



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-500097-WW

Development	New two storey extension and all associated site works.
Location	13 Castle Villas, Killincarrig Delgany, Co. Wicklow.
Planning Authority	Wicklow County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560423
Applicant(s)	Thomas O'Connor
Type of Application	Retention and Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Ann Whiston and Others
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	22 nd January 2026
Inspector	Terence McLellan

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site refers to the two storey semi-detached dwelling located at 13 Castle Villas which is located in a residential estate in Killincarrig, Delgany. The site measures c. 0.129ha and benefits from front and rear garden ground. The existing dwelling is south facing, and the plot is roughly 9.5m wide and 125m long. Off-street parking is provided within the front garden. The site is set back from the edge of the road by approximately
- 1.2. The northern extent of the long rear garden is bounded by the side garden of the dwelling at No. 70 Burnaby Heights. The long eastern boundary is flanked by the two storey-semi-detached dwellings of Castlefield Terrace which have very short rear gardens. To the south is Castle Villas and the adjacent homes whilst the adjoining dwelling at No. 12 Castle Villas marks the western boundary. A backland dwelling, No. 12A Castle Villas, is located c. two thirds of the way along the western boundary with the subject site. Site levels rise slightly to the north and the site sites approximately 0.5-0.6m above the adjacent Castlefield Terrace plots.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for a part single/part two storey side and rear extension with first floor pop-out window. The development was amended at Further Information stage to reduce the size of the pop-out window and the length of the two storey extension. Development undertaken without the benefit of planning permission, such as the front boundary walls and pillars and the changes to the surface of the garden were subsequently included on the application, which was re-publicised on the basis that the Further Information was deemed significant.
- 2.2. Following amendments at Further Information stage, the proposed extension would measure 22.56m in length at ground floor level and 16.41m in length at first floor level. The single storey element would be 4.1m to parapet level from ground. The two storey extension would be c. 5.75m to eaves level and 8.2m to ridge height (above ground). The proposal incorporates a 2m wide gravel footpath along the eastern boundary to provide pedestrian access to a future shed and vegetable patch.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. Permission was granted by Wicklow County Council subject to 10 conditions. Five conditions seeking omissions or amendments were imposed as follows:

6. The vehicular entrance shall be reduced in width to a maximum 3.5m. Within six months of the commencement of development the applicant shall submit photographic evidence confirming that this condition has been implemented.

Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and proper planning and sustainable development.

7. The front boundary wall shall be reduced in height to a maximum of 0.8m and the pillars shall be reduced in height to maximum height of 1.2m. Within six months of the commencement of development the applicant shall submit photographic evidence confirming that this condition has been implemented.

Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and visual and amenity.

8. The boundary fence past the front building line with the attached dwelling to the west shall be reduced in height to a maximum of 1m. Within six months of the commencement of development the applicant shall submit photographic evidence confirming that this condition has been implemented.

Reason: In the interest of architectural harmony and visual amenity.

9. The fixed obscured window on the first floor pop out window feature on the eastern elevation shall be omitted and shall be replaced with a render finish.

Reason: In order to protect the privacy and amenity of the properties to the east.

10. The proposed double height window on the eastern elevation shall be omitted and shall be replaced with a render finish.

Reason: In order to protect the privacy and amenity of the properties to the east.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. The first Planner's Report accepted the principle of the development but raised various design and amenity concerns largely relating to overlooking, creation of a sense of enclosure, quality of accommodation and overshadowing. Additional concerns were raised regarding various works that had been undertaken without the benefit of planning permission, including the increased width of the vehicular access and the front boundary walls/pillars. The first Planner's Report concluded in a request for Further Information in order to address the following points:

- Address the matter of overlooking of the dwellings to the east, noting that the double height staircase window is unlikely to be acceptable.
- Reconsider the pop out window box which is not considered a suitable design solution for the habitable room at first floor level and address concerns regarding how a sufficient level of light and ventilation would be achieved with particular regard to the use of obscure glazing.
- Submit a design statement with a reasoned justification for the depth of the first floor extension as well as a full assessment of the impact on the residential amenity of the attached dwelling to the west (overbearance, overshadowing, sense of enclosure).
- Provide clarification regarding the width of vehicular access and the height of the front boundary wall and pillars as well as the side wall boundaries past the front building line. This should include revised drawings that accurately show the existing development on the site and a clear indication of works that require retention permission, including any revisions to the development description.
- Provide revised drawings confirming the total area of the site to be hard surfaced and the proposed surface treatments for these areas noting that permeable surfaces are preferable. This should include confirmation of what SUDS treatments are proposed.

