



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

**ACP-323653-25**

### Development

The creation of a third floor to accommodate 2 apartments over the cultural centre and place of worship granted under planning reference 24/147 and all ancillary site works.

### Location

18 Sexton Street, Limerick.

### Planning Authority

Limerick City and County Council

### Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

24453

### Applicant(s)

Ghousia Masjid Limerick

### Type of Application

Permission

### Planning Authority Decision

Grant permission

### Type of Appeal

Third Party

### Appellant(s)

John Deegan

### Observer(s)

None

### Date of Site Inspection

3 December 2025

### Inspector

Natalie de Róiste

## Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description .....	3
2.0 Proposed Development .....	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	4
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
6.0 The Appeal .....	10
7.0 Assessment .....	12
8.0 AA Screening.....	17
9.0 Recommendation.....	17
10.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	18
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	
Form 2: EIA Preliminary Examination	

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site (c. 300 sqm) comprises a single-storey deep-plan building with a large roller shutter and single window to the front elevation, on Sexton Street in Limerick city centre. A gated laneway runs to the east of the building. It is attached to the west to a single-storey building (the appellant's gym). This side of the street is largely residential, with two- and three-storey houses, as well as a credit union, a garage, and the gym. The site faces a large complex of educational buildings (formerly the Presentation Convent, now primary, secondary, and further education) across the street.
- 1.2. The site backs onto vacant commercial buildings on Upper William Street. It is a six-minute walk to Colbert Station to the south, and a similar distance to O'Connell Street to the west.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for:

- Construction of additional floor over permitted two-storey masjid (mosque) building
- Providing two apartments, each having two bedrooms (1 double and 1 single) and measuring 64 sqm and 67 sqm.

Further information was sought and submitted, and the revised design includes private open space for each apartment, revised external storage areas for each apartment, and direct access from bedrooms to the exterior. Each revised apartment measures 65 sqm. I note that the cover letter responding to the Further Information request copied the text of the cover letter accompanying the Further Information submitted with the previous application, reg ref 24/147. This erroneously refers to the questions posed in that application, which were settled with the grant of permission.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Decision**

Grant permission.

### **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

#### **3.2.1. Planning Reports**

Two reports, the first dated 04.02.2025, the second following the submission of further information dated 12.08.2025.

- First report noted the site context, the zoning, the planning history, Development Plan policy and Ministerial Guidelines, internal reports and third party submission. Considered design of building at odds with other buildings on street. Considered lack of car parking acceptable, but cycle parking should be provided. Concerns regarding internal layout and design having regard to fire safety, daylight and sunlight, storage, private amenity space. Further information required on refuse storage, ownership and access to laneway. Concerns regarding impacts on neighbouring property should be addressed following further information.
- Second report noted the material submitted, the adoption of the Ministerial Design Standards for Apartments, and considered the development acceptable.

#### **3.2.2. Other Technical Reports**

- Fire & Building Control – email dated 17 January 2025 noting concerns with layout, not in compliance with Part B (Fire Safety) or Part F (Ventilation) of building regulations. Email dated 8 August 2025 noting no objection.
- Water Services – no report

#### **3.2.3. Conditions**

Two conditions, that the conditions of the parent permission be adhered to, and a pre-commencement compliance condition regarding samples of external finishes to be submitted.

### 3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

Uisce Éireann – no objection in principle

### 3.4. **Third Party Observations**

One received, from appellant, raising issues as follows:

- Proximity of windows compromises privacy.
- Errors in drawings
- Lack of information submitted
- Lack of compliance with building regulations and fire safety regulations
- Impact on future development potential of gym site

## 4.0 **Planning History**

4.1.1. The following applications on the site were referred to in the planner's report or found on the council website:

### **18 Sexton Street**

- 24/147: Permission granted for a change of use from a repair garage to a two storey cultural centre and place of worship, new roof and elevational changes to the front facade with an increase in height, the provision of a new first floor mezzanine and all ancillary site works.

