



Inspector's Report

PL-500071-DL

Development

Retention of extensions and attic conversion and all associated site development works.

Location

Kinnea, Clonmany, Co. Donegal

Planning Authority

Donegal County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2561342

Applicant

Bridget Diver

Type of Application

Retention Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant

Martin Doherty

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

16th January 2026

Inspector

John Duffy

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	5
3.4. Third Party Observations	5
4.0 Planning History	5
5.0 Policy Context	5
5.1. Development Plan	5
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	7
6.0 EIA Screening	7
7.0 The Appeal	8
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	8
7.2. Applicant Response	9
7.3. Planning Authority Response	10
7.4. Observations	10
8.0 Assessment	11
9.0 AA Screening	11
10.0 Recommendation	16
11.0 Reasons and Considerations	17
12.0 Conditions	18

Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site with a stated area of 0.365 ha is located in the coastal townland of Kinnea, situated in the north-west corner of the Inishowen Peninsula and approximately 2km to the north-west of Clonmany village in Co. Donegal.
- 1.2. The appeal site, set back approximately 0.38km from the coast, is accessed by way of a lengthy narrow (single lane) carriageway (c 230m in length) from a local rural road and accommodates a single and two storey rural dwelling and small outbuilding. A drainage ditch runs along the western side of the site.
- 1.3. Adjoining the appeal site to the south is a farmyard and associated agricultural buildings. The topography of the surrounding area is gently undulating, with lands to the south of the subject site rising in elevation. There are a number of one-off rural dwellings of varying designs and styles in the area.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Retention permission is sought for (1) side and rear extensions and (2) attic conversion, together with all associated site development works.
- 2.2. The extensions comprise a single storey pitched roof element to the eastern side of the existing house, which is set back from the front building line, along with a two storey extension to the rear, positioned proximate to the southern boundary of the site.
- 2.3. Submitted floor plans indicate the area to be retained at ground floor level (stated as c 66 sqm) accommodates living, kitchen and utility areas along with a sewing room. The areas to be retained at first floor (stated as c 44 sqm) in the two storey extension are indicated as storage areas / gym. At attic level, an office and a storage area (c 20 sqm) are proposed to be retained.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority granted retention permission on the 18th of September 2025 subject to two conditions including that no surface water discharges onto the public road or onto the site.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. The Planning Report dated 12th September 2025 forms the basis for the planning authority's decision to grant retention permission and the report includes the following comments:

- Unauthorised elements have been in situ for a prolonged period.
- Principle of a dwelling is long established on the site.
- Proposal is considered acceptable having regard to the form and design of the existing house.
- Side extension is modest in height scale and massing.
- No adverse impacts on the High Scenic Amenity designation of the area.
- No issues arise regarding loss of privacy, overlooking or residential amenity given separation distances to dwellings nearby.
- Proposed attic to be retained will not result in any significant additional loading to the existing wastewater treatment system on site and no major public health concerns arise.
- All storm water to discharge to existing storm drainage network.
- No development charge applicable in this instance.
- Points of third party objection noted and responded to.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Roads and Transportation Planning: While I note the Planning Officer's report indicates no report was received from Roads Section, there is a report on file from this Section. No recommendation is given and the report is signed off on 9th September

2025. This report is date-stamped as being received by Planning Services on the 22nd September 2025.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No reports received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One third party submission was received from a nearby landowner. The matters raised are similar in nature to the grounds of appeal, as set out in section 7 of this report, below.

4.0 Planning History

Subject site

No recent planning history.

Adjoining Lands to the east

Reg. Ref. 25/61460 refers to an application made by the applicant's daughter in which Donegal County Council decided in October 2025 to grant retention permission for revised front elevation, attic conversion, domestic shed, to grant permission for a new septic tank and all associated works at Kinnea, Clonmany, Co. Donegal. This application is the subject of a third party appeal (Ref. PL-500214-DL-25), lodged with An Coimisiún Pleanála on 5th November 2025.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The County Donegal Development Plan 2024-2030 is the operative plan for the area and it sets out local planning policy context including provision of rural development.