3.2.2. Further Information was received by Wicklow County Council on the 21st August 2025 and the application was subsequently re-publicised. The Further Information submission was addressed in the second Planner's Report which contains the following points of note:

- The double height window to the stairwell as been retained with obscure glazing. Given the proximity to the neighbouring dwellings to the east, a two storey glazed opening is not considered appropriate and this window should be omitted by condition.
- The amended design of the pop out window is noted but obscured glazing will increase perceived overlooking. The Applicant was afforded the opportunity to amend this design, and this could have included a review of the internal layout.
- A condition should be imposed to omit the obscure glazing on the pop-out window in favour of a render finish to match the main dwelling.
- The reduced depth of the first floor extension is acceptable.
- The front boundary treatments as well as a widened vehicular entrance were completed without planning permission and the Applicant has submitted revised public notices.
- The width of the revised vehicular entrance is 4.34m which is not appropriate for a dwelling in an urban residential area. A condition should be imposed to reduce this width to 3.5m.
- The pillars are a maximum height of 2.1m which is not acceptable. A condition should be imposed to ensure that the maximum height of the pillars is 1.2m and the front boundary wall is a maximum of 0.8m.
- The boundary wall with the attached neighbour to the west is 2m in height. This is inappropriate, visually obtrusive, and not in keeping with the established vernacular. A condition should be imposed to ensure a maximum height of 1m.
- Drainage matters have been successfully addressed.

3.2.3. The second Planner's Report concludes that permission should be granted, subject to conditions.

3.3. Other Technical Reports

3.3.1. None.

3.4. Prescribed Bodies

3.4.1. No response

3.5. Third Party Observations

3.5.1. Two submissions were received in response to the original planning application and a further response received following the republication of the application following the Further Information submission, signed by residents of Nos. 2, 3, 6-13 (inclusive), and 15 Castlefield Terrace. Matters raised are generally consistent with the grounds of appeal which are set out in detail in Section 6 below. In summary the observations raise the following issues:

- Overlooking
- Rear garden parking
- Unauthorised development (widening of entrance, height of boundary wall, adjusted ground levels and lack of proper retaining walls/use of fences and walls on neighbouring properties for same, potential damage to a spring).

4.0 Planning History

Subject Site

4.1.1. **ACP Ref. 23/307/Planning Authority Ref. 318167**: Permission was refused by the Commission in June 2024 for the construction of a single storey dwelling within the rear garden ground. Permission was refused for the following reason:

It is the objective of the council under CPO 6.21 of the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028 that in areas zoned 'Existing Residential', appropriate infill residential development in accordance with principles of good design and protection of existing residential amenity will normally be permitted. Having regard to the restricted configuration of the site, the presence of two-storey dwellings in close proximity to the east of the site and which overlook the site, the lack of detail with respect of levels, measurements and overshadowing analysis, the substandard design of the proposed dwelling and the lack of clear details with respect to vehicular access

arrangements, it is considered that the proposed development would result in a substandard residential unit and lack of privacy for future occupants, would seriously injure the amenities of adjoining residential properties by way of overlooking and overshadowing and would result in traffic hazard as a consequence of restricted space for turning vehicles on site. The proposed development would, therefore, materially contravene Objective CPO 6.21 of the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028 and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

4.1.2. **Planning Authority Reference 22/554:** Permission was refused by Wicklow County Council in January 2023 for the erection of a single storey dwelling within the rear garden ground. Permission was refused for the following reason:

1. Having regard to

- a) The submitted information on the overshadowing effect of the proposed development no. 7 Castlefield,
- b) The lack information on the possible overshadowing effect of the development on nos. 8-10 Castlefield,
- c) Lack of assessment to demonstrate how compliance with BRE document; "Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight; a guide to good practice, 2011" would be achieved

It is considered that the proposed development could result in increased overshadowing of the rear gardens house nos. 7-10 Castlefield Terrace, would seriously injure the residential amenities of these properties, would set an unfavourable precedent for similar development and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Draft Greystones - Delgany & Kilcoole Local Planning Framework

5.1.1. The Greystones - Delgany & Kilcoole Local Area Plan 2013 – 2019 has expired and is expected to be replaced with the Greystones - Delgany & Kilcoole Local Planning Framework, which is currently still in draft form. Under the draft plan, the site is zoned

'RE-Existing Residential', the stated objective of which is 'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential areas'.

