



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-323250-25

Development	Full sized all weather sports pitch, change of use of yard to sports pitch, 6m high hurling wall, retention of as built hurling wall.
Location	Ballymakally, Newcastle, Dublin.
Planning Authority	South Dublin County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	SD24A/0165W
Applicant(s)	Lucan Sarsfields GAA Club
Type of Application	Permission and Retention Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Split Decision
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Lucan Sarsfield's GAA Club
Observer(s)	Paul Gogarty Shane Moynihan Emer Higgins

Date of Site Inspection

27th April 2026

Inspector

Emer Doyle

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located within the Lucan/ Adamstown area of Dublin at 12th lock, Ballymakailly, Lucan, Co. Dublin. The site has an irregular shape and consists of an area of 1.855 hectares. Lands to the south of the site are a proposed NHA Grand Canal. The 12th lock is in close proximity to the east of the site. The area to the east is characterised by the Strategic Development Zone designation for Clonburris, whilst the area to the north comprises of warehouse/ industrial uses.
- 1.2. Existing development on the GAA grounds at this location comprises of a GAA clubhouse, an existing hurling wall and a number of pitches including a junior pitch and a senior pitch. A mobile phone mast is located to the rear of the grounds and there is a large surfaced car park to the front of the existing clubhouse.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Planning permission is sought for:

- A full sized sports playing pitch together with 6 No. 22m high lighting masts and floodlighting, fencing and ball stop netting. This would replace an existing junior pitch and would extend into an adjoining undeveloped yard area.
- A new 6m high hurling wall and all-weather sports playing area to include 4 No. 16m high lighting masts and floodlighting.
- Retention of the existing as built hurling wall, as modified, as originally granted under planning permission ref. SD04A/0520 for 2 ball alleys.
- All associated site works, land drainage and landscaping.

The following documentation accompanies the application:

- AA Screening Assessment
- Tree Survey and Planting Report
- Engineering Services Report
- Ecological Impact Assessment
- Lighting Design Plan

Further Information submitted to the Planning Authority dated 06/06/25 included the following:

- Cover Letter
- Biodiversity Action Plan
- Ecological Impact Assessment updated in response to RFI
- Engineering Report updated in response to RFI
- Sustainability and Disposal Report including Microplastic Management
- Lighting Design by Musco Lighting
- Drawings showing clear details of changes to the hurling wall from the original application granted under SD04A/0520.
- Details of proposed Astro Turf Finish.
- Sustainable Movements and car parking requirements plan.
- Traffic and Transport Assessment including Chapter 6 (Mobility Management Plan).
- Revised site layout to proposed for accessible car parking spaces, cycle parking, pedestrian route, coach/ bus parking.
- Immediate proposals to applying for 2 No. EV chargers and proposal to provide ducting for 20% of surface car parking spaces.
- *The Commission should note that some of the information on the digital records relates to another similar application for St. Joseph's Boys National School, Clondalkin. The reason for this is set out in the Further Information Response cover letter and relates to drainage and is in response to item 5 of the Further Information Request.*

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Split Decision

3.1.1. The Planning Authority decided to grant permission for the all weather pitch, the new hurling wall, and the retention of the existing hurling wall on 9th July 2025, subject to 13 no. conditions. Permission was refused for all floodlighting. I have set out the reason for refusal in full for the floodlighting in the assessment.

3.1.2. Conditions of note include:

Condition 2 stated that permission was hereby granted for the development as set out in the public notices. For clarity, the existing lighting on top of the existing hurling wall is not included as part of the development permitted.

Condition 3 required that prior to commencement of development, the applicant shall submit revised plans showing the new hurling wall moved away from the southern site boundary (northwards and/ or reorientated away from this boundary).

Condition 6 required a biodiversity management plan.

Condition 9 required that the operation of cranes shall be co-ordinated with the Air Corps Traffic Services.

All other conditions are of a standard nature for a development of this pitch.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- **Planning Report** (16/08/24): Concerns expressed regarding biodiversity and ecology. Further Information required.
- **Planning Report** (09/07/25): All proposed floodlighting is not considered to be compliant with the South Dublin County Development Plan and refusal recommended for this element.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- **Lighting Design** Noted that no lighting design had been provided and recommended permission subject to conditions including the provision of a lighting scheme.

- **Environmental Health** No objection and no conditions
- **Water Services** (25/06/25): Proposed development should be 50m setback from top bank of canal. Aquacells not recommended to attenuate surface water. Water Services do not recommend the proposed development because it would negatively impact the biodiversity and riparian strip within 50m of adjacent canal.
- **Heritage Officer** (23/08/24): Refusal recommended.
- **Heritage Officer** (01/07/25): Revised EclA has improved the status of information regarding the presence of protected species. Significant concern remains regarding the impact of lighting on protected species currently using the site and availing of the adjacent proposed Natural Heritage Area for feeding and commuting. The mitigation measures as proposed are deemed not to be significantly adequate for this location adjacent to a sensitive ecological feature and are not considered sufficient to avoid negative impacts on biodiversity and on protected species in particular. Refusal recommended.
- **Public Realm Planning Report** (20/08/24): Application not in compliance with SUDS policy as underground attenuation proposed rather than natural SUDS.
- The development fragments the Green Infrastructure corridor and this primary green infrastructure corridor will be heavily impacted by loss of trees and light spill from both the astro pitch and the hurling wall. The Ecological Impact Statement wrongly states that the development of floodlighting facilities is 100m from the pNHA when it is directly adjacent to it.
- No Green Infrastructure Plan has been submitted with the application. All developments in primary GI corridors should demonstrate how their proposal will protect and enhance GI links. The Grand Canal corridor is of national importance as it connects the River Shannon to the Dublin Bay Biosphere.
- No information submitted regarding make up of the all weather pitch. Significant concerns regarding microplastic pollution from plastic grass and rubber crumb infills.
- Refusal recommended.

