



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-500123-DR

Development	First floor extension over rear extension. Internal alterations and associated works.
Location	4, Moreen Walk, Sandyford, Dublin, D16T8K1
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D25B/0443
Applicant(s)	William Ronayne
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	William Ronayne
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	28th January 2026
Inspector	Aoife McCarthy

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy and Context.....	6
6.0 The Appeal.....	8
7.0 Assessment	11
8.0 Recommendation.....	11
9.0 Reasons and Considerations	17
10.0 Conditions	18
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site has a stated area of 0.015 hectares and is located at 4 Moreen Walk, Sandyford, Dublin 16.
- 1.2. The property is located within a terrace of 4 no. 2 storey properties, extending from No. 2, 4, 6 and 8 Moreen Walk.
- 1.3. This terrace of dwellings is bound by a terrace of 3 no. 2 storey residences with rear gardens (No.s 10 to 16.)
- 1.4. The estate comprises a mix of 2 storey dwellings and is residential in character.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development will consist of:
First floor extension over existing extension to the rear. Internal alterations and all associated site works to existing dwelling house.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. The local authority issued a Notification of a Decision to Grant Permission on the 24th September 2025, subject to 5 No. Conditions.

- 3.1.2. Condition 2 required the following:

Prior to the commencement of works, the applicant shall submit for the written agreement of the Planning Authority, a revised set of plans showing the first-floor rear extension to be reduced in depth by 1 metre.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. **Planning Reports (dated 24th September 2025)**

- The Report includes a summary of the single submission received on the file (see below).

- The Report includes a detailed planning history and planning context relating to the site.
- The Report has regard to the A zoning objective which applies to this site and considers that the principle of an extension to a residential dwelling, is acceptable, subject to assessment with a range of criteria.
- The proposal would exacerbate the level of overshadowing to rear gardens of the adjoining properties, particularly in the early morning and late afternoon.
- The extension is to be set back on the boundary with No.2, mitigating overbearing impact to a degree. The first floor extension, when combined with the existing ground floor structure would have an overbearing impact on the residential amenities of these properties.
- The PA consider that a reduction in the depth of the extension from the established building line would reduce potential overbearance impacts.
- The design of the pitched gable roof would not appear discordant and would harmonise with the rear elevation.
- Materials and finishes would harmonise with the existing built form.
- There are discrepancies on the submitted proposed roof plan, wherein the pitched roof is shown below the eaves on the rear elevation, whilst it is shown above the eaves on other drawings.
- The Report concludes that, the proposed development would not adversely impact on the residential amenity or adjacent properties by reason of overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing appearance, would not detract from the character of the surrounding area and would be in accordance with relevant policy and the provisions of the Development Plan.
- The report recommends that permission is granted in this regard.

3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

3.2.3. None received.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. None received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. A single third party submission was received from residents of the adjoining property to the west (No.6), and may be summarised as follows:

- Inconsistencies in the drawings as submitted.
- The proposal would result in a loss of light when viewing the rear garden of their home. The proposal would also result in reduction in use of the rear garden.
- The applicant welcomes Condition 2, of the permission, reducing the depth of the extension by 1m, the proposal would result in loss of daylight and excessive overlooking.
- There is no precedent for an extension at first floor level, of a mid terrace dwelling, as currently proposed.
- The proposal would result in a reduction in a quality of life; and is contrary to s/12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan (relating to Extensions).
- It is unclear how rainwater from the western extension of the roof would be managed.
- The existing north side gutter extending from No. 6 and 8 overflows during heavy rain.
- The additional volume will cause more frequent overflows of the gutters, requiring more frequent cleaning.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Subject Site

- 4.1.1. **P.A. Reg. Ref.: D25B/0582:** Final Grant of Permission issued on 21st January 2026 for conversion of the attic space with a dormer type flat roof to the rear. New Velux type window to the front and all associated site works to existing dwelling house.
- 4.1.2. **P.A. Reg. Ref.: D03B/0097:** Retention Permission granted on 16th May 2003 for a canopy structure to the front of the house.