- 5.1.2. The zoning objective seeks to provide for house improvements, alterations and extensions and appropriate infill residential development in accordance with principles of good design and protection of existing residential amenity. In existing residential areas, the areas of open space permitted, designated or dedicated solely to the use of the residents will normally be zoned 'RE' as they form an intrinsic part of the overall residential development; however new housing or other non-community related uses will not normally be permitted.

5.2. Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028

- 5.2.1. CPO 6.21 – In areas zoned 'Existing Residential' house improvements, alterations and extensions and appropriate infill residential development in accordance with principles of good design and protection of existing residential amenity will normally be permitted (other than on lands permitted or designated as open space, see CPO 6.25 below). While new developments shall have regard to the protection of the residential and architectural amenities of houses in the immediate environs, alternative and contemporary designs shall be encouraged (including alternative materials, heights and building forms), to provide for visual diversity.
- 5.2.2. CPO 14.12 - Excessive hard surfacing shall not be permitted for new, or extensions to, residential or commercial developments and all applications will be required to show that sustainable drainage techniques have been employed in the design of the development.

5.3. Appendix 1 - Development and Design Standards

House Extensions

- 5.3.1. The construction of extensions to existing houses will be encouraged generally as it usually provides a less resource intensive method of expanding living space than building a new structure. Given the range of site layouts prevailing, it is not possible to set out a set of 'rules' that can be applied to all extensions, but the following basic principles shall be applied:

- The extension should be sensitive to the existing dwelling and should not adversely distort the scale or mass of the structure.
- The extension shall not provide for new overlooking of the private area of an adjacent residence where no such overlooking previously existed.
- In an existing developed area, where a degree of overlooking is already present, the new extension must not significantly increase overlooking possibilities. If for example a two-story dwelling already directly overlooks a neighbour's rear garden, a third storey extension with the same view will normally be considered acceptable.
- New extensions should not overshadow adjacent dwellings to the degree that a significant decrease in day or sunlight entering into the house comes about. In this regard, extensions directly abutting property boundaries should be avoided.
- While the form, size and appearance of an extension should complement the area, unless the area has an established unique or valuable character worthy of preservation, a flexible approach will be taken to the assessment of alternative design concepts.

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.4.1. The site is not within or immediately adjacent to any European site. The nearest European Site is The Murrough SPA (Site Code: 004186) which is located c. 1.65km to the east.

5.5. EIA Screening

- 5.5.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. A Third Party appeal has been received from Marston Planning Consultancy, for and on behalf of:

- Ann Whiston
- David Timmins
- Marie and Aaron Hempenstall
- Scott and Tatiana O'Toole

6.1.2. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed development would materially and negatively impact on residential and visual amenities and would be contrary to the RE zoning of the site.
- Dwellings on Castlefield Terrace have highly restricted rear gardens.
- The Applicant replaced the boundary fence. The difference in levels has increased from c. 0.3m to 0.6m. No foundation was laid for this new fence, and soil is spilling into the rear garden of No. 12.
- The development would be visually dominant, obtrusive, and overbearing.
- The ground floor is elevated 0.6m above ground level and this will afford overlooking of adjacent properties. High level windows would be a more appropriate design response.
- A condition should be imposed to prevent vehicular access to the rear of the garden as it would be contrary to the RE zoning of the site and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- Separation distances would be significantly below the minimum separation distance of 16m set out in the Compact Settlement Guidelines.
- The Case Planner has failed to recognize the closeness of the proposed extension to the eastern boundary and the loss of amenity due to overlooking from elevated ground floor windows, and the breach of SPPR1 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines.

