



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500214-DL

Development	Retention of revised front elevation, attic conversion, gable windows and skylights, domestic shed to rear and permission for new septic tank system.
Location	Kinnea, Clonmany, Co. Donegal
Planning Authority	Donegal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2561460
Applicant	Irene McDermott
Type of Application	Retention Permission and Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant	Martin Doherty
Observer(s)	None

Date of Site Inspection

16th January 2026

Inspector

John Duffy

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
3.1. Decision	5
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	6
3.4. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History	6
5.0 Policy Context	6
5.1. Development Plan	6
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	8
6.0 EIA Screening	8
7.0 The Appeal	8
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	8
7.2. Applicant Response	9
7.3. Planning Authority Response	11
7.4. Observations	11
8.0 Assessment	11
9.0 AA Screening	17
10.0 Recommendation	17
11.0 Reasons and Considerations	18
12.0 Conditions	18

Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site with a stated area of 0.2 ha is located in the coastal townland of Kinnea, situated in the north-west corner of the Inishowen Peninsula and approximately 2km to the north-west of Clonmany village in Co. Donegal.
- 1.2. The appeal site, set back approximately 0.38km from the coast, is accessed by way of a carriageway over which the applicant has a right of way (as indicated on the site layout plan) and accommodates a single storey rural dwelling with attic accommodation and a shed.
- 1.3. The topography of the surrounding area is gently undulating, with lands to the south of the subject site rising in elevation. There are a number of one-off rural dwellings of varying designs and styles in the area.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Retention permission is sought for (1) revised front elevation (2) first floor attic conversion to include gable windows and skylights and (3) a domestic shed to rear and all associated site development works. Permission is sought for a new septic tank system.
- 2.2. Submitted floor plans indicate the area to be retained at attic level level (stated as c 77 sqm) accommodates a bedroom, a storage room and an office. There is one gable window at attic level within each of the side gable walls of the dwelling. There are two rooflights in both the front and rear roof planes of the dwelling.
- 2.3. The existing domestic shed to be retained measures approximately 98sqm and ranges in height from c 4.5m to c 5.7m. This structure has a large open plan internal area along with three separate smaller areas labelled on plan as turf sheds. The building features both flat roof elements and a pitched roof over the larger open plan area.
- 2.4. Application documentation indicates that the existing septic tank is to be replaced by a proposed new septic tank system and percolation area.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority granted permission on the 9th of October 2025 subject to three conditions. Conditions 2 and 3 relate respectively to surface water drainage and the existing / proposed septic tanks.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. The Planning Report dated 2nd October 2025 forms the basis for the planning authority's decision to grant permission and the report includes the following comments:

- Principle of residential use is long established on the site.
- Retention of attic conversion is considered acceptable as the building is used as a domestic dwelling.
- Conversion of the attic does not alter the height of the dwelling.
- The shed is domestic in nature and scale.
- There are no visual amenity concerns and the proposal does not give rise to any adverse impacts on the High Scenic Amenity designation of the area.
- No issues arise regarding loss of privacy, overlooking or residential amenity given separation distances to dwellings nearby.
- No changes proposed to the existing access arrangements.
- The existing septic tank will be decommissioned and the proposal provides for installation of a new prefabricated septic tank system and percolation area.
- The planning authority is satisfied that, subject to conditions, the proposal can efficiently dispose of effluent.
- All storm water to discharge to existing storm drainage network.
- No development charge applicable in this instance.
- Points of third party objection noted and responded to.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Roads and Transportation Planning: Report dated 15th September 2025 notes that existing vision lines to be maintained where the private lane intersects the county road.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No reports received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

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

4.0 Planning History

Subject site

No recent planning history.

Permission was granted in May 2000 under Planning Authority Reg. Ref. 00/4341 for erection of a house served by a septic tank.