- **Public Realm Planning Report (20/06/25):** Risk of plastic pollution in a very sensitive area and no detailed landscape plan or green infrastructure plan has been submitted. Refusal recommended.
- **Roads (08/08/24):** Additional information required.
- **Roads (23/03/25):** The additional information requested was reviewed by the Roads Department and no objection subject to conditions.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

- Department of Defence (30/06/25): No observations made. Given the proximity to Casement Aerodrome, operation of cranes should be co-ordinated with Air Corps Air Traffic Services, no later than 30 days before use.
- Uisce Eireann (27/06/25): No objection in principle.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

- 3.4.1. The Planning Authority received 8 No. submissions from local councillors and public representatives, all strongly supporting the proposed development.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. Appeal site:

The planner's report notes that there are two relevant planning applications for the site for development similar to that proposed under PA Reg. Ref. SD20A/0345 and SD21A/0028. Both applications were withdrawn following Further Information Request.

PA Reg. Ref. SD04A/0520: Permission granted for 2 No. ball alleys.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Planning Framework 2025 (First Revision)

Relevant objectives include the following:

National Policy Objective 37 Ensure the integration of safe and convenient alternatives to the car into the design of our communities, by prioritising walking and cycling accessibility to both existing and proposed developments, and integrating physical activity facilities for all ages.

National Policy Objective 69

Reduce our carbon footprint by integrating climate action into the planning system in support of national targets for climate policy mitigation and adaptation objectives, as well as targets for greenhouse gas emissions reductions as expressed in the most recently adopted carbon budgets.

5.2. Climate Action Plan 2024 (CAP24)

- 5.2.1. This plan is a roadmap to cut Ireland's emissions by 50% by 2030 and achieve net-zero emissions by 2050, as mandated by the Climate Action and Low Carbon Development (Amendment) Act 2021.

Climate Action Plan 2025 (CAP25)

- 5.2.2. The Climate Action Plan 2025 (CAP25) is the third annual statutory update to Ireland's Climate Action Plan under the Climate Action and Low Carbon Development (Amendment) Act 2021. CAP25 builds on previous Climate Action Plans by refining and updating the measures required to deliver carbon budgets and sectorial emission ceilings. It provides a roadmap for taking action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 51% by 2030 and achieve climate neutrality by no later than 2050.

5.3. South County Dublin Development Plan 2022-2028

- 5.3.1. The appeal site is zoned 'Rural and Agriculture' (RU) with a stated zoning objective '*To protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture*'. 'Recreational-Facility' and 'Sports Club / Facility' are amongst the uses listed as open for consideration in this zoning.

Relevant Policies and Objectives include the following:

NCBH1 Objective 1: To protect, conserve and enhance natural, cultural and built heritage features, seeking opportunities to identify, retain, protect, and incorporate heritage assets into plans and development.

NCBH2 Objective 2: To protect and conserve the natural heritage of the County, and to conserve and manage EU and nationally designated sites and non-designated locally important areas which act as 'stepping stones' for the purposes of green infrastructure and Article 10 of the Habitats Directive.

Policy NCBH4: Proposed Natural Heritage Areas

Protect the ecological, visual, recreational, environmental and amenity value of the County's proposed Natural Heritage Areas and associated habitats and species.

NCBH4 Objective 1

To ensure that any proposal for development within or adjacent to a proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA) is designed and sited to minimise its impact on the biodiversity, ecological, geological and landscape value of the pNHA particularly plant and animal species listed under the Wildlife Acts and the Habitats and Birds Directive including their habitats.

NCBH4 Objective 2

To restrict development within or adjacent to a proposed Natural Heritage Area to development that is directly related to the area's amenity potential subject to the protection and enhancement of natural heritage and visual amenities including biodiversity and landscapes. Such developments will be required to submit an Ecological Impact Assessment prepared by a suitably qualified professional.

Policy NCBH9: Grand Canal

Protect and promote the Grand Canal as a key component of the County's Green Infrastructure and ecosystem services network, and protect and enhance the visual, recreational, environmental, ecological, industrial heritage and amenity value of the Grand Canal, recognising its sensitivities as a proposed Natural Heritage Area with adjacent wetlands and associated habitats.

NCBH9 Objective 1

To protect and enhance the important biodiversity resource offered by the Grand Canal, recognising and protecting the vital function that the Canal provides as a key corridor for habitats and wildlife from the River Shannon to Dublin Bay.

Policy G12 Biodiversity

Strengthen the existing Green Infrastructure (GI) network and ensure all new developments contribute towards GI, in order to protect and enhance biodiversity across the County as part of South Dublin County Council's commitment to the National Biodiversity Action Plan 2021-2025 and the South Dublin County Council Biodiversity Action Plan, 2020-2026, the National Planning Framework (NPF) and the Eastern and Midlands Region Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES).

Policy G17: Landscape, Natural, Cultural and Built Heritage

Protect, conserve and enhance landscape, natural, cultural and built heritage features, and support the objectives and actions of the County Heritage Plan.

Chapter 4 outlines 6 No Strategic Green Infrastructure Corridors. The Grand Canal Corridor is identified as Strategic Corridor 3 as follows:

The Grand Canal is a key national Green Infrastructure feature, acting as a major ecological and recreational link between the River Shannon in the midlands and Dublin City where the canal enters the sea. As a proposed Natural Heritage Area, the Canal supports a range of key ecosystem services along its entire route and offers a major route for a range of protected species from Dublin's rural hinterland through the urban environment of South Dublin County. While the Grand Canal offers significant opportunities for recreation and amenity, these provisions must be appropriate to the status of the Canal, at a time of biodiversity loss, as a key biodiversity corridor. This is particularly important when the Canal encounters the more urban environment of South Dublin County, where higher population densities and demand for recreational

provision has the potential to sever and fragment the Canal's regional ecological connectivity. The Grand Canal Corridor forms a major point of interaction with other identified Strategic Corridors in this Strategy: the M50 Corridor, the Rural / Urban Fringe corridor, and the Liffey-to-Liffey Corridor, while further local links connect it to the other areas of the Liffey Valley Corridor. There are also opportunities to connect to the Royal Canal Greenway in Fingal County Council, expanding the potential for additional GI connectivity in the Dublin region.

