

**Development**

Conversion of car ports to living room

**Location**

12 Park House, Dublin Street,  
Baldoyle, D13HKE3

**Planning Authority**

Fingal County Council

**Planning Authority Reg. Ref.**

F25A/0686E

**Applicant(s)**

Edel and Hugh Kilbride.

**Type of Application**

Permission

**Planning Authority Decision**

Refuse Permission

**Type of Appeal**

First Party

**Appellant(s)**

Edel and Hugh Kilbride.

**Observer(s)**

- 1) Ali Onur Uyar
- 2) Roisin Russ
- 3) Pamela and Christopher  
Samuelson
- 4) Suzanne McGann

**Date of Site Inspection**

2<sup>nd</sup> December 2025.

**Inspector**

Barry Diamond

## Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description .....	4
2.0	Proposed Development .....	4
3.0	Planning Authority Decision .....	4
4.0	Planning History .....	6
5.0	Policy Context .....	6
6.0	EIA Screening .....	8
7.0	The Appeal .....	8
8.0	Assessment .....	11
9.0	AA Screening .....	15
10.0	Water Framework Directive .....	16
11.0	Recommendation .....	17
12.0	Reasons and Considerations .....	17
13.0	Conditions .....	17

### Appendix 1 –EIA Screening

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The application site comprises a mid-terrace dwelling which has undercroft garages at ground level. The existing dwelling is designed in a contemporary style with a stone finish, render on the first floor and a flat roof.
- 1.2. The dwelling sits within a small cul-de-sac which accesses onto Dublin Street. The cul-de-sac is made up of other similarly designed dwellings which have also undercroft garages along with some areas of assigned car parking.
- 1.3. To the rear of the site is St Patricks nursing Home and to the northeast is the Rectory Park House which is a protected structure (RPS No. 795).

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. The proposed development seeks to convert two existing undercroft garages into a living room to serve the dwelling. The proposal would include the removal of the existing garage doors to be replaced with windows and internal alterations.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Decision**

On the 15<sup>th</sup> September 2025 the Planning Authority issued a decision to refuse planning permission for the following reason:

1. The proposed conversion of a garage/car ports to living space would lead to the loss of dedicated car parking spaces without replacement. The proposal in itself and in the precedent set will give rise to uncontrolled car parking on footpaths and common areas within the Park House estate, and as such would seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area and contravene Objective SPQHO45 Domestic Extensions and Policy SPQHP5 Quality Placemaking of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029.

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

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

The decision of the planner reflects the decision to refuse planning permission. It includes the following points:

- Residential extensions are acceptable within the 'RS,' Residential zoning
- The replacement of the garage doors with windows would not be visually obtrusive in the estate;
- A condition (No.4) of the previous grant of permission for the development (Ref: F15A/0438) restricted garage conversions;
- The Transport Planning Section requires at least one car parking space;
- The loss of parking would lead to an increase in parking on public footpaths;
- The development would set an undesirable precedent in the area; and
- The proposal will not significantly impact any Natura 2000 site.

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

- Water Services Section: no objection.
- Transport Planning Section: recommends permission be refused as at least one car parking space is required.

### **3.3. Prescribed Bodies**

None

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

There were four observations during the processing of the planning application which are attached to the file. I consider that the issues raised are also mirrored and expanded upon in their submissions to the Coimisiún and are not replicated in this section.

## 4.0 Planning History

### Site & Setting

F15A/0438 & PL06F.246755 - The development will consist of the part demolition, repair, refurbishment and sub-division of 'St. Mary's' (Protected Structure) to provide 9 residential units, and the construction of 17 other residential units and associated site works at St. Mary's, former Christian Brother Retirement Home, (a protected structure no.795), Dublin Street, Baldoyle, Co. Dublin.

The permission included condition No. 4 which states;

- (a) Development described in Classes 1 or 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, or any statutory provision modifying or replacing them, shall not be carried out within the curtilage of any of the proposed dwellinghouses without a prior grant of planning permission.
- (b) All internal garages shall be retained as vehicular garages only unless by prior grant of permission from the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity and orderly development.