Adjoining lands to the west

Reg. Ref. 25/61342 refers to a decision made by Donegal County Council in September 2025 to grant retention permission for side and rear extension, attic conversion and all associated works to Bridget Diver (the applicant's mother) at Kinnea, Clonmany, Co. Donegal. This application is the subject of a concurrent third party appeal (Ref. ACP-PL-500071-DL-25), lodged with An Coimisiún Pleanála on 15th October 2025.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Other relevant Policy:

WW-P-2: Ensure that new developments: a. do not have an adverse impact on surface and ground water quality, drinking water supplies, Bathing Waters and aquatic ecology (including Water dependent qualifying interests within Natura 2000 sites); and b. do

not hinder the achievement of, and are not contrary to: i. The objectives of the EU Water Framework Directive. ii. EU Habitats and Bird Directives. iii. The associated Programme of Measures in the River Basin Management Plan 2022-2027 including any associated Water Protection or Restoration Programmes. iv. Drinking Water Safety Plan. v. The Guidelines on the Protection of Fisheries During Construction Works In and Adjacent To Waters (IFI, 2016).

WW-P-6: Facilitate development in urban or rural settings for single dwellings or other developments to be maintained in single ownership with a projected PE <10 in unsewered areas proposing the provision of effluent treatment by means of an independent wastewater treatment system where such systems:

- a. Demonstrate compliance with the EPA's Code of Practice for Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (PE. ≤10) (EPA 2021) or any subsequent or updated code of practice.*
- b. Would not result in an over concentration or over proliferation of such systems in an area which cumulatively would be detrimental to public health or water quality.*
- c. Otherwise comply with Policy WW-P-2.*

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

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

6.0 EIA Screening

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

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

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

- The red line boundary includes land that has not historically formed part of the domestic curtilage. No dated mapping is provided to demonstrate established domestic use. The curtilage should remain limited to genuine domestic needs to avoid future conflict with existing agricultural operations.
- A public mains water pipe traverses the area within the red line boundary and it must remain free of development. A concrete street and shed are constructed over the pipe which may impede access and protection of the infrastructure.
- A Local Improvement Scheme (LIS) road (ID 1691) traverses the site and must not be enclosed, altered or encroached upon.
- The site curtilage overlaps lands referenced in a recent nearby planning application (PA Reg. Ref. 25/61342 refers). This does not appear to have been addressed in the planner's report. Consistent curtilage interpretation is important to avoid incremental loss of agricultural land.
- The roof ridge height of 5.88m exceeds the building scale in the area and should be considered in terms of rural character and visual impact.
- Request that permission is refused or alternatively that appropriate conditions in relation to the foregoing attached.

Attachments to the appeal are as follows:

- An aerial photograph (from Google Maps) of the subject site and adjoining lands dated June 2019.
- A proposed site plan relating to the application, the subject of this appeal.
- An existing site plan relating to a planning application pertaining to a neighbouring site to the west (Reg. Ref. 25/61342).

7.2. Applicant Response

BPS Planning and Development Consultants responded to the third party appeal on behalf of the applicant on 20th November 2025. Matters raised are summarised as follows:

- The appellant does not refer to grounds of appeal and has forwarded a list of points addressed by the local authority.
- The appellant has also lodged an appeal against the granting of the applicant's mothers' planning application (Reg. Ref. 25/61342 refers). Both planning applications arise from the need to apply for compensation as part of the Mica / Pyrite redress scheme.
- The applicant and other local people have complained about adverse impacts of a nearby pig farm, stated to be operated by the appellant. It is considered that the appeal is vexatious and should be dismissed having regard to section 138 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.
- The appeal submission raises no new points not already addressed by the planning authority.
- The red line boundary meets the requirements of planning legislation and the applicant owns the lands within the red line boundary. A red line boundary is not a legal boundary and the appellant's understanding of this is questioned. The planning authority is satisfied the red line covers the development presented to the Council.
- Legal boundaries to sites within the ownership of others are civil matters as detailed in the Development Management Guidelines.
- The proposal would not undermine the nearby agricultural operation.
- The Planner's report refers to the watermain and other underground services; in this regard the report noted the proposal does not include any new build element to the house. The appellant is repeating points already addressed by the planning authority. Similarly the matter raised relating to the LIS road infrastructure is also addressed in the planner's report.

- The ridge height of the bungalow has no impact on the appellant's property or the area; it has no visual impact on the area. Again, this matter was assessed by the planning authority which raised no concerns.
- The appeal response includes an extract of the planner's report which responds to the various items of objection raised in relation to the planning application.