Overarching Objectives include the following:

- To protect and enhance the Grand Canal as an ecological green corridor, recognising its role as a national / regional corridor for wildlife and some ecosystem services.
- To ensure that development along and adjacent to the Grand Canal, including the sensitive provision of amenity and recreational facilities, recognises the Canal's ecological status, avoiding areas and features of biodiversity and heritage sensitivity, and that appropriate set-back distances or buffer areas are identified and included.

Section 8.6 sets out policies in relation to Sports Facilities and Centres

Policy COS4: Sports Facilities and Centres

Ensure that all communities are supported by a range of sporting facilities that are fit for purpose, accessible and adaptable.

COS4 Objective 1: To promote the provision and management of high-quality, multi-functional, sport and recreational infrastructure across the County, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, to meet existing and future needs, to include sports hubs and multi-sport astro-pitches, in accordance with the South Dublin County Council Sports Pitch Strategy (2020), the National Sports Policy (2018-2027) and the aims of the South Dublin County Sports Partnership, consistent with RPO 9.15 of the RSES.

COS4 Objective 9: To support and facilitate a framework for the improvement, maintenance, and enhancement of existing community-based sports facilities within the County.

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.4.1. The appeal site is not located on or within proximity to any designated Natura 2000 site(s).

The nearest Natura 2000 sites are:

Rye Water Valley/ Carton SAC (Site Code 001398) c. 5.3km northwest.

Glenasmole Valley SAC (Site Code 001209) c. 10km southeast.

- 5.4.2. The Grand Canal proposed Natural Heritage Area (Site Code 002104) is c. 10m to the south of the site.

5.5. EIA Screening

- 5.5.1. 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 (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). 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 report.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. The grounds of the First Party appeal can be summarised as follows:
- Appeal relates solely to the decision to refuse permission for the floodlighting.
 - Requested that Commission deal with this matter under Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act.
 - An updated EclA was submitted to the Planning Authority which incorporated significant changes including design elements to lighting, updated survey work, specialist assessments and robust mitigation measures to address ecological concerns.

- The external lighting expert (Pat Redmond) employed by the Local Authority recommended a grant of permission for the development.
- The Planning Authority did not have regard to the revised lighting proposals.
- There are a large number of precedent cases for lighting of sporting facilities adjacent to canals.
- The floodlighting proposed is necessary and critical to the development and without it the development may not receive funding and may not proceed.
- There is no difficulty with some form of restriction being placed on the floodlighting to allow the Council to monitor same.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

6.2.1. The submission made by the Planning Authority comprises of a report prepared by the Heritage Officer which can be summarised as follows:

- The applicant did not consider a suggestion from the Planning Authority in the Request for Further Information to investigate an alternative location of reorientation of the proposed pitch within the proposed development site to avoid maximum light impact on the adjacent Grand Canal.
- It is recognised that additional effort was made by the applicant in the form of an updated EclA to respond to the Council's concerns in the Request for Further Information.
- However the EclA insufficiently assessed the effects of the vertical 'wall' of light that would be created by the lighting scheme in such close proximity to the pNHA and its protected species.
- The revised EclA did not address the effect of the vertical wall of intense light that would be experienced by wildlife species encountering floodlighting from beyond the pitch and from beyond the boundary of the application site where the pNHA is located.
- Intense floodlighting as proposed at this location has the double effect of acting as a block to passage to other feeding areas whilst also reducing the volume of prey in the dark zone adjacent to the canal corridor where they are fed.

- The revised EclA therefore failed to identify the cumulative effects of the proposed floodlighting and the mitigation measures proposed are insufficient.
- The absence of a tree line at the southern end of the site, at an appropriate height and density to help shield the glare from the vertical wall of light is a particular concern as light glare would have the potential to impact on the surface layer of the canal's waterbody where light sensitive Daubenton's bats are likely to be feeding.
- Permitting the floodlighting element would therefore be contrary to objective NCBH4 Objective.
- The report considered that the precedents mentioned by the applicant as not relevant as the nature of the development does not include high intensity floodlighting as proposed in the current case or are in well light urban areas.
- In terms to the previous permission granted to the club, it is noted that the national and European legislation and obligations for the protection of biodiversity differ to those that were in place 26 years ago.
- In relation to the applicant's suggestion regarding restrictions on timing, such compromises may be appropriate in certain locations and have been used in the past as a means to facilitate some usage of floodlighting. This premise is based on the fact that bats are a hibernating species. Due to climatic warming, winter months are no longer sufficiently cold to facilitate full hibernation by bats and is an inadequate mitigation measure.

6.3. Observations

6.3.1. Observations have been submitted from the following parties:

- Emer Higgins T.D.
- Shane Moynihan T.D.
- Paul Gogarty T.D.

6.3.2. The main issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed facility is much needed as there is already a shortage of such facilities in Lucan and across Dublin Mid-West.

- Without floodlighting, the proposed facility will be underutilised.
- Whilst everyone understands the importance of conservation issues, the community badly needs this resource.
- The club has been pro-active in addressing potential ecological impacts.
- South Dublin County Council has not looked at the additional information provided by the club.
- To turn down the proposed development would be detrimental to an area already earmarked for complementary development in an award winning masterplan.

