- Living next door to the parent's house will give great benefit to the security of elderly parents.
- Given the current housing crisis, government policy on housing, lack of any significant impact to the environment, connection to the area, permission is sought.
- Any conditions relating to the replacement of the hedge and upkeep of new hedge will be complied with.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- 6.2.1 Letter dated 5/6/25 notes that the appellant states that the site layout plan erroneously shows the site entrance next to the family home and that this position would not satisfy the 125m sightline condition. The appellant states that the correct intended entrance will be somewhere 25-30m east of the location shown on the site layout plan and sightlines can be achieved to the north-west with only minor works.
- 6.2.2 The appellant incorrectly identifies the sightline terminating on the opposite side of the R166 to the north-west. The sightline should terminate on the nearside of the road. This would have a significant impact on the scale of works required.
- 6.2.3 The Planning Authority contends that the proposed entrance shown on the site layout plans was not an error and that the relocation is an attempt to deal with fundamental issues in relation to the excessive removal of significant sections of roadside ditch and mature native hedgerow to facilitate access and to provide for sightlines.

6.2.4 A revised site layout plan has not been provided. If the site access point was relocated to the east, it would have the following consequences: a) the entrance and driveway would impact on indicated surface water drainage proposals for the development and b) the 125m sightline would still require an excessive removal of significant sections of roadside ditch and mature native hedgerow.

6.3. **Observations**

6.3.1 No observations on file.

6.4. **Further Responses**

6.4.1 By letter dated 27/6/25 the appellant responded to the Planning Authority letter of 5/6/25. The appellant refutes any suggestion that they deliberately mislead the Coimisiún with respect to the location of the intended entrance to the proposed property.

6.4.2 It was always the appellants intention that the entrance would be to the extreme east of the site to maximise the sightline in both directions.

6.4.3 The Planning Authority correctly reduces the issue to the necessity to remove an existing hedgerow and ditch to give the necessary sightlines to the proposed development. The Planning Authority does not contend that the hedgerow or ditch have any special status or ecological value other than that they are established.

6.4.4 The Planning Authority has not engaged in any conditions relating to restoring the hedgerow. These concerns could be mitigated by way of conditions and such a binary approach appears overly rigid.

6.4.5 At no stage was there any intention to mislead or be disingenuous with the Planning Authority with respect to sightlines.

6.4.6 Planning Law and development plans should be favourably interpreted to allow a development to proceed where possible. This should apply more now given the dearth of houses available in the county. There are concerns with respect to the priorities of the Planning Authority.

6.4.7 The appellant states that they will abide by any conditions relating to the reinstatement and maintenance of the hedgerow in the event that the development is permitted.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. Having examined the appeal details and all other documentation on file, including submissions / observations, the reports of the local authority and inspected the site, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development / Compliance with Rural Housing Policy
- Vehicular Access / Hedgerow removal
- Wastewater Management
- Flooding
- Appropriate Assessment

7.2. **Principle of development / Compliance with Rural Housing Policy**

7.2.1 The appeal site is within a rural area. Map 3.2 of the *Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027* identifies that the land is within the Rural Policy Zone 2 which identifies that the land is an Area under strong urban influence.

7.2.1 The Rural Generated Housing Need for areas Rural Policy Zone 2 as set out in Table 3.5 of the *Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027* includes 8 classes of rural generated housing need under which applications for one-off rural housing can be made and sets out criteria which apply to each. The applicant would fall under criteria 4 (A person who is seeking to build their first house in the area and has a demonstrable economic or social requirement to live in that area).

7.2.2 The application includes detailed information including letters from St. Jospeh's GFC, the Parish Priest for Darver, Dundalk Institute of Technology. In addition to this the applicant has provided birth certificate, driving license, tax certs, bank statements letters, car insurance and other forms of personal information.

7.2.3 Based on the information submitted, I consider that the appellant has a long-standing existing tie to the rural area and has demonstrated they have resided in the area for a minimum of 18 years as required by criteria 4 of Table 3.5 of the *Louth County*

Development Plan 2021-2027. I am satisfied that the applicant has a genuine housing need.