The appeal site is located within an area designated as a 'Structurally Weak' Rural Area as noted on Map 6.3.1. In such areas, Rural Policies RH-P-6 , RH-P-7 and RH-P-9 apply as set out below.

RH-P-6 relates to Refurbishment / Replacement / Extension of Existing Non-Vernacular Dwellings

RH-P-7 relates to Refurbishment / Extension of Existing Traditional Building Stock

RH-P-9 states that proposals for individual dwellings (including refurbishment, replacement and/or extension projects) shall be sited and designed in a way that is sensitive to the integrity and character of rural areas.

The site is also located within a Landscape Character Area of 'High Scenic Amenity' as noted on Development Plan Map 11.1. Chapter 11 defines such areas as '*landscapes of significant aesthetic, cultural, heritage and environmental quality that are unique to their locality and form a fundamental element of the landscape and identity of County Donegal. These areas have the capacity to absorb sensitively located development of scale, design and use that will enable assimilation into the receiving landscape and which does not detract from the quality of the landscape, subject to compliance with all other objectives and policies of the plan.*'

Policy L-P-2 is relevant and states the following:

To protect areas identified as 'High Scenic Amenity' and 'Moderate Scenic Amenity' on Map 11.1 'Scenic Amenity.' Within these areas, only development of a nature, location and scale that integrates with, and reflects the character and amenity of the landscape may be considered, subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan.

Chapter 16 sets out development standards and technical guidance. Policy TS-P-1 requires developments to follow technical standards, where applicable, in addition to all other relevant policy provisions in the County Development Plan and relevant Governmental guidance and standards.

Other objectives / policies as raised in the appeal:

RH-P-5 Clachans: To consider proposals for single dwellings for permanent occupation/family homes within identified Clachans without requiring the demonstration of a rural housing need, subject to the dwelling: a. being sited and designed in a manner that enables the development to be assimilated into the area; b. not giving rise to a road safety hazard; c. complying with public health standards;

and d. otherwise complying with the policies of this Plan. New Holiday Homes will not be permitted in these areas.

WW-P-3: Developments connecting to the public water network shall provide confirmation from Uisce Éireann that it is feasible to provide an appropriate water supply service and network capacity to serve the development. Such developments shall ensure that an adequate water supply can be provided to serve the projected requirements of any proposed development, and that existing water services will not be negatively impacted.

WW-O-1: To maintain, improve and enhance the quality of surface and ground waters as appropriate in accordance with the requirements of a. The EU Water Framework Directive including implementing the Programme of Measures contained with the River Basin Management Plan 2022-2027 and any subsequent plan. b. The European Communities (Surface Water) Regulations 2009. c. The European Communities (Ground Water) Regulations 2010.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The proposed development is not located within or immediately adjacent to any European Site. The nearest European Site is the North Inishowen Coast SAC (Site Code 0002012) which is located approximately 380m north of the development to be retained.

6.0 EIA Screening

The development to be retained 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 this report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

This is a third party appeal from Martin Doherty of Roxtown, Clonmany, Co. Donegal, stated to be the owner and occupier of nearby lands, against the decision made by the planning authority to grant permission. The grounds of appeal are summarised under relevant headings, as follows:

Roads and Transportation Report

- There appears to be a discrepancy between the decision date (18th September 2025) and receipt of the Engineer's report (dated stamped as received on 22nd September).
- If the Engineer's report did not inform the decision, the matter should be regularised.
- The report identified sightline, drainage and reinstatement matters that do not appear to have been conditioned.
- In accordance with section 34(10) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, the Board is requested to attach appropriate standard road conditions.

Site boundary accuracy

- There are overlapping red line boundaries in terms of the appeal site and a planning application on adjoining lands to the east (Reg. Ref. 25/61460 refers). This creates uncertainty and is contrary to Article 22(g) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. This should be clarified prior to any grant of permission.
- Bringing residential development closer to a working farm, owned and operated by the appellant, could give rise to amenity sensitivities and unwarranted constraints on established farm operations, which involve routine agricultural activities.
- Verified mapping and ownership confirmation should be required prior to a grant of permission. The curtilage should be limited to the domestic historical envelope only.