6.4. **Further Responses**

6.4.1. The applicant responded to the Planning Authority submission as follows:

- The applicant did consider the Planning Authority suggestions regarding re-location or re-orientation of the pitch as set out in the Further Information response dated the 6th of June 2025.
- It is within the powers of ACP to move the senior pitch by c. 7m to facilitate planting along the southern boundary to reduce glare.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on the appeal file, including the appeal submission, and inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local, regional and national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal can be addressed under the following headings:

- Principle of Development
- Ecological Matters
- Other Matters

7.2. **Principle of Development**

- 7.2.1. The appeal site is located within the existing Lucan Sarsfields GAA grounds. The site is subject to zoning objective 'RU' – 'To protect and improve rural amenity and to provide for the development of agriculture'. This is an long established GAA club at this location and the plan provides that recreational facilities and sports clubs are open for consideration under this 'RU' Zoning.
- 7.2.2. At the outset, I recognise that the club is not providing any additional pitches at this location, it is retaining changes to an existing hurling wall, providing a new hurling wall and redesigning, resurfacing and enlarging an existing junior pitch to provide a full sized pitch with associated works including floodlighting and ball stop netting etc.
- 7.2.3. The observations submitted by local elected officials strongly emphasise that there is a shortage of sporting facilities in the local area and floodlighting is required to fulfil the needs of winter training. It is stated that without floodlighting the facility will be underutilised. This is the primary area of concern in the appeal and I shall examine this issue more fully later in this report.
- 7.2.4. Having regard to the above, I am satisfied that the proposal is supported by adopted objectives within the plan, notably Objective COS4 Objective 1 in promoting the provision of high quality sporting infrastructure to meet existing and future needs, and COS4 Objective 9 in supporting and facilitating a framework for the improvement, maintenance, and enhancement of existing community-based sports facilities within the County. As such, I am satisfied that the principle of the development proposed would positively contribute to the enhancement of existing facilities at the GAA grounds at this location and also, positively contribute to the health and well-being of its users and is acceptable, subject to compliance with normal planning considerations.

7.3. **Ecological Matters**

Preliminary Matters

- 7.3.1. The grounds of appeal state that the appeal relates solely to the decision to refuse permission for the 6 No. 22m high floodlighting masts and floodlighting and requests that the Commission consider the case under Section 139 under the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

7.3.2. The Planning Authority issued a Split Decision on this case, granting permission and retention permission for the development and refusing permission for the floodlights. Condition 3 required that the location of the proposed hurling wall was amended. As Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act relates to appeals against conditions only, I consider that the Commission cannot consider the appeal under the provisions of Section 139. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that floodlighting and impact on ecology is main issue of concern in this appeal and I propose to limit my assessment to this issue only.

Background Information

7.3.3. The site is located adjacent to the Grand Canal pNHA. The Grand Canal is identified as one of 6 No. Primary Green Infrastructure Corridors on Figure 4.4 - Green Infrastructure Strategy Map in the Development Plan. The Grand Canal is a key national Green Infrastructure feature, acting as a major ecological and recreational link between the River Shannon in the midlands and Dublin City where the canal enters the sea. The Grand Canal is identified as a key biodiversity corridor and this is particularly important where the Canal encounters the more urban environment of South Dublin where higher population densities and demand for recreational provision has the potential to sever and fragment the Canal's regional ecological connectivity. An overarching Objective set out in Section 4.3.2 – Strategic Corridor Objectives – is to protect and enhance the Grand Canal as an ecological green corridor, recognising its role as a national/ regional corridor for wildlife and some ecosystem services.

7.3.4. The following policies and objectives of the South Dublin County Council Development Plan 2022-2028 are relevant:

Policy NCBH4: Proposed Natural Heritage Areas

Protect the ecological, visual, recreational, environmental and amenity value of the County's proposed Natural Heritage Areas and associated habitats and species.

NCBH4 Objective 1: To ensure that any proposal for development within or adjacent to a proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA) is designed and sited to minimise its impact on the biodiversity, ecological, geological and landscape value of the pNHA, particularly plant and animal species listed under the Wildlife Acts and the Habitats and Birds Directive, including their habitats.

NCBH4 Objective 2: To restrict development within or adjacent to a proposed Natural Heritage Area to development that is directly related to the area's amenity potential subject to the protection and enhancement of natural heritage and visual amenities, including biodiversity and landscapes. Such developments will be required to submit an Ecological Impact Assessment prepared by a suitably qualified professional.

NCBH9 Objective 1: To protect and enhance the important biodiversity resource offered by the Grand Canal, recognising and protecting the vital function that the Canal provides as a key corridor for habitats and wildlife from the River Shannon to Dublin Bay.

NCBH9 Objective 4: To ensure that development along and adjacent to the Grand Canal protects and incorporates natural heritage features including watercourses, wetlands, grasslands, woodlands, mature trees, hedgerows and ditches and includes an appropriate set-back distance or buffer area from the pNHA boundary to facilitate protected species and biodiversity and a fully functioning Green Infrastructure network.

GI6 Objective 6: To minimise the environmental impact of external lighting within the GI network to achieve a sustainable balance between the recreational needs of an area, the safety of walking and cycling routes and the protection of light sensitive species such as bats (See Chapter 3: Natural, Cultural and Built Heritage and Chapter 12: Implementation and Monitoring).

IE8 Objective 6: To ensure external lighting schemes minimise light spillage or pollution in the immediate surrounding environment and do not adversely impact on residential or visual amenity and biodiversity in the surrounding areas having regard to the Institute of Lighting Engineers' Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution (UK). (see section 12.11.4 (iii)).

The reason for refusal for the floodlighting is as follows:

The proposed floodlighting for the proposed pitch and hurling wall, at a location proximate to the Grand Canal proposed Natural Heritage Area and within the Grand Canal Primary Green Infrastructure Corridor, would disrupt nocturnal wildlife, particularly light-sensitive species like bats, and undermine the ecological integrity and function of this corridor as a dark, natural refuge for species including bats which are protected under the EU Habitats Directive. As such, the subject proposal would be contrary to the provisions of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028,

including NCBH4 Policy and Objectives 1 and which seek to restrict development adjacent to and minimise impacts on pNHAs; NCBH9 Policy and Objectives 1 and 4 which seek to protect and enhance the Grand Canal; GI2 Objective 1 which seeks 'to reduce fragmentation and enhance South Dublin County's GI network by strengthening ecological links between urban areas, Natura 2000 sites, proposed Natural Heritage Areas, parks and open spaces and the wider regional network by connecting all new developments into the wider GI Network; and GI6 Objective 6 and IE8 Objective 6, which aim to minimise the environmental impact of external lighting and minimise light spillage in order to not adversely impact on biodiversity. The proposed floodlighting would thus be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area and would, if permitted, set an undesirable precedent for similar unsatisfactory development.

