



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

**PL500077-DS**

---

<b>Development</b>	Demolition of non-original extension to rear, and construction of proposed single and two storey extension to rear
<b>Location</b>	12 Tower Avenue, Rathgar, Dublin 6, D06 RH97
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Dublin City Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	WEB2756/25
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Niamh & Perry Sammon
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Split Decision
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Susan Russell & Lorcan Walshe
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	21 <sup>st</sup> December 2025
<b>Inspector</b>	Andrew Hersey

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1 The site is located at 12 Tower Avenue, Rathgar, Dublin 6 D06 RH97. The site comprises of a mid-terrace period red brick house with front and rear gardens.
- 1.2 There is pedestrian entrance to the front garden.
- 1.3 To the rear there is a two storey red brick rear return and a single storey conservatory of modern construction.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1 The proposed development is for;
  - The demolition of the single storey conservatory (referred to as the non-original extension to the rear in the development description) and
  - The construction of a two storey extension with the ground floor extending to the eastern and western party boundaries and is 3.285 metres height and which is clad in a timber finish and a first floor extension which has a pitched roof and clad in a brick finish.
  - The proposal includes for the replacement of rooflights on the main pitch of the roof and a new rooflight and solar panels on the south slope of the existing rear return
  - New boundary treatments in the form of increased heights to party boundaries
  - The proposal also includes for a garden store with a floorspace of 14.1sq.m. which is located at the southern end of the garden, has a flat roof and a parapet height of 2.97 metres. The garden store is also proposed to be clad in timber.
  - Bin store in the front garden clad in timber

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

- 3.1 **Decision** – a split decision was issued as follows;
  - 3.1.1 Grant permission for demolition of non-original extension to rear, construction of proposed single storey extension to rear, replacement of existing rooflights to

original roof and new rooflight to existing return roof, new solar panels, proposed single storey garden room structure to rear of garden, new boundary wall treatment, modifications to opes and elevational treatment and all necessary associated site works and services.

3.1.2 Refuse permission for the first floor extension for the following reason:

*Having regard to the bulk, scale and massing of the first-floor extension, it is considered that the cumulative depth in combination with the existing rear return would be overbearing, would impact upon overshadowing to the adjacent properties and fail to harmonise with the existing and adjoining dwellings. As such, the proposed development due to its negative impact on both visual and residential amenity would be contrary to the relevant guidance set out in Appendix 18 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. The development would set an undesirable precedent and would therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area*

3.1.3 The following conditions are considered relevant;

- Condition 2 states; *This permission excludes the first-floor extension of the development, for the reasons set out in the attached refusal schedule*
- Condition 3 states; *a) All external finishes to harmonise with the existing house in respect of materials and colour. b) The house and extension hereby permitted shall be used as a single dwelling unit.*
- Condition 4 states; *The permitted garden room shall be used only for purposes ancillary to the use of the main dwelling on the site as a single dwelling unit. It shall not be separated from the main house by sale or lease, used as sleeping accommodation or used for any commercial purpose without a separate grant of planning permission.*

## **3.2 Planning Authority Reports**

3.2.1 Planners Report

3.2.1.1 The case planners report raises the following issues;

- That the principle of an extension at this location is acceptable
- That the rear garden after construction of the extension will be 50sq.m in area which is sufficient to serve the dwelling

- Concerns are raised with respect to the bulk, scale and massing of the first floor element and having regard to the confined nature of adjacent sites the first floor element would appear overbearing.
- That the proposed first floor extension would adversely impact upon the surrounding visual amenity and would appear overly dominant in this instance. It is therefore considered appropriate that the first floor extension is omitted.
- That the other proposed elements such as the rooflights, solar panels, and boundary treatments are considered acceptable
- That the proposed garden shed is also considered acceptable subject to its use being for domestic purposes only

#### 3.2.1.2 Other Technical Reports

- Drainage (13<sup>th</sup> August 2025) – no objection subject to the design of the proposed soakaway being compliant with BRE Digest 365 and CIRIA C753.

### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None on file

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1 There are ten submissions on file which in summary, raise the following issues;

- Adverse impacts of the garden room on adjoining property
- Issues regarding inaccurate drawings
- That No 19 Brighton Gardens is located immediately adjacent to the proposed garden store.
- Loss of natural light. Shadow analysis drawings show loss of light into the garden of No. 19. Proposed shed would fail BRE – 45 degree rule test
- Shadow analysis drawings show loss of light as a consequence of two storey extension
- Concerns raised with respect to loss of light from two storey extension
- Concerns raised with respect to scale of extension

- Proposal not sensitive to the setting of the surrounding buildings
- Extension is disproportionate in scale
- Edwardian character and window pattern has been retained in surrounding single storey extensions
- Site overdevelopment
- The proposed fencing on top of wall is unnecessary
- Single storey extension sought extends further than surrounding single storey extensions

## 4.0 Planning History

None on site.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1 Development Plan

5.1.1 The Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 is the statutory development plan in force in the area at present.

5.1.2 Under that Plan, the site is zoned as ‘Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods – Z1 Residential Neighbourhoods *‘To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential areas’*

5.1.3 Volume 2, Appendix 18, Section 1.1 ‘General Design Principles’ outlines that: *‘the design of residential extensions should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties and in particular, the need for light and privacy. In addition, the form of the existing building should be respected, and the development should integrate with the existing building through the use of similar or contrasting materials and finishes’.* *Innovative, contemporary design will be encouraged. A contemporary or modern approach, providing unique designs, can offer a more imaginative solution. However, such proposals are still required to take account of the design issues outlined in this document. Applications for extensions to existing residential units should:*

- *Not have an adverse impact on the scale and character of the existing dwelling*
- *Not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, outlook and access to daylight and sunlight*
- *Achieve a high quality of design*
- *Make a positive contribution to the streetscape (front extensions)*

5.1.4 Volume 2, Appendix 18, Section 1.2 Extensions to Rear outlines that;

*Ground floor rear extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining. The extension should match or complement the main house.*

*First floor rear extensions will be considered on their merits, noting that they can have potential for negative impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties, and will only be permitted where the planning authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities. In determining applications for first floor extensions the following factors will be considered:*

- *Overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking - along with proximity, height, and length along mutual boundaries*
- *Remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability*
- *Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries*
- *External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing*

5.1.5 Volume 2, Appendix 18, Section 1.6 Daylight and Sunlight states that;

*Large single or two-storey rear extensions to semi-detached or terraced dwellings can, if they project too far from the main rear elevation, result in a loss of daylight to neighbouring houses. Furthermore, depending on orientation, such extensions can have a serious impact on the amount of sunlight received by adjoining properties. On the other hand, it is also recognised that the city is an urban context and some degree of overshadowing is inevitable and unavoidable. Consideration should be given to the proportion of extensions, height and design of roofs as well*

*as taking account of the position of windows including rooms they serve to adjacent or adjoining dwellings.*

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

- The Grand Canal NHA (Site Code 002104) is located 2km to the north of the site
- The South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (Site Code 004024) is located 5km to the east of the site
- South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) is located 5km to the east of the site
- Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (Site Code 003000) is located 12km to the east of the site

## **6.0 EIA Screening**

6.1 The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning & 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 report.

## **7.0 The Appeal**

### **7.1 Grounds of Appeal**

7.1.1 A third party appeal in the name of Susan Russell & Lorcan Walshe of 19 Brighton Gardens was lodged on the 16<sup>th</sup> October 2025. The appeal in summary raises the following issues;

- That the proposed development will result in the loss of amenity and loss of natural light in their patio area (which measure 14sq yards) and
- Overbearing Impact upon their property.