### **17-18 Sexton Street (the appellant's site and the appeal site)**

- 08770309: Permission for (1) Demolition of existing single storey buildings on site (2) Construction of a new 4 storey building with ground floor on site parking and 3 floors of offices over (3) Connection to public services and all associated site works. Permission granted subject to 17 conditions following submission of Further Information. Not implemented.
- 07/770400: Planning application for demolition of existing single storey buildings on site. Construction of new five storey building with ground floor on - site parking

and four floors of offices over. Connection to public services and all associated site works — Withdrawn.

4.1.2. The following was referred to in the applicant's further information submission, and by the appellant:

- ABP-310676-21 (reg ref 201236): Planning application by Dawat-E-islami for the demolition of existing un-occupied buildings on 21, 22 & 23 Wickham Street and the construction of a 4-storey cultural centre and all ancillary site services 20,21,22,23 & 24 Wickham Street, Limerick. Permission granted subject to conditions.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Limerick City and County Development Plan 2022-28

5.1.1. The site is zoned City Centre, where the objective is to protect, consolidate and facilitate the development of the City Centre commercial, retail, educational, leisure, residential, social and community uses and facilities. As per the Zoning Matrix, residential development is generally permitted under this zoning.

5.1.2. The site lies outside the area designated for the Colbert Quarter Spatial Framework Strategy 2021-2041.

5.1.3. As per *Chapter 2: Core Strategy*, the site lies within Density Zone 1: City Centre, Central & Accessibly Locatins, with a minimum net density of 100+ dwelling units per hectare required at appropriate locations within the City Centre.

*Policy CS P2 Compact Growth It is a policy of the Council to support the compact growth of Limerick City Metropolitan Area, towns and villages by prioritising housing and employment development in locations within and contiguous to existing City and town footprints where it can be served by public transport and walking and cycling networks, to ensure that development proceeds sustainably and at an appropriate scale, density and sequence, in line with the Core Strategy Table 2.7.*

*Objective HO 05 Apartments*

*It is an objective of the Council to encourage an increase in the scale and extent of apartment development, particularly in proximity to core urban centres and other*

*factors including existing public transport nodes, or locations where high frequency public transport can be provided, close to locations of employment and a range of urban amenities including parks/ waterfronts, shopping and other services.*

#### **Section 11.4 Residential Development – Quality Standards**

##### **Section 11.4.1 Apartment Development**

This section states (in part) that the “*design and layout of apartments shall comply with the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines (2020) and any future updates/ amendments thereto.*”

###### **11.4.1.1 Minimum Apartment Floor Areas**

###### **11.4.1.2 Dual Aspect Design**

###### **11.4.1.3 Separation between Blocks**

###### **11.4.1.4 Internal Storage and External Storage**

###### **11.4.4.4 Mixed-Use Development**

###### **11.4.4.5 ‘Living-Over-The-Shop’**

- 5.1.4. *Table DM 9(a): Car and Bicycle Parking Standards Limerick City and Suburbs (in Limerick) Mungret and Annacotty* sets standards for car and cycle parking with a standard of 0.5 spaces per unit for car parking and 1 space per unit for cycle parking (with 1 visitor cycle parking space per 2 units) for Zone 1. There is a general proviso for Infill development and building refurbishment as follows: *For building refurbishment schemes on sites of any size or urban infill schemes on sites of up to 0.25ha., car parking provision may be relaxed in part or whole, on a case-by-case basis, subject to overall design quality and location.*
- 5.1.5. Bicycle infrastructure is as per Section 4.17 of the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments – Guidelines for Planning Authorities, DHLGH2020 and National Cycle Manual, NTA 2012.

## **5.2. National Policy and Guidance**

### **5.2.1. Project Ireland 2040 – National Planning Framework (2018, updated 2025)**

5.2.2. A key element of the NPF is a commitment towards ‘compact growth’, which focuses on a more efficient use of land and resources through reusing previously developed or under-utilised land and buildings. It contains several policy objectives that articulate the delivery of compact urban growth.