### Permissions Referred to as Precedent

F20A/0715 & ABP-30977-21 - Permission was granted for the demolition of warehouse, construction of 2 apartment blocks, 21 residential units. Modifications of bottle store structure. The Elphin, 36 Baldoyle Road, Baldoyle, Dublin 13

F22A/0469 & ABP 315139-22. Permission was granted for the construction of 4 apartments and all associated site works at the Elphin, 36 Baldoyle Road, Baldoyle, Dublin 13

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

The Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 is the operational plan for the area. The appeal site is zoned 'RS,' Residential with the associated land use objective 'to provide for residential development and to protect and /or improve residential amenity.' The appeal site is also located within the Dublin Airport Noise Zone D.

Objective HCAO24 Alteration and Development of Protected Structures and ACAs and 14.19.3.1 Protected Structures - Requires proposals for any development, affecting a Protected Structure and/or its setting, to be sensitively sited and designed so that they do not adversely affect the Protected Structure.

Policy SPQHP5 Quality Placemaking - seeks to add quality to the places where we live and work, by integrating high quality design, through ensuring good quality accessible public realms, promotion of adaptable residential buildings and by ensuring development contributes to a positive sense of place, local distinctiveness and character.

SPQHP41 Residential Extensions - seeks to support the extension of existing dwellings with extensions of appropriate scale and subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities.

SPQHO45 Domestic Extensions - seeks to support dwelling extensions of appropriate scale and subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities.

Objective DAO11 and DMSO105 – Requirement for Noise Insulation - The site is identified in the Plan as being located within Dublin Airport Noise Zone D which requires noise insulation where appropriate.

Section 14.10.2 Residential Extensions: supports applications to amend existing dwelling units to reconfigure and extend as the needs of the household change, subject to specific safeguards. In particular, the design and layout of residential extensions must have regard to and protect the amenities of adjoining properties.

Section 14.10.2.1 Front Extensions - The scale, height, and projection from the front building line of the dwelling should not be excessive so as to dominate the front elevation of the dwelling.

Section 14.17.7 Car Parking – Identifies two car parking zones in the Plan Area Table 14.18: Car Parking Zones which is supported by the criteria in Table 14.19: Car Parking Standards.

Policy CMP25 Car Parking Management – Promotes a balanced approach to the provision of car parking with the aim of using parking as a demand management measure to promote a transition towards more sustainable forms of transportation.

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

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

Architectural Heritage Protection, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2011 (Architectural Heritage Guidelines).

## **5.3. Natural Heritage Designations**

The appeal site is not located on or within proximity to any designated Natura 2000 sites, with the nearest designated site being the Baldoyle Bay SPA (SPA: 004016) Baldoyle Bay SAC (SAC: 000199) and Baldoyle Bay (pNHA: 000199) which are all located c. 250 metre to the east of the site. North Bull Island SPA (SPA: 004006) is located 900 metres to the south of the site.

## **6.0 EIA Screening**

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of my report.

## **7.0 The Appeal**

### **7.1. Grounds of Appeal**

7.2. The first party's grounds of appeal are provided by Hughes Planning and Development Consultants and are as follows:

- National and local policies have evolved to promote compact growth since the original permission for the estate was granted;
- The proposal to retain one garage is submitted as an alternative if necessary although the preference remains for the original proposal;
- The conversion will enhance the applicants amenity;
- There will be no negative impact onto neighbouring properties;

- The site is within proximity to nearby services and amenities including excellent transport links, within 4 mins to bus links and 13 mins to the train station;
- The proposal will improve passive surveillance of the estate;
- An upstairs living room is not practical as the applicants are getting older and an age friendly approach is advocated by the Development Plan;
- The site is within Zone 1 car parking area as defined by Section 14.17.7 of the Development Plan with there being a maximum of one car parking space for a three bed unit as per Table 14.19;
- The proposal complies with Policy CMP25 and Objective CM032 of the Development Plan which promotes a move away from car heavy developments;
- The Compact Settlement Guidelines only require 1.5 spaces per dwelling;
- There are seven car parking spaces available on the western side of the block;
- It is common place for residents with garages to park on the footpath outside dwellings;
- The alternative proposal to retain one car parking space is compliant with the Transport Divisions assessment;
- A development for reduced parking provision was approved by An Bord Pleanála at the Elphin, 36 Baldoyle Road, under ABP-30977-21 and subsequently four additional units were approved for the same scheme with no additional parking under ABP 315139-22.