4.2. Sites within the Environs of the Subject Site

- 4.2.1. **P.A. Reg. Ref.: D25B/0582:** 3, Moreen Lawn, Sandyford, Dublin 16; Final Grant of Permission issued in May 2025 for construction of a flat roof first floor extension to the rear, attic conversion with dormer window to the rear & all associated site works including removal of the shed in the rear garden.
- 4.2.2. **P.A. Reg. Ref.: D17A/0268:** 8, Moreen Lawn, Sandyford, Dublin 16; Final Grant of Permission issued in June 2017 to erect a two storey extension with attic storage space to the side of existing dwelling and all associated site ancillary works including new side gate entrance with connection to existing public services.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities, Best Practice Guidelines, 2007

- 5.1.1. These Guidelines set out national planning policy and guidance in relation to housing design.
- 5.1.2. The guidelines include the following relevant target for a 3 storey 3B/6P dwelling; target floor area (110m²); minimum main living room (15m²) aggregate living area (37m²); aggregate bedroom area (36m²) and storage (6m²).

5.2. Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities, Best Practice Guidelines 2024

- 5.2.1. These Guidelines set out national planning policy and guidance in relation to the creation of settlements that are compact, attractive, liveable and well designed.

5.2.2. Development standards for housing are set out in Chapter 5, including SPPR1 – relating to separation distances, requiring a minimum distance of 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of house above ground floor level.

5.2.3. SPPR 2 in relation to private open space (3-bed + 40 m²).

5.3. Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Development Plan 2022-2028

5.4. Land Use Zoning

5.4.1. The site is zoned Objective A, “to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities.”

5.4.2. Residential use is Permitted in Principle under this zoning objective.

5.5. Extensions to Dwellings (Section 12.3.7.1)

5.5.1. The Plan includes the following relevant policies:

5.5.2. (i) Extensions to Dwellings: The following Section provides guidance with respect to porches, front extensions, side extensions, rear extensions, roof alterations, attic conversions and dormer extension.

(ii) Extensions to the Rear:

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.

5.6. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.6.1. The closest European site is the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024), located c.4.4km to the northeast of the subject site.
- 5.6.2. The closest designated site is the South Dublin Bay pNHA (Site Code: 000210), located c.4.4km to the northeast of the subject site.

5.7. EIA Screening

- 5.7.1. The proposed development as referenced in the question above, does not come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA, that is, it does not comprise construction works, demolition or intervention in the natural surroundings. Refer to Form 1 in the Appendix of report.

5.8. Appropriate Assessment

- 5.8.1. Screening the need for Appropriate Assessment: Screening Determination (Stage 1, Article 6(3) of Habitats Directive).
- 5.8.2. I have considered the proposed extension to the rear of an existing dwelling and all associated works, in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 5.8.3. The closest European site is the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024), located c.4.4km to the northeast of the subject site.
- 5.8.4. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 5.8.5. 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.
- 5.8.6. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The distance from nearest European site.

- The small scale and nature of the subject proposal.

5.8.7. 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 other plans or projects.

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

5.9. **Water Framework Directive Screening**

5.9.1. The subject site is located in a built-up area in the Greater Dublin Area, c. 0.93km north-west of the Carrickmines Stream _010 (Site Code: IE_EA_10C040350), within the Carrickmines Stream 0_010 sub basin (Site Code: IE_EA_10C040350).

5.9.2. The site is located on top of the ground water body Wicklow (IE-EA-G-076).

5.9.3. The proposed development comprises the construction of a rear extension to an existing dwelling within an established urban context.

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

5.9.5. I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

5.9.6. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- the small scale and nature of the development.
- the distance from the nearest water bodies and the lack of hydrological connections.