5.2.3.

5.2.4. **Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).**

5.2.5. These guidelines reiterate the National Planning Framework and the RSES priority of ambitious growth targets for cities and metropolitan areas, including delivering brownfield and infill development at scale within the existing built-up footprint. There is an emphasis on compact growth, and the provision of more houses and denser development in cities and towns in proximity to existing services and public transport. Planning authorities are obliged to have regard to these Section 28 Guidelines, and obliged to implement any Specific Planning Policy Requirements (SPPRs) set out therein. While there is an emphasis on houses (as opposed to apartments) some standards (separation distances, public open space, car parking) refer generally to all housing.

5.2.6. **Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2023**

5.2.7. As this application was lodged in December 2024, and was subject to consideration within the planning system on or before 8<sup>th</sup> July 2025, the Design Standards for Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2025) do not apply, as per Circular Letter: NSP 04/2025. The ‘Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities’, 2023 are the relevant standard.

5.2.8.

### 5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

Lower River Shannon SAC 002165 – 700 m west

#### **5.4. Water Framework Directive Screening**

- 5.4.1. The subject site is located in a built up area in Limerick city, c. 700 metres south and west of the River Shannon (transitional waterbody Limerick Dock IE-SH-060-0900) within the Ballynacloch\_010 sub basin (IE\_SH\_24B040800). The site is located on top of the ground water body Limerick City Southwest (IE\_SH\_G\_141).
- 5.4.2. The proposed development comprises the provision of two apartments.
- 5.4.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 5.4.4. I have assessed the 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 & 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.
- 5.4.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
  - the small scale and nature of the development
  - the distance from the nearest water bodies and the lack of hydrological connections
- 5.4.6. 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.

#### **5.5. EIA Screening**

The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered

that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

One third party appeal was received, against the grant of permission. Issues raised summarised as follows:

- The planner's report did not take sufficient account of the appellant's original submission, or give it sufficient weight.
- The proposal incorporates doors on the elevation facing the appellant's property (the neighbouring gym), 2.7 metres from the boundary. The development is reliant on the neighbouring site for outlook and amenity, and the development will effectively sterilise the neighbouring site and undermine the co-ordinated regeneration potential of Sexton Street, precluding any future redevelopment of the neighbouring site, as it would obstruct these openings.
- The separation distance of only 2.7 metres does not reflect recognised planning standards or good planning practice
- Sexton Street is located within Newtown Pery, known for its Georgian architectural heritage. The proposal undermines the visual integrity of the street, and does not correspond with the established character of the street.
- The gym operates from 6 am to 10 pm 7 days a week, generating regular activity and associated noise. The introduction of new residential units and cultural centre (mosque) in immediate proximity creates potential conflict, as residents may be adversely affected by the established use of the gym, leading to poor residential amenity and unreasonable restrictions on the continued operation of the gym.
- The Dawat-E-islami community made a previous planning application on Wickham Street (reg ref 20/1236) A search on estate agent websites does not turn up any indication of the site being for sale, as asserted in their planning

application. That site is larger, already has planning with residential use, and is more suitable.

- The scheme should be refused permission.

## 6.2. Applicant Response

A response was received from the applicant's agent as follows:

- The planner's report specifically referenced all submissions received, and assessed them under the policies of the Development Plan.
- The distance of the side openings is consistent with urban design practices, and the reliance on adjacent properties for light and amenity is common in densely populated areas. Future redevelopment of no 17 is unaffected. The proposed separation exceeds that required under Part B (Fire) of the Building Regulations. No part of the proposal relies on adjoining lands for light, ventilation, or amenity.
- The scheme complies with the Ministerial Guidelines for apartments, and complies with daylight and privacy standards.
- The site is not a protected structure or within an Architectural Conservation Area (although it is within the Newtown Perry Character Area. It is a sensitive infill development, contributing to a dynamic urban environment that respects historical architecture, with carefully selected materials, fenestration and proportions to harmonise with the existing streetscape.
- The site is zoned City Centre, where a mix of uses are encouraged under the Development Plan and the National Planning Framework. Residential uses over commercial uses are established and appropriate. Adequate sound insulation and ventilation measures will be incorporated in the new development. These are compatible land uses, typical of a central urban location.
- The planning application on Wickham Street is of no relevance to the present application, which must be assessed on its merits.
- The development should be granted for the above reasons.

### **6.3. Planning Authority Response**

None received within time limit.

### **6.4. Observations**

- Development Applications Unit – observations dated 17 November 2025, recommending provision of swift nest boxes and caller, under guidance of suitably qualified ornithologist, and requesting a bat survey be carried out prior to a planning decision.

### **6.5. Further Responses**

None received.

## **7.0 Assessment**

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Impact from openings on developability of neighbouring site
- Visual impact and architectural character
- Residential amenity of proposed development
- Bats and birds (new issue)

### **7.2. Impact from openings on developability of neighbouring site**

7.2.1. The appellant has concerns regarding the proximity of proposed openings to his property. I note at the outset that the openings shown on the west elevation drawing do not correspond with those shown on the plan drawing, with a minor discrepancy in the location of both the entrance door and the window to bedroom 2 of apartment 2. No elevation drawing was provided with the revised design submitted as further information; however, the main elements (relative to the issue of impact from the openings) are not in dispute. The apartments have deck access; a stair core at the

front of the building leads to a corridor which leads to a deck running the depth of the building. A handrail (1.2 metres high) separates this deck from skylights which provide light to the ground- and first-floor prayer rooms. There is a canopy roof over the deck, and a boundary wall (c. 1.8 metres above the finished floor level) to the boundary with the appellant's site. The deck is therefore partly enclosed by the canopy roof overhead, and partly open to the elements. No roof plan has been provided; I have extrapolated this information from the section drawings.

- 7.2.2. The layout of the apartments was revised slightly following a request for further information on compliance with Fire Regulations. As a result, each of four bedrooms has been provided with two doors, one leading from the living room, and one leading to the deck.
- 7.2.3. Three of these doors (which would need to be glazed, to provide light to the bedrooms) face the appellant's property, at a setback of 2.7-3.0 metres. The appellant states that this is non-compliant with accepted separation standards, depending on the neighbouring site for light, outlook, and amenity, and would sterilise the neighbouring site. I note that there are no numerical minimum separation standards in force, with such standards replaced by a performance-based approach. I consider the residential amenity of the proposed development further below under the relevant heading.
- 7.2.4. Having considered the drawings as submitted, the openings have very limited outlook over the neighbouring site, due to the boundary wall which rises nearly to the top of the windows, and the canopy over the deck. Even in the event of a redevelopment of the neighbouring site, there is no risk of significant overlooking by the appealed development. The development as proposed does not have windows on the boundary, or oversail the neighbouring property.

### **7.3. Visual impact and architectural character**

- 7.3.1. The existing streetscape has a mixed architectural character, with houses of various dates, finish, and materials, as well as the larger scale educational buildings to the south side of the street. They are predominantly three-storey in height. This proposal is for an additional floor to a permitted development – the permitted development is red brick, with a pitched roof, gabled to the front, with asymmetrical fenestration. The

proposed development is similar in character to that permitted, with an additional floor which replicates the fenestration and brickwork below, and an asymmetrical roofline. Visual impacts would be acceptable.