Watermain

- A 5 inch watermain, installed under a Local Improvement Scheme (LIS), crosses the green area on the eastern side of the site. In accordance with Development Plan policies WS-P-3 and WS-O-1, a condition should be attached requiring the applicant to survey and map the watermain, agree protection measures and a way leave (minimum 3m) with Irish Water and the Roads Authority.

Rural character

- The red line boundary extends beyond the established domestic area into land previously used for agriculture. No mapping or photographic evidence is provided to demonstrate prior domestic use.
- No analysis undertaken by the planning authority in terms of Policy RH-P-5.
- To permit retention permission risks suburbanisation and precedent for further curtilage expansion.
- A curtilage restriction condition would safeguard rural character and surface water management.

Attachments to the appeal include:

- An aerial photograph (from Google Maps) of the subject site and adjoining lands dated June 2019.
- A site plan relating to the application, the subject of this appeal.
- A proposed site plan and existing site plan relating to a planning application pertaining to a neighbouring site to the east (Reg. Ref. 25/61460).

7.2. Applicant Response

BPS Planning and Development Consultants responded to the third party appeal on behalf of the applicant on 12th November 2025. Matters raised are summarised as follows:

- The applicant and other local people have complained about adverse impacts of a nearby pig farm, stated to be operated by the appellant. It is considered that the appeal is vexatious and should be dismissed having regard to section 138 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

- The appeal submission raises no new points not already addressed by the planning authority.
- This planning application is required a part of the Defective Concrete Blocks (DCB) Grant Scheme. To avail of the Scheme the applicant must apply for retention.
- The appellant did not include any roads issue as a ground for objection to the planning authority. A Roads report is not a requirement.
- Legal boundaries to sites within the ownership of others are civil matters as detailed in the Development Management Guidelines. No issues relating to the shared boundary with the appellant are raised.
- The proposal would not undermine the adjoining agricultural operation.
- The appellant is the beneficial owner of areas in red on the maps. These areas have not been used for agriculture in the last 50 years.
- The Planner's report refers to the watermain and other underground services; in this regard the report noted the proposal does not include any new build element to the house.
- The rural context of the area was assessed in the planner's report.
- A rural house is not limited to only 'a domestic area.'
- The appeal response includes an extract of the planner's report which responds to the various items of objection raised in relation to the planning application.

A copy of the third party appeal is appended to the response submitted on behalf of the applicant.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

This was received on 10th November 2025 and it considers the issues raised in the appeal are dealt with in the Planning Officer's report which recommended a grant of planning permission.

7.4. Observations

None.

8.0 Assessment

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

- Land-use and nature of the proposed development
- Report of Roads and Transportation Planning Section
- Site boundaries
- Watermain
- Rural character
- Water Framework Directive – Screening
- Other issues
- Planning Authority conditions

8.2. Land-use and nature of proposed development

8.2.1. The proposed development comprises retention permission for existing extensions (totalling c 130 sqm) to a rural dwelling. From my site visit and available aerial mapping, it appears the extensions to the house were constructed several years ago. This development type is acceptable in principle at the site subject to no significant impacts on surrounding residential and visual amenities. Having regard to the design, scale, and form of the development to be retained and the separation distances to residential properties in the area, no undue impacts on residential and visual amenities arise. To conclude, I consider the development to be retained acceptable in principle.

8.3. Report of Roads and Transportation Planning Section

8.3.1. The appellant notes that the Roads report does not appear to have been received by Planning Services until after the decision was made on the application. Having reviewed this report I would concur with the appellant on this point, as it is dated-stamped as being received on 22nd September 2025 and I note the planning authority's decision was made on the 18th of September 2025.

8.3.2. Notwithstanding, although the subject report indicates the site notice was in place and legible when inspected on the 9th of September 2025, I note it makes no recommendation on the proposal. There is no text contained in the 'Recommendation' section on the first page of the report. Subsequent pages contain 'tick boxes' for a variety of planning conditions relating to transportation matters, such as 'Entrance,' 'Vision Lines,' and 'Drainage' and also for Items of Additional Information. I note that no boxes are completed or ticked. Page 2 also includes Recommendation 'tick boxes' (i.e. *No Objection, Objection or Further Information*) and it is noteworthy that none of these boxes are ticked. Having regard to the foregoing I conclude that the Roads and Transportation Planning Section made no recommendation in connection with the proposal. In this regard I do not concur with the appellant who has stated that the report contains recommendations in connection with matters including sightlines and drainage.