Attachments to the appeal response include a copy of the third party appeal and a copy of the response made by BPS Planning to the third party appeal submitted in connection with the proposal on the adjoining site to the west (PA Reg. Ref. 25/61342 / ACP Ref. PL-500071-DL-25).

7.3. Planning Authority Response

This was received on 17th November 2025 and it considers the issues raised in the appeal are dealt with in the Planning Officer's report which recommended a grant of planning permission.

7.4. Observations

None.

8.0 Assessment

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

- Land-use and nature of the proposed development
- Site boundaries and curtilage
- Impact on LIS infrastructure (Watermain and Road)
- Rural character
- Wastewater Treatment
- Water Framework Directive – Screening

- Other issues
- Planning Authority conditions

8.2. Land-use and nature of proposed development

- 8.2.1. The proposed development comprises retention permission for the front elevation of the rural house, an attic conversion, associated rooflights and provision of gable windows at attic level, along with retention permission for a domestic shed. Furthermore, a new upgraded septic tank system and percolation area are proposed.
- 8.2.2. This proposal is acceptable in principle subject to no significant impacts on surrounding residential and visual amenities and the environment. While I note the appellant's concerns that the roof ridge height of the subject dwelling at 5.88m would impact on the visual amenity of the area, I do not concur. In my view, having regard to the design, scale, and form of the development to be retained and the separation distances to residential properties in the area, there are no undue impacts on residential and visual amenities of the area. To conclude, I consider the proposal to be acceptable in principle.

8.3. Site boundaries

- 8.3.1. Concern is raised that the red line boundary includes land that has not historically formed part of the domestic curtilage and that no dated mapping is provided to demonstrate established domestic use. The appeal also notes the site curtilage overlaps with lands relating to the application on the adjoining site to the west (PA Reg. Ref. 25/61342 refers).
- 8.3.2. The response to the appeal from the applicant's agent states that the red line boundary meets the requirements of planning legislation and the applicant owns the lands within the red line boundary. I note also that the planning authority is satisfied the red line boundary denoted on the proposed site plan incorporates the development as presented to the Council. I concur with the planning authority's view and it is apparent that all elements of the proposal are contained within the red line on the site layout plan, stated to be in the applicant's ownership. It is open to the applicant to make a planning application for development on lands within their ownership if they so wish.

8.3.3. I accept that there is some overlap in lands within the red line boundary of the subject site when compared with the lands within the red line boundary on the adjoining site to the west. However, I do not consider this to be a material issue for the purposes of this appeal, given that the planning application, the subject of this appeal, relates to specific development sited within the curtilage of the appeal site, which does not encroach upon or impact on the development to be retained within the adjoining site, as demonstrated on the proposed site layout plan pertaining to that concurrent application / appeal (Reg. Ref. 25/61342 refers).

8.4. Watermain and road infrastructure

8.4.1. The appellant contends that the public watermain traversing an area within the red line boundary must remain free of development, and that the shed structure to be retained may impede access and protection of this infrastructure. The appellant also considers that a road traversing the site should not be enclosed, altered or encroached upon.

8.4.2. It appears from information on file that the public watermain was provided under a Local Improvement Scheme (LIS). I note that Uisce Éireann (UÉ) was invited to comment on the proposal and that no subsequent response was received. The appellant also states that the road traversing the site was also provided under a LIS. From my examination of the site layout plan, the proposals as set out in the planning application do not involve alterations to or encroachments onto the subject road.

8.4.3. The planning authority raised no concerns regarding this matter, noting that the proposal does not include any build element onto the dwelling. In this context the planning authority was satisfied the proposal would not impact the LIS funded infrastructure comprising the watermain and the road.

8.4.4. I note that the appellant has not provided any details or map relating to the exact location of the watermain and as such I cannot be satisfied that the shed structure is built above the watermain. Having regard to the foregoing, given the absence of any objections from UÉ relating to this issue and noting the comments of the planning authority relating to the LIS funded infrastructure, I consider the nature of the proposal to be acceptable in this context.

8.5. Rural character

- 8.5.1. The appellant is concerned that retention of the development would negatively impact the rural character of the area.
- 8.5.2. In my opinion, the proposal relating to relatively modest developments including retention of attic extension, associated windows, a shed and a new septic tank system would not undermine the rural character of the area in any way.