Information included in application and appeal documentation

- 7.3.5. The main information regarding the proposed NHA and impacts on same are included in the EclA and the revised EclA submitted in response to a Further Information request by the Planning Authority. A Biodiversity Action Plan was also submitted in response to the Further Information Request to demonstrate the club's commitment to biodiversity enhancement and ecological protection.
- 7.3.6. The revised EclA includes additional field surveys, revised design elements, specialist assessments and mitigation strategies to address the ecological impacts. The Further Information response also provided for the retention of trees and hedgerow originally proposed for removal (See Tree Survey Drawing 24021 TS). A revised lighting design prepared by specialists was also submitted in response to the Further Information Request.

A summary of Ecological Surveys and survey dates is set out as follows:

Table 4.1 Ecological surveys and survey dates

Survey	Survey Date(s)	Surveyor(s)
Multi-disciplinary Walkover Survey	11 th May 2023	Katie Neary JKW Environmental Ltd
Bat Survey: Potential Roost Features; Walked Transects	11 th May 2023 19 th September 2024	Katie Neary JKW Environmental Ltd
Automatic Bat Survey	11 th May – 17 th May 2023	Katie Neary JKW Environmental Ltd
Otter Survey	19 th September 2024	Katie Neary JKW Environmental Ltd

- 7.3.7. Section 5.2 of the updated EclA sets out the desk study results of ecology in the area. Table 1 outlines records of a number of bat species within 2km of the site as follows: Brown Long-eared Bat, Lesser Noctule, Common Pipistrelle, Daubenton's Bat, and Soprano Pipistrelle.
- 7.3.8. Section 5.3 sets out the result of field surveys. I refer the Commission to Section 5.4.1 in relation to bats. The results indicate that the Grand Canal tow path provides an important foraging and commuting route for bats. The tow path and adjacent tree-lined canal provides suitable habitat features, including sheltered flight routes and foraging opportunities. The findings reinforce the importance of maintaining and enhancing the existing riparian habitat along the Grand Canal to support bat populations. Due to the levels of bat activity recorded and the suitability of foraging adjacent to the Site, the EclA states that the site is considered of Local importance (higher value) for bat species and is included as a KER (Key Ecological Receptor). Treelines and otter were also considered to be key ecological receptors in the area.
- 7.3.9. The revised lighting design submitted with the further information response provides for an average horizontal illuminance of 350 lux with a uniformity of 0.7. For the hurling wall area, the average illuminance is 200 lux with a uniformity of 0.4. The system proposes uses Musco's TLC for LED™ technology, which features advanced light control, shielding, and beam shaping. All luminaires are mounted horizontally with no upward tilt and a 0% upward light ratio, reducing obtrusive light and sky glow. The lighting system operates at a 4000K colour temperature, which is considered suitable for reducing ecological impacts. To minimise spill light, column height,

number, and aiming angles have been optimised, using 21 m columns for the main pitch and 15 m for the hurling wall. The design demonstrates controlled light distribution, with lux contours (10, 5, 2 lux) shown to remain within site boundaries and away from sensitive areas such as the adjacent Grand Canal.

Full details in relation to lighting are set out in Section 6.2.2 as follows:

Lighting

- Use of fully shielded luminaires with 0% upward light ratio to eliminate upward light spill and reduce disturbance to nocturnal wildlife.
- All luminaires mounted horizontally, in line with best-practice guidance (ILP GN 08/18), ensuring no upward tilt and preventing light intrusion into the Grand Canal corridor.
- Colour temperature restricted to 4000K, which is within the recommended range to minimise ecological impacts on sensitive species, including otter.
- Lighting columns strategically positioned and angled to achieve precise light targeting on pitches only, minimising unnecessary light spill toward surrounding habitats.
- Lux levels taper off to <2 lux before reaching the Grand Canal, based on verified lighting contours, ensuring no artificial illumination of riparian or aquatic habitats used by otter.
- No lighting directed toward the canal or its banks, preserving the dark corridor essential for commuting and foraging otters.
- Regular maintenance minimised due to long-life LED technology (L90 >120,000 hours), reducing operational disturbance to nocturnal wildlife.
- Retaining existing vegetated stone wall and mammal-proof fencing between the site and canal to maintain a physical and visual buffer from light and activity.

7.3.10. The updated EclA concludes that as a result of these design measures, no significant lighting impacts on bat foraging or commuting behaviour are anticipated. Dark corridors along the Grand Canal and western boundary will be maintained, and lighting effects will remain highly localised within the development footprint, avoiding fragmentation of key habitats or behavioural displacement.

Will the floodlighting proposed have a direct impact upon the pNHA?

7.3.11. The Grand Canal proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA) serves as an ecologically significant corridor supporting a range of species, including otters and bats. Potential effects on the pNHA arising from the proposed development relate to construction activities, artificial lighting, increased human activity from the use of the pitches, and potential contamination of surface water. Artificial lighting associated with the development, particularly floodlighting for the playing pitches, has the potential to impact the ecological function of the Grand Canal pNHA. Bats are highly sensitive to artificial lighting, which can alter their foraging behaviour, disrupt commuting routes,

and increase predation risks. Bat surveys recorded multiple species using the canal corridor, with soprano pipistrelle being the most frequently detected species. Light spill onto the canal and adjacent tree lines could create a barrier effect, while also reducing the availability of dark, sheltered foraging areas along the waterway.

Are the mitigation measures proposed satisfactory?