8.3.3. I note the existing house is served by an existing lengthy narrow carriageway from the public road. The description of development contained in the public notices does not refer to any proposed amendments to the existing site entrance. As such, and given the nature of the proposal relating to retention of existing extensions to the existing house, there is no requirement, in my view, to include planning conditions relating to transportation matters such as sightlines.

8.4. Site boundaries

8.4.1. Concern is raised in the appeal that inaccurate site boundaries are depicted on the submitted drawings, and that ownership confirmation should be required prior to a grant of planning permission. In this context, it appears that the red line boundary as detailed in the site layout map overlaps with that of adjoining lands to the east, which are the subject of a separate planning application by the applicant's daughter.

8.4.2. The response to the appeal from the applicant's agent states that the red line boundary meets the requirements of planning legislation and the applicant owns the lands within the red line boundary. I note the planning authority is satisfied the red line boundary denoted on the proposed site plan incorporates the development as presented to the Council. I concur with this view and it is apparent that all elements of the proposal are contained within the red line on the site layout plan, stated to be in the applicant's

ownership. It is open to the applicant to make a planning application for development on lands within their ownership if they so wish.

- 8.4.3. I accept that there is some overlap in lands within the red line boundary of the subject site when compared with the lands within the red line boundary on the adjoining site to the east. However, I do not consider this to be a material issue for the purposes of this appeal, given that the planning application, the subject of this appeal, relates to specific development sited within the curtilage of the appeal site, which does not encroach upon or impact on the development to be retained and proposed within the adjoining site, as demonstrated on the proposed site layout plan pertaining to that concurrent application / appeal (Reg. Ref. 25/61460 refers).
- 8.4.4. Article 22(2)(g)(i) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, requires an applicant who is not the legal owner of the land or structure concerned to provide written consent of the owner to make the application. While the appellant suggests the proposal is contrary to this legislative provision, as detailed above, this is disputed by the applicant, and in this regard I would note that the onus is on the proposer to ensure they hold sufficient legal interest in terms of carrying out the proposal.

8.5. **Watermain**

- 8.5.1. The appellant contends that a condition should be attached requiring the watermain traversing the green area on the eastern side of the site to be surveyed, mapped, protected and subject to a wayleave. In the regard reference is made respectively to Development Plan Policy and Objective WS-P-3 and WS-O-1.
- 8.5.2. The current County Donegal Development Plan does not appear to include the above-mentioned policy and objective as referenced in the appeal; however it may be the case that the applicant is referring to Policy WW-P-3 (relating to a requirement to provide confirmation from Uisce Éireann (UÉ) that it is feasible to provide a water supply service) and Objective WW-O-1 (relating to surface and ground water quality).
- 8.5.3. Notwithstanding, I note the development to be retained is at a remove from the green area to the eastern side of the site, where the appellant maintains the watermain is

located. The planning authority invited UÉ to comment on the proposal and I note that no response was received.

8.5.4. To conclude, I concur with the planning authority's view, that the development to be retained would not impact the LIS funded infrastructure.

8.6. **Rural character**

8.6.1. The appellant is concerned that retention of the development would erode the rural character of the area, risking suburbanisation and precedent for further curtilage expansion. Furthermore, it is requested that the curtilage should be limited to the domestic historical envelope as residential development could lead to amenity issues and constraints on the farm.

8.6.2. In my opinion, the proposal relating to retention of extensions to an existing rural house would not undermine the rural character of the area or the continuation of agricultural operations in the area. I do not accept the appellant's contention that relatively modest extensions to a rural dwelling would lead to suburbanisation or an undesirable precedent.

8.6.3. Finally, while I note the third party is critical that the proposal was not assessed under Policy RH-P-5, I consider this policy to not apply as it relates to Clachans. The subject proposal comprising retention of domestic extensions to a house is outside an identified Clachan, as confirmed on the Clachan designations map as per the current County Development Plan 2024-2030.