### 7.3. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority considers that the proposal should not lead to the loss of parking without replacement, however, in the event that permission is granted a condition requiring a Section 48 development contribution or Special Development Contribution is requested.

### 7.4. Observations

A number of third parties raised issues through individual submissions. A summary of the main points of objection are as follows:

- The reduction in the proposed scheme to retain one space is not acceptable as the space to be retained would not accommodate a standard sized car let alone the applicants SUV;
- The living room could be converted to a fourth bedroom by future occupants;
- There is already inadequate parking in the area and the proposal would lead to the parking of vehicles on the footpaths and roads which would affect access and circulation;
- There is frequent misuse of the assigned parking bays along with misuse of the turning head and bin store areas;
- The road layout is too narrow and has not been designed to allow for on-street parking;
- There is no communal parking areas despite the agents comments;
- There was a recent accident in the estate which was caused by a poorly parked car;
- The proposal undermines the purpose of condition 04 of the original permission for the estate;
- The proposal is for the removal of two garages, not car ports;
- Approval of the appeal would contravene the spirit of national policies and policies in the Development Plan, SPQHP41 and SPQHO45.
- The Elphin, 36 Baldoyle Road does not set a precedent as it was for an apartment development, not houses;
- The estate was designed to reflect the protected structure and the change in the façade of the building would diverge from the uniformity of design and would be out of character with the estate;
- The applicant is not downsizing, they are increasing living space;
- A rear extension would be a more viable solution for more living space; and
- There is a restrictive covenant restricting alterations to properties and permission has not been sought or granted to alter the property from the Owners Management Company;

## 7.5. **Further Responses**

None

## 8.0 **Assessment**

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

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Parking
- Protected Structure
- Other Matters

### 8.2 **Principle of Development**

8.2.1 The proposed development comprises the conversion of two existing garages undercroft garages for the use as a dwelling, which is located within zoning 'RS', Residential, with the associated land use objective 'to provide for residential development and to protect and /or improve residential amenity.'

8.2.2 I note that the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 (FDP) is supportive of residential extensions. In this regard Section 14.10.2 supports applications to amend existing dwelling units to reconfigure and extend existing dwellings as the needs of the household change, subject to specific safeguards. I consider that the principle of the conversion to create additional living space is acceptable subject to issues of parking, design, and other relevant factors.

### 8.3 **Design**

8.3.1 The existing dwelling sits is a mid terrace three storey dwelling with undercroft garages on the front elevation enclosed by garage doors. The living accommodation for the dwelling is principally on the first and second floor of the dwelling. The design, finishes and form of the mid terrace application dwelling is reflected in the adjoining dwellings in the same linear row which runs from north to south. No. 16 Park House

is a detached house which sits at the end of the same linear row but has a ground floor window.

8.3.2 The applicant has asked for the appeal to be decided on the basis of the proposal put forward to the Planning Authority which entailed the removal of both garage doors. An alternative proposal was also submitted in the appeal documentation which would remove only one of the garage doors. In both proposals the garage door(s) to be removed would be replaced with a window and the internal space would be reconfigured to create a ground floor living room.

8.3.3 The existing garages in the front façade of the building create an existing void in the building form which would not be altered by their replacement with a window. I consider that the impact of the design change would not be excessive so as to dominate the front elevation of the dwelling. While I accept that the removal of the garage doors would create a variance in the design of the dwelling in relation to the neighbouring dwellings I do not consider that it would be so detrimental as to alter the visual amenity or character of the estate. In addition, I note that the change in the front façade of the building was not a matter raised as a reason for refusal by the Planning Authority.