5.9.7. 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.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. The grounds of a single first party appeal from a neighbouring property may be summarised as follows:

- Inconsistencies in the drawings as submitted.
- The proposal would result in a loss of light when viewing the rear garden of their home. The proposal would also result in reduction in use of the rear garden.
- The applicant welcomes Condition 2, of the permission, reducing the depth of the extension by 1m, the proposal would result in loss of daylight and excessive overlooking.
- There is no precedent for an extension at first floor level, of a mid terrace dwelling, as currently proposed.
- The proposal would result in a reduction in a quality of life; and is contrary to s.12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan (relating to Extensions).
- It is unclear how rainwater from the western extension of the roof would be managed.
- The existing north side gutter extending from No. 6 and 8 overflows during heavy rain.
- The additional volume will cause more frequent overflows of the gutters, requiring more frequent cleaning.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

6.2.1. A response was received from the planning authority on 28th October 2025. The grounds of appeal do not raise any matters which, in the opinion of the authority, would justify a change in attitude to the proposed development.

6.3. **Observations**

6.3.1. None received.

6.4. **Further Responses**

6.4.1. None received.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. Having examined the application details and other documentation on file, including the report of the local authority, having inspected the site and having regard to the relevant national and local planning policy guidance, I consider the substantive issues in this appeal area as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Residential Amenity
- Visual Amenity
 - Surface Water Drainage
 - Other matters

7.2. **Principle of Development**

7.2.1. The proposed development relates to the provision of an extension at first floor level, to the rear of a 2 storey terraced dwelling.

7.2.2. The site is located on lands which are subject to 'Existing Residential (A)' under the Development Plan, the objective of which is "to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities."

7.2.3. Residential use is Permitted in Principle under this zoning objective.

7.2.4. The Development Plan provides guidance with respect to extensions to the dwellings (s.12.3.7.1).

7.2.5. As such, I consider that the proposed development is acceptable in principle at this location, subject to its compliance with all relevant planning considerations as addressed below.

7.3. Residential Amenity

Overshadowing

- 7.3.1. The Appellants, residents of the adjoining property to the west (No. 6); consider that the scale of development to be excessive; with overbearing impacts affecting views from their rear garden; significantly affecting the amenity of their rear garden; and contrary to s.12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan.
- 7.3.2. From a review of the drawings, the existing ground floor extension has a depth of 4.32m from the rear of the property; abuts the boundary wall of the property to the east; and is set back from the boundary of the (Appellants property) to the west by c.0.75m.
- 7.3.3. The proposed development at first floor level seeks to maintain the depth of the extension at ground floor level, and would be set back by 1m on its eastern side, with new fibre glass roof to the ground floor extension below. The extension would abut the mutual boundary with the Appellants' property to the west.
- 7.3.4. The extent of shadows cast as a result of the proposed first floor extension is based on the height and depth of the extension and the orientation (the sun rising in the east and setting in the west) of both. In this case, the terrace of dwellings is on an east-west alignment, with the first-floor extension extending on the northern façade. Given this orientation, the existing ground floor extension would, in my opinion, generate shadows primarily across the subject rear garden.
- 7.3.5. Shadows are also cast across the rear garden as a result of the principal 2 storey dwellings, to the south of the extension.
- 7.3.6. I consider that the proposed extension at first floor level would result in an increase in shadows primarily across the rear garden of the subject property and across the rear gardens of neighbouring properties.
- 7.3.7. I therefore consider that a reduction in the depth of the proposed extension at first level would reduce the extent of shadow within the rear garden of this property; noting the northern boundary wall receives south facing sunshine.
- 7.3.8. I consider the inclusion of condition No 2 as per the PA recommendation is sufficient to overcome any concerns raised in the GOA in relation to overshadowing of their property.

7.3.9. I also consider that a reduction in depth would reduce extent of shadow to the adjoining properties to the immediate east and west; with resultant shadow closer to the extent of shadows cast by the principal dwellings.

Overbearing Impacts

7.3.10. The extension with a depth 4.32m and height of 3m in height above ground floor level; would, in my opinion, would result in adverse visual impacts when viewed Appellants' rear garden, which is 10m in length; with no set back from the party boundary within the application site.

7.3.11. I also consider that this reduction in the depth of the first floor, would reduce the bulk and mass of the extension and resultant overbearing impacts to the neighbouring properties. This is particularly the case with respect of the property to the east, taking account of the 1m set back from the mutual boundary.