- 7.3.12. Section 6 of the updated Ecological Impact Assessment provides for an assessment of effects and mitigation measures. Mitigation measures include optimised lighting design, surface water protection and retention of all mature trees and hedgerows with additional planting and biodiversity.
- 7.3.13. In terms of otters, it was noted that the proposed development will formalise an existing use and that the increase in evening activity would not significantly alter otter activity.
- 7.3.14. The revised lighting design will reduce overspill effects onto adjacent habitats. The revised lux levels of the overspill area is still considered greater than the recommended 0.5- 1lux deemed acceptable for sensitive bat species.
- 7.3.15. The report of the Heritage Officer notes that there are multiple negative effects that may arise from intense floodlighting in an area of biological interest, particularly where light sensitive species are known to occur. The EclA has failed to identify and address potential impacts of vertical light. This block of light rising vertically from the ground level to the height of the light poles presents a 'wall' of intense light. At the height level at which some bat species commute and forage, this vertical wall of light acts as a significant deterrent to their flight paths, and can close off access to their feeding and commuting areas. Ground species such as otters and other mammals can also be negatively impacted by the installation of strong lighting. A further impact arising is the effect on night flying insects which are the main food source for protected bat species. Insects such as moths, midges and flies are drawn into the lighted area, away from the dark zone. This can result in a significant depletion of food prey for bats in the surrounding areas.
- 7.3.16. The Heritage Officer expresses concern regarding the absence of appropriate and adequate shielding along the full length of the southern boundary. There are some

trees which will provide a limited degree of screening but these are intermittent and in limited locations and insufficient to provide adequate screening. The existing wall at this location will provides little visual shielding from the proposed intense floodlighting to the pNHA and its light sensitive species.

- 7.3.17. The revised EclA report indicates that bat activity was particularly high in the southwestern corner of the site, close to the area proposed for the hurling wall, yet the proposal remains to install lighting at this area to facilitate usage of the hurling wall.
- 7.3.18. The EclA also did not adequately address the cumulative impact of the existing flood lighting on the proposed development site in conjunction with the proposed additional installation of new flood lighting on a directly adjacent proposed artificial surface. The all-weather pitch will offer and will sustain significantly higher levels of usage than the adjacent grass-based pitch. This more frequent usage of highly intense light in a location adjacent to the ecologically sensitive pNHA has not been adequately assessed.
- 7.3.19. A Biodiversity Management Plan was submitted with the Further Information Response. The Heritage Officer outlines that whilst some of the actions proposed have merit, others are questionable in terms of the benefits they are proposed to provide. For example, it is proposed to install bat boxes to enhance roosting opportunities for local bat populations, particularly in response to concerns about lighting impacts on nocturnal species. Two of these boxes appear to be located on the clubhouse building overlooking the proposed floodlit artificial pitch. Similarly, two other bat boxes are indicated within the area proposed for the flood-light hurling wall. These locations are not suitable and offer insignificant mitigation to light-sensitive and protected species arising from light disturbance.
- 7.3.20. It is concluded by the Heritage Officer that the revised EclA has failed to assess the impact of the potential effect of the vertical light on the adjacent pNHA and the protected species it supports.
- 7.3.21. The First Party appeal outlines that additional effort has been made in order to address the lighting impact in terms of design and the retention of trees. It is considered that this will be a sufficient mitigation measure to protect sensitive species. The appeal considers that the impacts of lighting have been effectively

mitigated through a combination of ecological lighting design, habitat retention and provision of roosting structures ensuring no significant adverse effects. Further, the site's proximity to the Grand Canal necessitated a high level of scrutiny in terms of surface water management and microplastic containment system specifically designed for the new pitch.

7.3.22. The appeal response submitted by the Planning Authority considers that the applicant appears to have misunderstood the two main potential negative effects of lighting from intensely lit areas. The revised lighting design as submitted by the applicant may help to reduce some light overspill beyond the footprint of the playing pitch. However, this is just one of two important elements. A second, arguably, more critical element is one which was not addressed in the EclA and comprises of the effect of the vertical wall of intense light that would be experienced by wildlife species encountering floodlighting from beyond the pitch and from beyond the boundary of the site where the pNHA is located. When light sensitive species are faced with an intensely lit wall of light, such species will be deterred and will not proceed further. This has the effect of reducing the area available for these species in which to feed, while also preventing them from continuing past the light block to access other feeding locations along their usual commuting routes. An additional effect of outdoor lighting is that light draws night flying insects out of the darker zones. Intense floodlighting, as is proposed at this location beside the darker canal corridor therefore has the double effect of acting as a block to passage to other feeding areas which also reducing the volume of prey in the dark zone where they feed. It is stated that the absence of a tree line at the southern end of the site, at an appropriate height and density to help shield the glare from the vertical wall of light emanating from the playing pitch is a particular concern as light glare would have the potential to directly impact the surface layer of the canal's water body where light sensitive Daubenton's bats are likely to be feeding.

7.3.23. The response concludes that the revised EclA has failed to identify these potentially cumulative effects of the proposed floodlighting and it considers that mitigation measures are insufficient to address the light pollution effect that would impact on the movement and feeding of light-sensitive species along the Grand Canal pNHA. It points out that the applicant's proposed mitigation measures in terms of restrictions on light usage is based on the premise that bats are a hibernating species and the

hibernation period coincides with the the clubs requirement for light usage during the Winter months. However, due to climatic warming, winter months are no longer cold enough to facilitate full hibernation by bats and some species are no longer sufficiently cold enough to facilitate full hibernation by bats. The negative impact on bats in winter when they encounter intense floodlighting can be even more problematic for individual bats as they are using up vital fat reserves built up for hibernation that cannot be replaced in winter when prey numbers are low. It is concluded that the mitigation measures submitted by the applicant are therefore inadequate to protect bats.