8.3.4 Given that the proposal creates windows at ground level which look onto the estate road, a parking area and open space I do not consider that the changes to the front façade present any opportunity for overlooking, or loss of light onto neighbouring properties.

8.3.5 I consider that in terms of design, both the removal of the single garage doors or both the garage doors would be acceptable.

#### **8.4 Parking**

8.4.1 The loss of parking in the area as a result of the proposal is the core issue of the reason for refusal put forward by the Planning Authority and the third parties. Section 14.17.7 of the Development Plan identifies two car parking zones in the Plan Area. Table 14.18: Car Parking Zones identifies that Zone 1 comprises areas within 800m of Bus Connects spine route, or 1600m of an existing or planned Luas/Dart/Metro Rail station or within an area covered by a Section 49 scheme.

8.4.2 The application site is within 800 metres of bus stops at Balydoyle, Moyclare and Admiral Park. In addition, there is a Dart Station at Bayside approximately 1km from the site. I consider that the site is within a highly accessible location and is well

served by public transport links and should be classified as being within a Zone 1 parking area. The Transportation Section of the Planning Authority also indicate that the site is within Zone 1.

8.4.3 Within Zone 1 maximum parking standards apply. Table 14.19 of the Development Plan identifies that the maximum parking for a 3 bedroom dwelling is 1 parking space. A third party indicates that a future owner of the property could convert the living room area to a fourth bedroom, however, the parking standard in the Development Plan for a four bedroom house would also be a maximum of one parking space.

8.4.4 The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities states that Car parking ratios should be reduced at all urban locations, and should be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated at locations that have good access to urban services and to public transport. SPPR 3 of the Guidelines indicates that in accessible locations the maximum parking requirement would be 1.5 spaces.

8.4.5 The third parties correctly note that the original grant of permission for the estate (Ref's: F15A/0438 & PL06F.246755) required that all internal garages be retained as vehicular garages unless by prior grant of permission from the planning authority. This condition requires that any conversion requires the grant of planning permission, which the applicant has applied for and does not prevent planning permission being granted, subject of course to the prevailing policies in the Development Plan and other guidelines relevant at the time of assessment.

8.4.6 Evidently the area in which the application site is situated is subject to maximum parking requirements as opposed to normal standards. The applicant seeks to remove their two existing parking spaces in substitution for enhanced living space to meet their future needs. As the Development Plan and SPPR 3 of the Guidelines refer to maximum parking spaces there is no policy requirement to provide parking at this location as set out in the current Development Plan.

8.4.7 The Planning Authority refers to Objective SPQHO45 and Policy SPQHP5 of the Development Plan in their reason for refusal which relates principally to placemaking. I note from the Officers report that their objection in this regard is the impact that on-street parking may have on the area as the rationale for the refusing the development. It was evident from the photographs provided by the third parties

and from my own site inspection that parking already occurs on the adjoining pavements. There is no requirement for the applicant to park in their garage, the availability of the garage(s) provides an option for parking rather than a requirement. In addition, there is a responsibility on all car owners to park safely and legally so as not to create a hazard to other road users.

8.4.8 Previous permission (Ref: ABP 315139-22) at the Elphin, 36 Bald Doyle Road, Bald Doyle was quoted by the applicant as a precedent as four apartments were permitted with no parking. I note that the inspector in that case stated that the appeal site was in an accessible urban location where the default policy is for car parking provision to be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated in certain circumstances. While the case was determined on its own merits the interpretation of the policy direction is properly stated which advocates for reductions in parking requirements in favour of more sustainable forms of transport.

8.4.9 I do not consider that the loss of the two parking spaces within the application site would have a detrimental impact on the sense of place, local distinctiveness or character of the area which Policy SPQHP5 seeks to protect. I consider that the loss of the two parking spaces would be acceptable and may help promote the transition to more sustainable forms of transport promoted by Policy CMP25 of the Development Plan.