7.3 Siting and Design

- 7.3.1 The design guidelines as set out in Section 13.9.8 of the *Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027* require that the design, scale, and form of a dwelling (and any associated garage or outbuildings) shall be sensitive to the landscape in which it is located. In addition to this, contemporary buildings, finished and designed appropriately, will be considered if it can be demonstrated the development would integrate into and make a positive contribution to the local landscape.
- 7.3.2 I note that there is no specific landscape protection or protected views for this area outlined in the *Louth County Development Plan 2021-2017*. In addition to this, there are a number of modern one-off dwellings along the R166, including the applicant's family home to the north-west of the site. I am satisfied that the proposed dwelling would not be out of character with the area.
- 7.3.3 While this is an application for outline permission, the site plan submitted with the application does provide some detail with respect to the location and floor heights of the proposed dwelling. The proposed dwelling would be set back 17m from the roadside and c.19m from the dwelling to the northwest of the site. The plans also show that the finished floor height of the proposed dwelling is 19.0m which is c.2m lower than the dwelling to the north. The plans do not detail where the proposed dwelling would be a single storey or dormer dwelling. In my opinion the most appropriate design type for the site would be either a single storey or dormer style dwelling as this would be appropriately sensitive to the landscape of the area as required by Section 13.9.8 of the *Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027*. This matter could be dealt with by way of condition, should the Coimisiún be of a mind to grant outline permission. Overall, I am satisfied that the appeal site could accommodate a dwelling, subject to detailed design.

7.4 Vehicular Access / Hedgerow removal

- 7.4.1 The reason for refusal states that, as a result of the excessive removal of significant sections of roadside ditch and mature native hedgerows to facilitate access and sightlines would result in an obtrusive feature which would be unduly dominant in the rural landscape and would detract from the rural character of the area and would be

contrary to the policies HOU 42, HOU 47 and Section 13.9.14 (Access) of the *Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027*.

- 7.4.1 I have considered all the documentation associated with this appeal and it is clear that there is a certain level of confusion regarding the location of the vehicle access to the site. I make the Coimisiún aware that I do not doubt the bone fides of the third party with respect to an error being made relating to the location of the vehicular entrance. However, this is a fundamental matter, and I intend to evaluate the proposal on the basis of the vehicular entrance as applied for in the initial application.
- 7.4.2 If the Coimisiún wish to consider a relocated vehicular entrance, then I would recommend that a Section 132 notice is issued seeking further information with respect to the location of the new vehicular entrance and information relating to how the new entrance would achieve the appropriate sightlines. This further information would then be required to be circulated to all parties and would require new public notices.
- 7.4.3 The proposal as lodged seeks to remove a large amount of hedgerow to facilitate the proposed vehicular access to the site. A hedgerow of c.192m is proposed to be removed from the front of the site and from the adjacent dwellings to the northwest and southeast, as shown on Drawing No. 4116-OPP-3.0.
- 7.4.4 I note Policy ENV 38 and 39 of the *Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027* requires the retention and protection of significant stands of trees/ hedgerow, particularly rich roadside boundary hedgerows.
- 7.4.5 I have considered all the drawings and information submitted with this application and I believe the applicant has not clearly demonstrated the full extent of boundary treatment necessary to be removed from the sites to the north-west and south-east of the appeal site required to accommodate the required sightlines. In this regard I do not consider the full visual impact can be assessed.
- 7.4.6 Notwithstanding this, I have concerns that the cumulative impact of the removal of a large amount of hedgerow along the road will cause a significant negative visual impact on the surrounding area, will impact in the rural character of the area and lead to an unnecessary loss of biodiversity. The proposal would therefore fail to achieve compliance with policies ENV 38 and ENV 39 of the *Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027*. This matter could not be dealt with by way of condition and refusal is recommended on this basis.

- 7.4.7 It may be the case that the appeal site could be accessed via a shared access arrangement with the existing family dwelling to the north-west of the site. In my opinion, this would reduce the need to remove any hedgerow and would ensure that the visual impact on the surrounding area is reduced. However, this matter could not be dealt with by way of condition in this case, as the existing access is outside the application area identified on the site location plan submitted with this application.
- 7.4.8 Having considered the foregoing, while there maybe options for an appropriate vehicular entrance to the site, the entrance proposed as part of the initial application requires the removal of a large section of roadside hedgerows which form part of the rural character of the area and provide visual amenity for the area. The proposal would fail to achieve compliance with policies ENV 38 and ENV 39 of the *Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027* and therefore refusal is recommended.