- The Council's decision relies on a number of incorrect elements, including the shadow analysis and level changes between the extension and ground levels.
- The Applicants shadow analysis is inadequate to assess the impact to the nearest dwellings on Castlefield Terrace which have small rear gardens and are susceptible to any form of development that would affect their amenity.
- The shadow analysis has not been undertaken in line with best practice, looking at midwinter and mid-summer only, failing to consider the spring and autumn equinox, which are the key dates for the consideration of shadowing.
- The development would increase the shadowing of adjoining rear gardens.
- A number of development works have been undertaken without planning permission.
- The use of the rear garden for commercial parking is unauthorized development and the vehicular link outs increased pressure on the Applicant's new fence the Appellant's own boundary treatments, creating serious property damage and a daily negative amenity impact.
- If permission is granted, then the following conditions should be imposed:
 - No vehicular access to or parking within the rear garden, including the storage of machinery.
 - Replace vehicular gate with a pedestrian sized gate and fencing.
 - Reduce vehicular entrance width to 3.5 metres.
 - Reduce front boundary wall to 0.8m and pillars to 1.2 m.
 - Omit the first floor pop out window.
 - Ground floor windows facing east should be high level.
 - Omit double height window on the east elevation.

6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. No response on file.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

6.3.1. No response on file.

6.4. Observations

6.4.1. None.

7.0 Assessment

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

- Design and Amenity
- Retention

7.2. Design and Amenity

7.2.1. The substantive issues raised in the appeal regarding design and amenity relate primarily to the scale of the proposed extension and the Appellants' position that it would be visually dominant, obtrusive, and overbearing. It is submitted that the extension would lead to overlooking and overshadowing impacts to the dwellings on Castlefield Terrace, noting their constrained rear gardens and the difference in levels, including the finished floor level of the proposed extension.

7.2.2. At the outset I would advise the Commission that I have taken measurements from the Applicant's plans. My measurements align with the stated key dimensions in all respects with the exception of the ground level measurement which, by my measurements, is underestimated, given as 0.6m on the plans but measures at c.0.75m from ground and c.0.85m when measured to FFL. The Commission may therefore seek to clarify this matter in the event that permission is granted.

7.2.3. The proposed extension would be set back 3.4m from the boundary and would rise to a height of c. 5.75m to eaves level (measured from ground), for a length of 16.4m parallel to the boundary with the dwellings on Castlefield Terrace before reducing in height to c. 4.1m above ground for a further length of c.6m, giving a total extension length of around 22.5m.

- 7.2.4. By any measure, the proposed extension is a significant addition, more than tripling the floorspace of the existing dwelling. I note that there are some large extensions in the wider area, however these are generally on less visible/prominent sites and parallel plots. Whilst a large extension is not objectionable in principle, the scale, form and bulk of the extension is such that I consider it to be an excessive and disproportionate addition to the parent dwelling. In my opinion, the proposed extension would fail to be subordinate to the existing dwelling and would be contrary to the provisions of Appendix 1 of the CDP which states that extensions should be sensitive to the existing dwelling and should not adversely distort the scale or mass of the structure. The extension would be highly visible from the street due to the views afforded by its position relative to Castlefield Terrace and its position on a curve in the road. In my opinion, it would be at odds with the pattern of development in the area, appearing as a visually dominant and obtrusive feature relative to the surrounding built form.
- 7.2.5. This is a relatively constrained site in terms of its relationship to the dwellings on Castlefield Terrace which sit perpendicular to the side boundary. Whilst I note the position of the Appellants' properties to the north east of the proposed extension and have considered this in full in my assessment, the development would largely impact on the dwellings at Nos. 1-5.
- 7.2.6. As with all of the dwellings on Castlefield Terrace, these dwellings have fairly short rear gardens, in the region of 6m-6.5m in depth when measured from their main rear facades to the boundary line. In addition to this, there is a change in level of between 0.5m and 0.6m between the subject site and the adjacent rear gardens. Notwithstanding the proposed 3.4m set back from the boundary, I find that the height of the extension, its excessive length along the shared boundary and the difference in levels between the site and the dwellings on Castlefield Terrace is such that it would appear unduly dominant and overbearing on its immediate neighbours to the east, further enclosing the already constrained rear gardens. The pop-out window would further exacerbate the sense of the extension being overbearing, being just 2.5m from the boundary at a high level and looming over the adjacent rear garden at No. 2.
- 7.2.7. In terms of overlooking I note the conditions imposed by the Planning Authority regarding the omission of the double height side window and the omission of the obscure glazed element on the pop-out window. I further note the Appellant's request

that only high level windows be used on the ground floor side elevation and that the pop-out window be omitted in its entirety.