- 7.3.24. Having regard to the above, I consider that the mitigation measures proposed are inadequate and insufficient and further, it would appear that the applicant does not fully understand all the potential impacts of the proposed floodlighting. As such, concerns remain in relation to negative impacts on biodiversity and on protected species in particular.

Is there an alternative location suitable within the site?

- 7.3.25. This question was raised in the Further Information request. The applicant responded that all locations on the site had been fully considered for both the pitch and the hurling wall. It was stated that the club was very restricted regarding what parts of the existing site can be developed to provide new facilities within the club grounds to provide much needed activity for its members.
- 7.3.26. The response of the planning authority to the Commission also raised this question and outlined that the applicant did not consider a suggestion from the Planning Authority to investigate an alternative location or reorientation of the proposed pitch. The applicant's response to this issue stated that it was completely incorrect that the applicant 'did not consider' alternative options. It states that this had been addressed in the Further Information Response. The new senior pitch area measures 145m x 85 which replaces the junior pitch area, which measures approximately 118 X 65. It is not possible to re-orientate the new senior pitch as the overall site boundary from north boundary to south boundary only measures approximately 130m at its maximum on the western boundary for undeveloped lands. As previously set out in

the Further Information response, the full sized pitch will not fit anywhere else on the club grounds.

- 7.3.27. Condition 3 of the Planning Authority required the new hurling wall to be moved away from the southern site boundary (northwards/ and/or reorientated). I note that floodlighting of the proposed hurling wall was refused but the Planning Authority permitted the hurling wall subject to it being moved away from the southern site boundary. The Public Realms Department raised concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on the canal, including micro plastic pollution in a very sensitive area. The Public Realms Department recommended refusal of the application as the floodlights would cause extreme disruption to the pNHA and its established habitats. In terms of SuDS, the report stated that in the absence of SUDS, there is no water cleaning and this means there is a risk of micro plastic pollution in a very sensitive area. Revised details were submitted to address this at Further Information stage including the use of filter systems capable of trapping microplastic and preventing them from accessing the drainage water system. The Planner's report considered that relocating the hurling wall away from the boundary together with additional planting would mitigate the concerns regarding risk of micro pollution from plastics. I note that whilst a tree survey and proposals for retention of trees were proposed, no detailed landscaping scheme was submitted for the site.
- 7.3.28. The response of the applicant to the Commission dated the 29th of October 2025 stated that it was within the powers of the Commission to relocate the senior pitch c. 7m northwards to facilitate tree planting along the southern boundary to reduce glare. It is stated that this has already been included in Condition 3.
- 7.3.29. It is clear from the reports on file that both floodlighting and risk of micro pollution from plastics and the impacts on biodiversity are the concerns regarding the location of the proposed hurling wall. Condition 3 as set out above does not include any reference to a specific distance from the site boundary. At the location where the hurling wall is proposed at present, the revised EclA notes that there is significant bat usage. Sections 5.4.1 and 6.4.1 indicate that this area of the site has the highest usage by bats. I refer the Commission to the survey work carried out on behalf of the applicant. The proposed hurling wall is located in close proximity to location 2 of the static automatic survey. The static bat detectors recorded a total of 11,702 bat passes across the three monitoring locations over a 54 hour survey period. Of these,

a total of 8,208 were at location 2, whilst 901 were at location 1 (south-eastern fence) and 2,594 were at location 3 (western boundary).

7.3.30. It may be possible to provide a pitch of a reduced size at an alternative location however, it is not clear to me if this option has been examined. It may be possible to relocate the hurling wall to the north west of the site, however it is set out in the cover letter submitted in the Further Information response, that this area is set aside for biodiversity planting.

7.3.31. I consider that the relocation of the hurling wall, together with the mitigation measures proposed by the applicant in the Further Information response and for additional planting in this area would address the concerns regarding micro-plastics and should the Commission be minded to grant permission for this aspect of the development, I recommend a similarly worded condition to the Planning Authority. I do not consider that the issue of floodlighting has been addressed.

7.4. Other Matters

Funding and Floodlighting

7.4.1. The appeal makes the point that the floodlighting is an integral part of the application and without it, it is extremely unlikely that normal funding channels will be available to the applicant such as Sports Council and National Lottery Grants. I have considered this matter but notwithstanding this, significant concerns remain regarding the impact of lighting on protected species using the site and availing of the proposed Natural Heritage Area for feeding and commuting.

Restrictions on Lighting

7.4.2. It is suggested by the appeal that restrictions are placed on floodlighting to allow South Dublin County Council to monitor, record, measure and survey the installed lighting conditions of the completed development. I have considered this matter and do not consider that such restrictions would be sufficient or appropriate. I consider that there are requirements in terms of health and safety for sporting facilities and it may be difficult to alter lighting once it is installed.

Precedent

- 7.4.3. The appeal makes reference to number of developments where a planning precedent has already been set for floodlighting on sporting facilities adjacent to canals together with a previous permission granted on the site which included floodlighting under SD09A/0246.
- 7.4.4. The Heritage Officer advised that the regulatory environment in relation to ecology had changed in the intervening period, together with changes in climate which have resulted in reduced hibernation periods for bats. I concur with this view.

Retention of Existing Hurling Wall

- 7.4.5. I note that the existing hurling wall has floodlighting. This did not form part of the application, and the Planning Authority excluded the lighting by condition. Should the Commission be minded to grant permission for this element, I consider that a similarly worded condition would be appropriate.