8.7. **Water Framework Directive - Screening**

8.7.1. The rural appeal site accommodates an extended dwelling. The proposal relates to retention of the extensions (c 130 sqm).

8.7.2. I have assessed the proposal 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 bodies 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 ground water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively. The reasons for this are as follows:

- The nature of the works comprising a small scale of development.
- The lack of direct hydrological connections from the site to any surface and transitional water bodies.

8.7.3. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposal 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. Therefore, I do not consider the proposal to be contrary to Objective WW-O-1 of the County Development Plan relating, inter alia, to water quality and WFD requirements.

8.8. **Other issues**

8.8.1. Wastewater Treatment

The application form received in respect of the proposal by the planning authority confirms the subject dwelling is served by a conventional septic tank system. Having regard to the submitted floor plans, the dwelling contains two bedrooms and I note the subject extensions do not provide for additional bedroom accommodation. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal does not place additional loading on the existing wastewater treatment system in situ and as such no upgrade would be required to cater for the development to be retained.

8.8.2. Financial Contribution Condition

The Planning Officer's report indicates that no development charge applies in this instance. I note that a Draft Development Contribution Scheme 2025-2030 was published in November 2025 whereby domestic extensions attract a €5 per sqm levy subject to a minimum charge of €100. Retention permissions for unauthorised development shall be the standard charge for the particular class of development plus 50%. However, according to the Donegal County Council website, the current scheme in place relates to the Donegal Development Contribution Scheme 2016-2021 under

which domestic extensions are exempt from levies (Table 2 refers). As such, given that the parameters of the Development Contribution Scheme 2016-2021 remain in place at the present time, the development to be retained does not attract any development contribution.

8.8.3. Request to dismiss appeal

The submission made on behalf of the applicant (section 7.2 above refers) sought dismissal of the appeal having regard to section 138 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. In this context, An Coimisiún Pleanála wrote to the applicant's agent on the 3rd of December 2025, confirming that it is satisfied the appeal meets all of the criteria as set out in section 127 of the Act and that the appeal process shall continue until determination.

8.9. **Planning Authority Conditions**

8.9.1. The planning authority conditions are standard and appropriate to this case, given that the proposal relates to retention of extensions to an existing house. As such, should retention permission be granted I recommend inclusion of both conditions in the Order, subject to minor alteration so that the conditions accord with the Commission's standard wording / text. I also suggest inclusion of an additional condition, requiring the dwelling and extensions to be jointly occupied as a single residential unit, in the interest of residential amenity.

9.0 **AA Screening**

- 9.1. I have considered the proposal comprising retention of domestic extensions and attic conversion, and all associated site works in the light of the requirements of Sections 177S and 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.
- 9.2. The development to be retained is not located within or immediately adjacent to any European Site. The nearest European Site is the North Inishowen Coast SAC (Site Code 0002012) which is located approximately 380m north of the development to be retained.

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

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Small scale and nature of the proposal.
- Location-distance from nearest European Site.
- Absence of any meaningful direct and indirect pathways to any European Site.
- Taking into account the screening determination of the planning authority.

I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with any other plans or projects.

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

10.0 Recommendation

10.1. I recommend that retention permission be granted for the proposal.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature and scale of the development to be retained, the relevant policies and objectives contained in the County Donegal Development Plan 2024-2030, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposal would not impact on the watermain traversing the eastern part of the site, would not erode the rural character of the area or undermine the continuation of agricultural operations and would not result in an undesirable precedent. Given that no amendments to the existing access are proposed, inclusion of planning conditions in this regard are not required. It is considered the proposed development to be

retained would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development to be retained shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The existing dwelling and the extensions to be retained shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit and the extensions shall not be used, sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.</p> <p>Reason: To restrict the use of the extension in the interest of residential amenity.</p>
3.	<p>Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</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, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

John Duffy
Planning Inspector

20th January 2026

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

No EIAR Submitted

Case Reference	PL-500071-DL
Proposed Development Summary	Retain domestic extensions and attic conversion and all associated site works.
Development Address	Kinnea, Clonmany, Co. Donegal
In all cases check box /or leave blank	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project.' Proceed to Q2. <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No No Screening required.	The development to be retained 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.
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?

Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____