7.2.8. I agree with the Planning Authority regarding the omission of the obscure glazed windows due to the risk of perceived overlooking. Removal of the pop-out window in its entirety would effectively result in the creation of an internal habitable room, which would not be acceptable, although I have concerns regarding the quality of this accommodation even with the pop-out window retained as directed, given that it would provide a poor level of outlook. My design concerns regarding the pop-out window have been previously expressed and the Commission could address this matter by way of design amendments in the event that permission is granted. In terms of overlooking from the ground floor windows, central to this issue is the finished floor level coupled with the change in level between the subject site and the adjacent dwellings, which could serve to afford views of adjacent dwellings and a loss of privacy, noting the short separation distances. I therefore agree with the Appellant's that these windows should be omitted in favour of high level windows in the event of planning permission being granted

7.2.9. In terms of overshadowing, I agree with the Appellant's that the information submitted is insufficient in terms of the potential impacts on the rear garden ground of the dwellings on Castlefield Terrace immediately to the east. The shadow analysis submitted by the Applicant analyses shadow impact in January and June. The BRE guidance states that If a space is used all year round then the equinox (21st March) is the best date for which to prepare shadow plots as it gives an average level of shadowing. In my opinion the Applicant has not demonstrated that the development would not have an adverse impact in terms of overshadowing and given the scale and positioning of the extension as well as orientation, I consider that there would be reasonable grounds to conclude that there would be a detrimental overshadowing impact.

7.3. **Retention**

7.3.1. Works sought for retention include the front boundary treatment (wall and pillars) and the widened entrance, in addition to the front boundary treatment between the subject site and the adjoining dwelling at No. 12 Castle Villas. The Planning Authority considered these unacceptable as presented and imposed a range of conditions to

address the matter, including provisions to reduce the entrance width, reduce the height of the wall and pillars and reduce the height of the boundary treatment between the site and the adjoining dwelling.

- 7.3.2. There are a range of front boundary treatments on Castle Villas, with no consistent approach taken. On balance I have no objections to the retention of the front boundary treatment as presented, nor do I have an objection to retaining the entrance width. The entrance itself is set well back from the road edge and there are no traffic safety or visibility concerns. I do however agree with the Planning Authority that the front boundary treatment between the subject site and the adjoining dwelling at No. 12 would not be appropriate for a front garden and would appear incongruous. I therefore recommend that the Commission include the Planning Authority's condition that seeks a reduced height of fence, should permission be granted.
- 7.3.3. On the matter of the parking of vehicles in the rear garden, I am satisfied that this could be controlled by way of a condition in the event that the Commission grant permission. Further issues raised by the Appellant's regarding the quality of the installation of common boundary treatment and potential property damage issues are, in my opinion, civil matters to be addressed between the relevant parties.

8.0 AA Screening

8.1. I have considered the proposal in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located in Delgany, at a distance of approximately 1.65km from The Murrough SPA (004186), which is the nearest European site. The development comprises an extension to an existing dwelling. No appropriate assessment issues were raised as part of the appeal. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature and small scale of the works.
- The significant separation distance from the nearest European site and lack of connections.
- The screening determination of the Planning Authority.

8.2. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the 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 (under Section 177V of the Planning and development Act 2000) is not required.

9.0 Water Framework Directive

9.1. There are no documented water courses in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site and I saw no evidence of any water courses during my site inspection. The proposed development comprises the extension to an existing dwelling. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration.

9.2. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature and scale of the works;
- The location of the site in a serviced area, the distance from nearest water bodies, and the lack of direct hydrological connections.

9.3. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

10.0 Recommendation

10.1. I recommend that the Commission refuse planning permission.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the established built form and the pattern of development in the area, including the relationship between the subject site and the adjacent dwellings to the east, it is considered that the proposed extension, by reason of its excessive scale, bulk, and massing, would be an unduly dominant and obtrusive addition that would fail to be subservient to the parent dwelling, would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area, and would be injurious to the residential amenities of neighbouring property by reason of visual obtrusion, overbearance and enclosure, and overshadowing. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

Terence McLellan

Senior Planning Inspector

3rd February 2026

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500097-WW
Proposed Development Summary	New two storey extension and all associated site works.
Development Address	13 Castle Villas, Killincarrig Delgany, Co. Wicklow.
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.	
<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, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

<p>development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	

<p>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</p>
<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____ Date: _____