#### **7.4. Residential amenity of proposed development**

- 7.4.1. The appellant expresses concerns regarding conflict between his own commercial use (a gym), and the new use, as residents may be adversely affected by noise. I note the existing street has a significant residential use, and the gym directly abuts an existing terrace of three-storey houses. There is therefore a pre-existing constraint on untrammelled noise from the gym. This is a typical inner urban mixed-use street, with a mix of houses, apartments, and commercial uses (a gym, car repair garage, and credit union). There is significant hustle and bustle associated with the school uses on the south side of the street. The applicant's agent states that adequate sound proofing will be implemented, and I consider this a reasonable measure to ensure adequate mitigation against noise in this mixed use residential area. However, I note that the drawings show the existing building has relatively narrow walls, and no provision has been made to provide additional insulation for sound or thermal regulation. Increasing the thickness of the walls would decrease the width and floor area of the rooms to the apartments, which are currently at or slightly above the minimum.
- 7.4.2. Regarding broader issues of residential amenity, I have noted above the relevant sections of the Development Plan, the 2024 Compact Settlement Guidelines (the SPPRs of which take precedence over Development Plan policy) and the Ministerial Guidelines on Apartments (2023), to which the Development Plan refers (as an update to the 2020 guidelines).
- 7.4.3. The Development Plan states at Section 11.4 that "*[t]he minimum standards set within these sections will be sought in relation to refurbishment schemes however, it is acknowledged that this may not always be possible, particularly in relation to historic buildings, 'living over the shop' projects, tight urban infill developments and in the city under the Living City Initiative. In such cases, the standards may be relaxed subject to the provision of good quality accommodation and where the proposal secures the effective usage of underutilised accommodation.*" This project is both a

tight urban infill development, and akin to a ‘living over the shop’ project, and as such it is sensible to apply the standards flexibly, while requiring an overall achievement of good quality accommodation.

- 7.4.4. Similarly, the *Compact Settlement Guidelines* note that “the obligation will be on the project proposer to demonstrate that residents will enjoy a high standard of amenity”, while the *Apartment Guidelines* reiterate the requirement for quality developments in any relaxation of standards on urban infill sites.
- 7.4.5. I have concerns regarding the residential amenity of the apartments. The living room to apartment no 2 is lit by rooflights only, while that to apartment no 1 is lit by rooflights and by the doors to the balcony which looks onto the gable of the neighbouring building. The other window to this living room looks onto an internal corridor. While daylight and sunlight would be provided by the rooflights, the lack of any views out (particularly to apartment no 2) is unfortunate. The bedrooms are lit by the fire doors which give onto the deck access. Three of these windows face the boundary at a distance of c. 2.5-2.8 metres, while one looks down the length of the deck. No daylight and sunlight assessment has been submitted, but given the height of the boundary wall (some 1.8 metres above the relevant floor level) and the distance of the building from it, the canopy which oversails the deck (shown in Section B-B), the size, location, and orientation of the openings, and the floor to ceiling height which does not exceed the minimum 2.4 metres, I have significant concerns regarding access to daylight and sunlight to the bedrooms, as well as concerns regarding the limited outlook. The orientation is west-north-west – the building faces south-south-west, but the windows on the street-facing elevation light the store rooms. Neither private open space would be likely to have significant sunlight, while that to Apartment no 1 compromises the internal layout of that apartment.
- 7.4.6. Any three-storey (or higher) redevelopment of the neighbouring gym site would further compromise daylight and sunlight to the development.
- 7.4.7. While the rooms meet the minimum standards for space, the layout is unorthodox, with two doors to each bedroom to allow for fire escape. This compromises the useability of the bedroom floorspace, and limits the options for the placement of

normal bedroom furniture such as bedside lockers, dressing tables or desks, chairs, or chests of drawers.

7.4.8. Flexibility is required in the assessment of infill sites in built up areas in city centres, due to the proximity to other buildings, and a reduced outlook and light levels (particularly to bedrooms) is often considered acceptable, given overall levels of residential amenity to the dwelling; however, there is little in the way of compensatory amenity offered in this instance, and I consider a refusal in order.