7.3.12. I therefore recommend that, in the event the Commission decide to grant permission for the subject proposal, the inclusion of a condition requiring the depth of the proposed extension (at first floor level) be reduced by 1m.

7.3.13. The Planning Authority made a similar recommendation, requiring the building to be set back by 1m (Condition 2 refers). The Appellants welcome this condition; however, they nonetheless consider that the proposal would, affect daylight to their garden; and that their rear garden would be overlooked by the proposed extension.

Overlooking

7.3.14. The extension would consist of a bedroom and ensuite bathroom. The bedroom would be served a single window on the northern façade with no opes within the side elevations. The window is centrally located within the rear extension, with no other windows to the west of the extension at first floor level within the principal building.

7.3.15. It is also proposed to reduce in width and reposition, to the east, a window within the rear façade of the main building (serving a bedroom).

7.3.16. The rear of the property at first floor level, does not oppose any habitable rooms in adjoining properties. The window within the proposed extension would be at distance of c.9m from the only opposing first floor window located within the gable wall of No.10 Moreen Walk, an opaque window serving a bathroom.

- 7.3.17. The rear window would primarily overlook the rear gardens of the subject property and of No. 10-16 Moreen Walk, taking account of the depth of the extension, with limited views available to the southern end of the adjoining rear gardens. Views would be available towards the northern end of these rear gardens.
- 7.3.18. Having regard to the above, I consider that the proposed layout would not result in significant adverse impacts with respect to overlooking of the adjoining rear gardens, noting the lack of windows within the side elevations of the extension.
- 7.3.19. I refer the Commission to s.12.3.7.1(ii) of the Development Plan which sets out that, first floor rear extensions, 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, the PA would have regard to: overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking; proximity, height, and length along mutual boundaries; degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries, remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability.
- 7.3.20. Matters relating to overshadowing, overbearing and overlooking, and the degree of set back from mutual boundaries are discussed above.
- 7.3.21. The proposed extension would not exceed beyond the footprint of the extension at ground floor level; and would not adversely affect the extent of private open space to the rear of this property, calculated to amount to 35m²). The remaining garden would consist of a paved area with a southerly aspect.
- 7.3.22. There is no requirement under s.12.3.7.1(ii) for the resultant garden to meet standards of the Development Plan relating to private open space for a dwelling of 60m² for a 3-bed house. The resultant garden in this case does not meet this standard. It is however, marginally below the standard of 40m² of as set out in the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities, Best Practice Guidelines 2024.
- 7.3.23. Having regard to the above, I consider that the proposed extension would not result in significant adverse impacts with respect to matters relating to residential amenity as referenced under s12.3.7.1(ii) of the Development Plan.

7.4. Visual Amenity

- 7.4.1. Development Plan parameters relating to Extensions to Dwellings s.12.3.7.1(ii) refer to external finishes and design, which should generally be in harmony with the existing.
- 7.4.2. In my opinion, the proposed pitched roof profile would integrate successfully with the existing southern elevation of the subject structure, and that the choice of materials would be in harmony with the existing.
- 7.4.3. I consider therefore, that the proposed development would accord with the provision of the Development Plan with respect to extensions to dwellings and visual amenities.

7.5. Surface Water Drainage

- 7.5.1. The Appellant outlines that it is unclear how rainwater from the western extension of the roof would be managed. The appellant sets out that the existing gutter on the northern façade, extending from No.s 6-8 overflows during heavy rain. The additional volume would cause more frequent overflows of the gutters, requiring more frequent cleaning.
- 7.5.2. The documentation states that the proposed surface water would connect to the existing system serving the house, before discharging to the public drain infrastructure. There is no requirement in the Development Plan for this form of development to provide specific report material.
- 7.5.3. It is proposed to connect the extension to the existing Access junction, within the footprint of the extension, as illustrated on the Site Layout Plan. Notation on the drawing also confirm that there is no change to the existing drainage; that all drainage works to be catered for within the existing system on site.
- 7.5.4. From a review of the side and contextual elevations, the extension would consist of a pitched roof with western side. The proposed gutter would extend across the western side of the extension, connecting to a gutter which extends from the subject property as far as No. 8 to the west, across the rear of the Appellants property, as shown on the Rear Contextual Elevation.