7.1.2 A copy of the submission to the planning authority was lodged with the appeal. The submission details the following;

- That the boundary map submitted by the architects is inaccurate and does not reflect the current legal boundaries
- The proposed detached storeroom is located directly to the rear of their garden and will result in the loss of light and will overbear their property
- The shadow study submitted shows that there will be a significant loss of light to their property leaving their small patio in the shade for during crucial morning and afternoon hours.
- The proposed structure would fail the widely accepted BRE 45 degree daylight test
- The proposed storeroom measuring 9 feet and 7 inches in height positioned directly against their boundary wall would create an unacceptable overbearing impact on their small patio area (photographs of the same is shown in the appeal)

### **7.3. Planning Authority Response**

None received

### **7.4. First Party Response to Appeal**

7.4.1 A first party response to the appeal was received 11<sup>th</sup> November 2025. The response raises the following issues;

- That the location map drawing and the site plan drawing are correct
- Boundaries were interpreted from the OSI maps.
- The boundary referred to in the appeal does not appear in any folio on the Tailte Eireann register
- The proposed garden room is 14.1sq.m. in area, is a flat roofed structure under 3.0 metres in height and is to be for domestic use only. The garden room structure is an exempted development.
- That the first party asks the Commission to review the entire planning decision and subsequent decision attached.
- It is stated that the first party believes the conditions imposed are not appropriate

- The solar/daylight study confirms that any overshadowing will be minor and occurs only in the early morning.
- That the sites east-west orientation, the proposed extension follows this alignment and would reasonably avoid undue loss of light
- The proposed ground floor extends just 300mm beyond the existing poorly built extension
- The first floor extension is only a modest 4.3 metre addition to the rear of the existing and is proportionate to the dwelling
- Care has been taken to use a similar palette of materials and proportions to create a modest extension which harmonises with the existing structure.
- No windows overlook adjacent properties
- The extension is designed in a manner fully sympathetic to the Edwardian terrace character.
- The proposal complies with development plan policy specifically with respect to Appendix 18 (residential extensions) and Appendix 16 (Daylight and Sunlight)
- The proposal is site specific and reflects the larger plot of the proposed development site. The proposal will not establish a precedent for out of scale extensions elsewhere.
- That the applicant would be able under exempted development provisions to construct a first floor extension so long as it is set back 2 metres from the boundaries which would yield similar overshadowing outcomes.
- That permission should be granted for the full application and that the first party requests that the Commission overturns the decision and grant permission for the modest first floor extension

## **8.0 Assessment**

### 8.1. Introduction

- 8.1.1 I have examined the application details and all other documentation on file and I have inspected the site and have had regard to relevant local development plan policies and guidance.
- 8.1.2 The appeal raises issues which relate to the fact that the boundaries shown in the site layout plan submitted are not correct and that the boundary of the appellants property extends to the northern boundary of the proposed development site.
- 8.1.3 I note that the area which the appellants refer to in the appeal is marked in the site layout plan as the rear garden of the property to the north of the proposed development site i.e. No.13 Tower Avenue.
- 8.1.4 While this is not marked on any folio maps submitted with the application nor the appeal I accept that, on the basis of the photographs submitted and on the basis of aerial images that this is the case. However, notwithstanding the same, I do not consider that this should prejudice the assessment or validity of this application.
- 8.1.5 I am satisfied the substantive issues arising from the grounds of this third party appeal relate to the following matters;
- Principle of Proposed Development/Development Plan Policy
  - Residential Amenities
  - Visual Amenity Considerations
  - Other Issues
- 8.1.3 I have also had regard to the observation to the third party appeal submitted by the first party on the 11<sup>th</sup> November 2025. The response requests that the Commission overturn the Planning Authorities decision and grant permission for the entire development including the first floor element which has been refused by the Planning Authority
- 8.1.4 Given that the assessment is to proceed on a de novo basis, the Commission is entitled to consider granting consent for the development in its entirety, despite the absence of an appeal by the first party in relation to the proposed development

## **8.2 Principle of Proposed Development/Development Plan Policy**

- 8.2.1 The proposed development site is located within an area designated in the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 (hereunder referred to as the plan) with zoning

objective Z1 Residential Neighbourhoods '*To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential areas*'

8.2.2 Having regard to the above, it is considered that the proposed development which is for domestic extensions would not have a negative impact upon the amenities of the area.