## 7.5. **Bats and birds (new issue)**

7.5.1. I note the submission from the Development Applications Unit of the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, which refers to the removal of hedgerows on site, the provision of swift nest boxes, and the requirement for a bat survey prior to any grant of permission. I do not believe there are any hedgerows on site. Swift nest boxes could be accommodated on the front elevation. This is a vacant building, and backs onto other vacant buildings (former Shannon Furniture buildings), and as such the presence of bats is a possibility. However, it is in an urban area with streetlights, and as such the likelihood of bat roosts is reduced.

7.5.2. The issue of bats was not raised in the planner's report or in the request for further information, and the Department made no submission on the file. The conditions attached to the parent permission reg ref 24/147 make no reference to a bat survey being undertaken. The commission may wish to seek the views of the parties on the issues raised in the Department submission.

## 7.6. **Other issues**

7.6.1. Regarding the permitted development for a cultural centre on Wickham Street (ABP-310676-21 reg ref 201236) its viability or otherwise is a moot point in the consideration of this application.

7.6.2. The development in question here is the addition of two apartments to a permitted cultural centre/place of worship. The principle of the cultural/religious use has been established on the site by permission 24/453. In my view, some confusion has been introduced by the applicant's response to the further information request, which covered old ground by replicating the response to the further information request on

the previous permission, and justifying the development on the grounds that the Wickham Street site was found to be unsuitable. This issue was settled in the consideration of the previous permission.

The appellant contends that the planner's report did not take full account of their original submission. I have read the original third party submission, and the planner's reports, and consider that the issues raised in the objection were adequately assessed. The third party listed a large number of documents that were omitted from the application. Many of these (eg, lighting report, mobility management plan, road safety audit, micro-climate assessment) are only required for the assessment of large-scale developments, and not expected or required in an application for a relatively small infill development of two apartments.

## **8.0 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.
- 8.2. The subject site is located in the city centre, and comprises 2 apartments. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site due to the nature of the development, the distance from the nearest European site, and the lack of any connections between them.
- 8.3. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the development to be retained would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
- 8.4. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

## **9.0 Recommendation**

I recommend permission be refused.

## 10.0 Reasons and Considerations

It is considered that the proposed layout and design of the proposed apartment development would produce a cramped and substandard form of development, with inadequate daylight, sunlight, and views out, giving rise to substandard residential amenity for future occupiers. The proposed development 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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

---

Natalie de Róiste  
Planning Inspector

6 January 2026

## Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	ABP-323653-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	2 apartments
<b>Development Address</b>	18 Sexton Street, Limerick
<b>In all cases check box /or leave blank</b>	
<p><b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b></p> <p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,</li> <li>- Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<p><b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b></p>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.  <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<p><b>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?</b></p>	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

<p>development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p><b>No Screening required.</b></p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p><b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b></p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p><b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b></p>	<p>Class 10(b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units – Sub Threshold</p> <p>Class 10(b)(iv) [Urban Development – 10 hectares – sub threshold]</p>

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

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

<b>Case Reference</b>	ABP-323653-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	2 apartments
<b>Development Address</b>	18 Sexton Street, Limerick
<b>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</b>	
<b>Characteristics of proposed development</b>  (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).	Construction of two apartments in an urban area, connected to public services.  The development would not result in the production of significant waste, emissions, or pollutants.
<b>Location of development</b>  (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 in a built up area, and would not have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location. There is no hydrological connection present such as would give rise to significant impact on nearby water courses (whether linked to any European site or other sensitive receptors). The proposed development would not give rise to waste, pollution or nuisances that differ significantly from that arising from other urban developments.
<b>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</b>  (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	The development would not result in the production of significant waste, emissions, or pollutants, and there is no potential for significant effects, either by itself or cumulatively with other developments.
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Likelihood of Significant Effects</b>	<b>Conclusion in respect of EIA</b> <i>[Delete if not relevant]</i>

**There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.**

**EIA is not required.**

**Inspector:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DP/ADP:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)