- 7.5.5. The gutter line on the eastern extension would connect to the subject house in the same manner. It is also shown on the proposed rear and side elevations. A detail drawing showing the extension, does not relate to the subject application, as discussed below.
- 7.5.6. From a review of the file and site inspection, I am satisfied that gutters are in place to address surface water on the extension, which is shown to connect to the existing dwelling. The application has thereafter outlined the surface water would connect to the existing connection, and to the public drain.
- 7.5.7. Matters relating to the maintenance of gutter are beyond the scope of this appeal.
- 7.5.8. The Planner's Report has not commented on this matter; Condition 5 of the permission as granted requires water supply and drainage arrangements, including the disposal of surface water, shall be in accordance with the requirements of Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Water Services Department.
- 7.5.9. In the event that the Commission is minded to grant permission for the subject proposal, I also recommend that a condition to this effect is attached, in order to ensure compliance with the local authority Water Services Department.
- 7.5.10. Having regard to the above, I consider that surface water drainage proposals serving the proposed development, subject to condition, would not give rise to adverse impacts relating to public health.

7.6. **Other Matters**

Assessment

- 7.6.1. The Appellants state there is no precedent for an extension at first floor level, of a mid terrace dwelling, as currently proposed.
- 7.6.2. As referenced within s.12.3.7.1 (ii) of the Development Plan relating to extensions to dwellings, each application is assessed on its own merits.
- 7.6.3. This is to take account of site specific parameters that may arise.

Inconsistent Drawings

- 7.6.4. The Appellant identifies that there are inconsistencies within the drawing specifically the eastern and western elevations do not accord with the proposed roof plan.
- 7.6.5. From a review of these plans, this discrepancy is noted.

- 7.6.6. From a review of the plans, House No.s 2 and No. 6 are inaccurately shown on the ground and first floor and existing and proposed roof plans, with No. 2 to the west and No.6 to the east. These should be the other way around and are otherwise accurately illustrated throughout the planning pack, including the Site Layout Plan.
- 7.6.7. A section through the Extension drawing is not consistent the proposed extension. The omission of this drawing and typographical errors as referenced as detailed above, have not affected my assessment of the proposed development.
- 7.6.8. I do not consider that this constitutes grounds to refuse permission.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that Permission is granted, subject to conditions, for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the site's location on urban land, the residential zoning objective under the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022- 2028 which applies to this site, the scale, mass and form of the subject proposal, to the pattern of development in the area, Development standard 12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan relating to Extensions to Dwellings, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions as set out below, the proposed development would constitute an acceptable form of development, would not adversely impact on the visual or residential amenities of the area.

The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application on 1st August 2025 except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2	<p>Prior to the commencement of works, the applicant shall submit for the written agreement of the Planning Authority, a revised set of plans showing the first-floor rear extension to be reduced in depth by 1 metre.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of residential amenity</p>
3	<p>The entire dwelling shall be used as a single dwelling unit and shall not be sub-divided in any manner or used as two or more habitable units.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent unauthorised development.</p>
4	<p>All external finishes, including roof tiles/slates, shall harmonise in material, colour and texture with the existing dwelling on site.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
5	<p>The disposal of surface water shall be in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Authority as follows:</p> <p>Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the disposal of surface water, shall be in accordance with the requirements of Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Water Services Department.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and amenity.</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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

Aoife McCarthy
Planning Inspector

30th January 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Coimisiún Pleanála Case Reference	PL-500123-DR		
Proposed Development Summary	First floor extension over existing extension to the rear. Internal alterations and all associated site works to existing dwelling house.		
Development Address	4 Moreen Walk, Sandyford, Dublin 16.		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)	Yes		
	No	x	
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes			
No			
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
	Threshold	Comment (if relevant)	Conclusion
No			
Yes			

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?

No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Preliminary Examination required
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____