Conclusion

- 7.4.6. I have no objection to the principle of the proposed development, however, I consider that the floodlighting element of the proposal would have a significant negative impact at this sensitive location. The site is located adjacent to the Grand Canal pNHA which is one of 6 No. Primary Green Infrastructure Corridors in South Dublin County Council and a key national Green Infrastructure feature, acting as a major ecological and recreational link between the River Shannon in the midlands and Dublin city where the canal enters the sea. I am not satisfied that the mitigation measures proposed are adequate to protect the proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA) or that the development is designed and sited to minimise its impact the pNHA. As such, I recommend a Split Decision granting permission for the proposed pitch and hurling wall together with retention permission for the existing hurling wall and refusing permission for all the floodlighting proposed. The proposed floodlighting would give rise to significant negative impacts on nocturnal wildlife, particularly light-sensitive species like bats and undermine the ecological integrity and function of this corridor as a dark natural refuge for species including bats which are protected under

the EU Habitats Directive. The granting of permission for the floodlighting element of the proposal would in my view be contrary to Policy Objectives NCBH4 Objectives 1 and 2, NCBH9 Objectives 1 and 4, G16 Objective 6, and IE8 Objective 6 of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment

- 8.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development for the retention of an existing hurling wall and the development of a full sized GAA pitch and a hurling wall in an established and serviced urban area, the distance from the nearest European site, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect, individually, or in combination with other plans or projects, on a European site.

9.0 Water Framework Directive

- 9.1. I have assessed the proposed development 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 and ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. The Site is located within the Liffey and Dublin Bay catchment and the Liffey_SC_090 sub-catchment. The Grand Canal (Main Line) E_09_AWB_GCMLE is located to the south of the Site boundary. The Grand Canal (Main Line) is classified as having 'Good' water quality as per the WFD River Waterbodies Status 2019-2024 and classified as 'Not at Risk'. The Liffey_170 watercourse (IE_EA_09L01210009G01) is located approximately 320m west of the Site. This is classified as having poor ecological status 2019-2024 and being 'At Risk' as per the WFD River Waterbodies Risk 3rd Cycle. The site is located within the Dublin groundwater body IE_EA_G_008. Groundwater quality provided by the EPA indicates the waterbody to be Good status.
- 9.2. 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.

- 9.3. 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.
- 9.4. This conclusion is based on:
- Nature of the project, site and receiving environment.
 - Objective information presented in the case documentation.
 - Hydrological and hydrogeological characteristics of proximate waterbodies.

10.0 Recommendation

- 10.1. Having regard to the above assessment, I recommend a SPLIT DECISION. I recommend that permission be GRANTED for the existing as built hurling wall and (a) A new full sized sports playing pitch to replace the existing grass surfaces junior sports pitch and adjoining part undeveloped yard area, all associated fencing, ball stop netting, (b) Change of use of adjoining part undeveloped yard area to sports playing pitch to include removal and relocation of existing boundary fence, all to facilitate new all-weather sports playing pitch, (c) A new 6m high hurling wall and all-weather sports playing area, all with associated fencing, ball stop netting (d) All associated site works, land drainage and landscaping, (e) Retention of existing as built hurling wall as modified, as originally granted under planning permission ref. SD04A/0520 for 2 ball alleys based on the reasons and considerations marked (1) under and subject to the conditions set out below. REFUSE permission for 6 No. 22m high lighting masks and floodlighting serving the proposed full sized all-weather sports pitch and 4 No. 16m high lighting masts and floodlighting serving the proposed new 6m high hurling wall for the reasons and considerations marked (2) under.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations (1)

- 11.1. Having regard to the provisions of South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028, and in particular Objective COS4 Objective 1 in promoting the provision of high quality sporting infrastructure to meet existing and future needs, and Objective

COS4 Objective 9 in supporting and facilitating a framework for the improvement, maintenance, and enhancement of existing community-based sports facilities within the County, and having regard to the established use of the subject site for sport and recreational purposes and the nature, extent, and design of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the retention and completion of the proposed development would provide a high quality sports facility for the area, would not seriously injure the residential amenities of the area, and would be acceptable in terms of road and traffic safety and would be in keeping with the established character of the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

1. 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 submitted on the 6th day of June 2025, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The existing hurling wall is granted solely for the development as set out in the Statutory Public Notices and description of development as set out in Section 9 of the planning application form submitted. For clarity, the existing

lighting on top of the existing hurling wall is not included as part of the development permitted.

Reason: In the interests of clarity.

3. The proposed hurling wall shall be relocated/ re-orientated on the site further away from the southern boundary to allow for planting along this boundary.

Reason: In the interests of biodiversity.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, or any statutory provision amending or replacing them, no advertisement signs, advertisement structures, banners, canopies, flags, or other structures shall be displayed, erected or placed within the curtilage of the site, unless authorised by a further grant of planning permission.

Reason: To protect the visual amenities of the area.

5. Surface water drainage arrangements shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to commencement of development, details of the proposed surface water drainage system shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

6. The site shall be landscaped in accordance with a comprehensive scheme of landscaping, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development. All trees

proposed for retention as indicated in the plans submitted to the Planning Authority on the 6th day of June 2025 shall be retained.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

13.0 Reasons and Considerations (2)

13.1. The proposed floodlighting for the proposed pitch and hurling wall at a location adjacent to the Grand Canal proposed Natural Heritage Area and within the Grand Canal Primary Green Infrastructure would give rise to significant negative effects on nocturnal wildlife, particularly light-sensitive species like bats, and undermine the ecological integrity and function of this corridor as a dark, natural refuge for species including bats which are protected under the EU Habitats Directive. The granting of permission for the floodlighting element of this proposal would, therefore be contrary to Policy Objectives NCBH4 Objectives 1 and 2, NCBH9 Objectives 1 and 4, G16 Objective 6, and IE8 Objective 6 of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028 and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

Emer Doyle

Planning Inspector

15th May 2026

Appendix 1- Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	323250-25
Proposed Development Summary	GAA pitch, hurling wall and retention of as built hurling wall.
Development Address	12 th Lock, Ballymakailly, Newcastle Road, Lucan, Dublin.
In all cases check box /or leave blank	
<p>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a ‘project’ for the purposes of EIA?</p> <p>(For the purposes of the Directive, “Project” means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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) 	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a ‘Project’. Proceed to Q2.</p>
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.</p>	<p>State the Class here</p>

<p>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3</p>	
<p>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?</p>	
<p><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.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR</p>	

<p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</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>N/A</p>
<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____