#### **8.4 Residential Amenity Impacts**

8.4.1 It is considered that impacts to the residential amenity of adjacent properties will result as a consequence of (a) the first floor extension and (b) the detached domestic store at the end of the rear garden and on the boundary of the appellants property.

8.4.2 Volume 2, Appendix 18, Section 1.1 'General Design Principles' outlines that: '*the design of residential extensions should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties and in particular, the need for light and privacy.*' and further states that an extension should '*Not adversely affect amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent buildings in terms of privacy, outlook and access to daylight and sunlight*

8.4.3 Firstly, I do not consider that impacts will arise as a consequence of the ground floor extension which as stated in the response to the appeal extends out only 300mm beyond an existing extension on site which is proposed to be demolished.

8.4.4 I also do not consider that there will be any impacts as a consequence of the proposed screen fencing along the northern and southern party boundaries and which is to extend 1110mm over the existing wall to give an overall height of 2245mm which is just 245mm over what would normally be exempt under Class 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Planning & Development Regulations 2001, as amended. The increased height is acceptable in this urban context.

8.4.5 Regarding the proposed first floor extension I note that the same extends 4.3 metres beyond the existing first floor rear return with a width of 3.935. The rising wall of the same sits directly adjacent to the northern boundary of the site.

8.4.6 The first floor extension comprises of a pitched roof structure the ridge height of which is 3.58 metres above the flat roof of the ground floor extension. Impacts therefore will be to the property directly to the north of the site i.e. No 13 Tower

Avenue. I note the occupants of No 13 made a submission with respect to the above where issues with respect to overbearing, overlooking and loss of daylight and sunlight were raised.

- 8.4.7 In terms of potential overshadowing impacts to No 13, I refer to the overshadowing diagrams submitted with the application. These diagrams show that the roof of the single storey extension of No 13 is shadowed from 12 midday to 3pm in March and September. There is also some shadowing to the garden though it is considered that this is a result of the higher boundaries proposed more so than the proposed first floor extension.
- 8.4.8 Volume 2, Appendix 18, Section 1.6 Daylight and Sunlight states, in part, that *extensions can have a serious impact on the amount of sunlight received by adjoining properties*. The section also states however that *it is also recognised that the city is an urban context and some degree of overshadowing is inevitable and unavoidable. Consideration should be given to the proportion of extensions, height and design of roofs as well as taking account of the position of windows including rooms they serve to adjacent or adjoining dwellings*.
- 8.4.9 With respect to the foregoing, I note that the first floor extension is relatively small in size (12.54sq.m) accommodating a single bedroom (3.58 metres high x 4.3 metres deep x 3.935 wide). A first floor window faces towards the rear garden of the property subject of this appeal. There are no windows proposed which face adjacent properties.
- 8.4.10 I note that the reason for refusal of this element of the application includes for overshadowing and overbearing impacts and impacts in terms of visual amenity as a consequence of the scale of the proposed first floor extension.
- 8.4.11 Notwithstanding the reason for refusal, it is considered that, in the context of an urban setting where some degree of overshadowing is anticipated, and given the modest scale of the proposed first floor extension, the resultant shadowing impact would be minor and acceptable, there would be no overlooking, and the scale of the extension is relatively modest. I therefore recommend that the Commission permit this element of the development