## 8.5 **Protected Structure**

8.5.1 The site looks onto a protected structure known as Rectory Park House which is a protected structure (RPS No. 795). Although the site does not lie within the curtilage of the Protected Structure, Objective HCAO24 and 14.19.3.1 of the Development Plan refer to the need to consider the setting of the protected structure. Concern was raised by third parties that the original estate was designed to reflect the protected structure and the change in the façade of the building would diverge from the uniformity of design.

8.5.2 I am of the opinion that the views towards or out of the protected structure would not be affected by the proposed change in the front façade of the application building which comprise fairly minor changes to a contemporary building which contrasts with the Protected Structure rather than replicates its style. I consider that no adverse impact on the setting of the Protected Structure would arise from the development.

## 8.6 Other Matters

8.6.1 The third parties state that the description refers to car ports as opposed to garages which is not accurate. While this is accurate I do not consider that the description is misleading or would lead the reader to conclude that the element of the building to be converted referred to some other element of the building.

8.6.2 In respect to the matter referring to a restrictive covenant on the building restricting alterations to the building without the consent of the Owners Management Company I note that such matters are not matters which can be adjudicated by the Coimisiún. I refer to Section 5.13 of the Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2007) which states that the planning system is not designed as a mechanism for resolving disputes about title to land or premises or rights over land; these are ultimately matters for resolution in the Courts. I also refer to Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) states that 'a person shall not be entitled solely by reason of a permission under this section to carry out any development'.

## 9.0 AA Screening

9.1 I have considered the development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located at 12 Park House, Dublin Street, Baldoyle, no relevant designated sites are close by.

9.2 The proposed development comprises the conversion of car ports to a living room. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site.

9.3 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Small scale and nature of the development;

- Distance from nearest European site and lack of connections; and
- Taking into account the screening decision of the Planning Authority.

9.4 I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

## 10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1 The subject site is located at 12 Park House, Dublin Street, Baldoyle which is 254 metres west of the nearest water body.

10.2 The proposed development comprises the conversion of car ports to a living room. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

10.3 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.

10.4 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of works e.g. small scale and nature of the development ; and
- Distance from nearest water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections.

10.5 I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a

temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

## 11.0 Recommendation

That planning permission be granted for the proposal which was originally submitted to the Planning Authority which includes the conversion of the two garages to be replaced by a living room for the reasons and considerations set out below and subject to the conditions set out below.

## 12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the design, appearance of the proposed conversion, the loss of parking, it is the Commissions view that, subject to compliance with conditions below, the development proposed would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area or residential amenities of any property in the vicinity, it would not adversely impact on the character or local distinctiveness of the area and the loss of parking would be acceptable in this highly accessible area. The proposed development, therefore, would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 13.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the Planning Authority on the 28<sup>th</sup> day of July 2025, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>Building noise insulation shall be provided to an appropriate standard having regard to the location of the site within Dublin Airport Noise Zone D.</p>

	<p><b>Reason:</b> In the interests of residential amenity and to ensure compliance with Objective DMSO105 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029.</p>
3.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Friday inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays.</p> <p>Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
4.	<p>a) All necessary measures shall be taken by the applicant to prevent any spillage or deposition of clay, dust, rubble or other debris, whether arising from vehicle wheels or otherwise, on the adjoining and/or adjacent public road and footpath network during the course of the construction works.</p> <p>b) Any damage to roads, footpaths or other public property caused by the development shall be made good to the satisfaction of the District Engineer.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of traffic safety and proper control of development.</p>
5.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p>

	<p><b>Reason:</b> It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.</p>
--	---

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

---

Barry Diamond  
Planning Inspector

16<sup>th</sup> December 2025

## Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	PL-500067-DF
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Conversion of car ports to living room
<b>Development Address</b>	12 Park House, Dublin Street, Baldoyle, D13HKE3
<b>In all cases check box /or leave blank</b>	
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<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>	
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<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>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 2</u>, 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>	
<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	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 Act).

<p>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 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> <b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b></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>	
<b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</b>
<b>No</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b>

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