7.5 Wastewater Management

- 7.5.1 In relation to the domestic waste, I note Policy IU 16 requires the undertaking of a site characterisation by a competent person and Policy IU 18 of the development plan requires all private wastewater treatment systems for individual houses to comply with the recommendations contained in the EPA CoP (2021). The proposed dwelling would be served by a Klargestar BioFicient Treatment Plant and Soil Polishing Filter.
- 7.5.2 I refer the Bord to the Site Characterisation Form which was submitted to the Local Authority. This shows that the percolation tests carried out on site suggests that the soils and subsoils inherent on the site have adequate percolation and infiltration qualities to accommodate a secondary system and soil polishing filter.
- 7.5.3 The form shows that subsoil is TLPSsS-Till derived from Lower Palaeozoic sandstone and shales with no bedrock encountered and no groundwater encountered up to 2.1m. The percolation tests yielded a sub-surface T value of 3.17 this would comply with the standards set out in the EPA Code of Practice: Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10) 2021.
- 7.5.4 The site Characteristics Form details that minimum separation distances will be met and exceeded in all instances. In addition to this, water would be supplied by way of a connection to public water.

7.5.5 Having reviewed the Geological Survey Ireland's GIS Mapping, I note that the proposed wastewater treatment system has been sited over a Poor Aquifer - Bedrock which is Generally Unproductive except for Local Zones with a high vulnerability. Having regard to the soil depth and the secondary treatment, as shown in the Site Characterisation Form, I am satisfied that the effluent will be suitably treated before reaching the aquifer.

7.5.6 Therefore, I am satisfied that wastewater treatment would comply with the EPA Code of Practice: Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10) 2021.

7.6 Flooding

7.6.1 have consulted the flood mapping system (www.floodinfo.ie) and I note that the subject land is within Flood Zone 'C'.

7.6.2 Having considered all the foregoing; I consider the proposed development would not result increase the risk of flood either within the site itself or the surrounding area. The proposal is acceptable from a flood risk perspective.

8 AA Screening

8.1 I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The application is for outline permission for a dwelling and associated wastewater treatment facility and associated works located within a rural area of County Louth.

8.2 There are no European designated sites within the immediate vicinity of the site. The nearest designated sites are the Stabannan-Braganstown SPA (Site Code: 004091), approximately 2.1 km to the southeast and the Dundalk Bay SAC (Site Code 000455) and Dundalk Bay SPA (Site Code 004026) located c. 6.4km to the east of the site.

8.3 In addition to this, the Stabannan-Braganstown pNHA is located c. 998m to the south-east of the site and the Dundalk Bay pNHA is located c.6.2km to the east of the site.

8.4 There is no hydrological link between the subject site and the European sites.

8.5 Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

8.6 This determination is based on:

- Small scale and domestic nature of the development
- Distance from European sites.
- No hydrological connections to the European sites.

8.5 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.

8.6 Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

7 Recommendation

7.1 I recommend that planning permission be refused.

8 Reasons and Considerations

1. It is the policy (ENV 38 and 39) of the *Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027* to seek to retain and protect significant stands of existing trees/hedgerows/woodlands and protect and preserve existing hedgerows in new developments. The achievement of the required sightlines will require the removal of a large section of mature hedgerow along the public road. This hedgerow forms part of the rural character of the area and provides visual amenity. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal would contravene the policy of the *Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027* and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Ronan Murphy
Planning Inspector

15 August 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-322505-25
Proposed Development Summary	Outline permission for a house and associated site works.
Development Address	Woodtown, Castlebellingham, Co Louth
	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 Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	Class 10(b) of Part 2, Schedule 5 (i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, or a prescribed type of proposed road	

development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	1 dwelling on 0.202ha

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)?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3) <i>[Delete if not relevant]</i>
No <input type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3) <i>[Delete if not relevant]</i>

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ABP-322505-25
Proposed Development Summary	Outline permission for a house and associated site works
Development Address	Woodtown, Castlebellingham, Co Louth
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	The proposal comes forward as a stand-alone project. The development does not require any demolition works. The development does not require the use of substantial natural resources or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural, or archaeological significance).	The development is situated in a predominantly rural area and is not adjacent an ACA. The subject land is not within or in proximity to any protected views within this landscape.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects, and opportunities for mitigation).	Having regard to the nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.

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

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)