- 8.4.12 Regarding the proposed first floor window, I note that there is a single floor to ceiling window facing towards the applicants rear garden. I consider it appropriate in this context that this window cannot be used for accessing the flat roof of the ground floor other than for maintenance purposes.
- 8.4.13 In relation to the detached garden store proposed to the rear of the site, which is situated on the boundary adjoining the appellant's rear garden to the north-west, the shadow analysis submitted indicates that some level of overshadowing would arise within the appellant's garden
- 8.4.14 The appellant refers to the 45 degree rule in the BRE guidelines (Site Layout Planning for Daylight & Sunlight). The 45 degree rule referred to is a measure of shadowing impacts on windows of adjacent houses rather than private open space.
- 8.4.15 Section 3.3.7 of the guidelines states that *'As a check, it is recommended that at least half of the amenity areas listed above should receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21 March'*. Regard is has to overshadowing diagrams submitted with the application which shows for the shadowing effect that will result as a consequence of the garden store. It's difficult to make out from the diagrams as to whether there will be 2 hours of sunlight available in the appellants rear garden if the said garden store were constructed. Certainly there will be a shadowing impact at noon when the sun is directly south and when the sun moves towards the west the proposed store will still result in an overshadowing impact.
- 8.4.14 The said garden store is just under 3 metres in height and measures as stated in the response to the appeal 14.1sq.m. The size and scale therefore are modest in this urban context.
- 8.4.15 The first party states that the garden store is to be for domestic use only and would be exempt under Planning & Development Regulations 2001. I concur with this statement.
- 8.4.16 While, overshadowing will occur to the private open space of the appellants property, I am mindful of the fact that the said garden store could be constructed as an exempt development under the Planning & Development Regulations 2001.
- 8.4.17 Having regard to the foregoing and while I accept that there will be more shadowing occurring to the appellants rear garden amenity space, and taking cognisance of the

fact that the shed could be constructed under exempt development provisions I consider the proposal to be acceptable in this urban context.

## **8.5 Other Issues**

8.5.1 The appellant refers to the overbearing impact of the proposed garden store. As stated previously the said shed is less than 3.0 meters in height and is to be clad in timber. While the structure may seem imposing relative to the small scale of the appellants private open space, the scale of the store is relatively minor.

8.5.2 I am also mindful of the fact that the said store could be constructed without the benefit of planning permission and therefore in this dense urban context where development will result in shadowing impacts I consider the proposed acceptable in visual amenity and in terms of overbearance on adjacent properties.

## **9.0 AA Screening**

9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

9.2 The subject site is located

- 5kms to the west of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (Site Code 004024)
- 5kms to the west of the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210)
- 12km to the west of the Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (Site Code 003000)

9.3 The proposed development comprises of a domestic extension in an urban area. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

9.4 Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, and its location in a suburban area, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site

9.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The relatively small scale nature of the works proposed
- The lack thereof of any hydrological connection from the proposed development to the Natura 2000 site.

- Having regard to the screening report/determination carried out by the Planning Authority

9.6 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.

9.7 Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (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 approximately 2km to the south of the Grand Canal NHA (Site Code 002104)

10.2 The proposed development comprises of a domestic extension in an urban area

10.3 No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

10.4 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.

10.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows [insert as relevant]:

- The minor scope of the works and nature of the development
- The 2km distance to the nearest water body and the lack of hydrological connections to the same.

10.6 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.

## 11.0 Recommendation

11.1 I recommend that permission for the development be granted.

## 12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the information submitted with the application and the nature and scale of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would comply with the zoning objective for the site and polices with respect to residential extensions as set out in the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, would not be injurious to the visual or residential amenities of the area or to adjoining properties, and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out 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.  <b>Reason:</b> In the interest of clarity.
2.	The garden store shall be used for purposes ancillary to the use of the main dwelling on the site as a single dwelling unit. It shall not be separated from the

	<p>main house by sale or lease, used for sleeping accommodation or used for any commercial purposes without a separate grant of planning permission</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interests of residential amenity</p>
3	<p>External finishes shall be indicated on the plans submitted unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to commencement of the development.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of visual amenity</p>
4.	<p>The first floor window of the proposed extension shall not be used for access onto the flat roof of the ground floor unless for the purposes of maintenance of the flat roof.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interests of residential amenity</p>
5.	<p>Surface water drainage arrangements shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of public health</p>
6.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Monday to Fridays, between 0800 and 1400 hours on Saturday and not at all on Sundays and Public Holidays. 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> To safeguard the residential amenities of adjoining property in the vicinity</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.

---

Andrew Hersey  
Planning Inspector

6th January 2026

### Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	PL500077-DS
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Domestic Extensions, detached garden store, ancillary site work
<b>Development Address</b>	12 Tower Avenue, Rathgar, Dublin 6
<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>	<b>State the Class here</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</b>	

proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.  <b>No Screening required.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.  <b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b>	<b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.  <b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b>  <b>OR</b>  <b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b>	<b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b>

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

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