8.6. Wastewater Treatment

- 8.6.1. Part of the proposal relates to the replacement of the existing septic tank with a new septic tank system and percolation area, located approximately 20m and 19m respectively from the existing house on the site.
- 8.6.2. The Site Characterisation Form submitted with the planning application identifies the appeal site as located in an area in which the aquifer category is poor (PI) with a 'Moderate' vulnerability (Groundwater Protection Response R1). I note the suitability of the site for a treatment system subject to normal good practice (i.e. system selection, construction, operation and maintenance in accordance with the EPA Code of Practice (CoP): Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems 2021).
- 8.6.3. The trial hole depth referenced in the Site Characterisation Form was 2.0m and no bedrock was encountered at the excavated depth / bottom of the trial hole at 2.0m. The water table was not encountered within the trial hole and no evidence of mottling was observed. The soil conditions found in the trial hole are described as comprising gravelly silty sand with extensive cobbles and boulders. Percolation test holes were dug and pre-soaked. A T value / sub surface percolation value of 18.36 was recorded. Based on the EPA Code of Practice 2021 (Table 6.4) the site is suitable for a number of treatment system types, namely a septic tank and percolation area, a secondary treatment system and soil polishing filter or a tertiary treatment system and infiltration area. I did not observe the trial holes at the time of my site inspection.
- 8.6.4. The Site Characterisation Form concludes that the site is suitable for the treatment of wastewater. I am satisfied the proposal complies with the required separation

distances set out in Table 6.2 of the 2021 Code of Practice. It is proposed to install a septic tank system and percolation area based on a population area of 6. The existing septic tank is to be decommissioned. In accordance with Table 7.2 of the Code of Practice, the percolation area is to consist of 6 x 18m lengths of trenches (108m in total) to be 500mm in width.

- 8.6.5. Based on the information submitted, it is considered that soil conditions are favourable for the treatment of wastewater as proposed. Having regard to the foregoing, I consider that the installation of a replacement septic tank and percolation area at the subject location would be acceptable.

8.7. Water Framework Directive - Screening

- 8.7.1. The rural appeal site accommodates an extended dwelling including attic conversion and a domestic shed. The proposal relates to retention of revised elevation, attic conversion, associated rooflights and windows and also permission for the installation of a proposed new septic tank system.

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

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

- 8.7.3. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the 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.

8.8. Other issues

8.8.1. Financial Contribution Condition

The Planning Officer's report indicates that no development charge applies in this instance. I note that a Draft Development Contribution Scheme 2025-2030 was published in November 2025 whereby domestic extensions attract a €5 per sqm levy subject to a minimum charge of €100. Retention permissions for unauthorised development shall be the standard charge for the particular class of development plus 50%. However, according to the Donegal County Council website, the current scheme in place relates to the Donegal Development Contribution Scheme 2016-2021 under which domestic extensions are exempt from levies (Table 2 refers). As such, given that the parameters of the Development Contribution Scheme 2016-2021 remain in place at the present time, the development to be retained and proposed does not attract any development contribution.

8.8.2. Request to dismiss appeal

The submission made on behalf of the applicant (section 7.2 above refers) recommends dismissal of the appeal having regard to section 138 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. I am satisfied the appeal meets all of the criteria as set out in section 127 of the Act and, as such, the appeal process should continue until determination.

8.9. Planning Authority Conditions

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

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposal comprising retention of domestic extensions and attic conversion, domestic shed and the proposed new septic tank system, and all associated site development works in the light of the requirements of Sections 177S and 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.
- 9.2. The development to be retained is not located within or immediately adjacent to any European Site. The nearest European Site is the North Inishowen Coast SAC (Site Code 0002012) which is located approximately 380m north of the development to be retained and the proposed development.
- 9.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

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

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

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

10.0 Recommendation

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

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

11.1.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and the development to be retained, the relevant policies and objectives contained in the County Donegal Development Plan 2024-2030, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposal would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area, would not impact LIS funded infrastructure and would not undermine the rural character of the area. It is therefore considered that the proposal would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

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

4.	<p>(a) The existing septic tank and associated infrastructure and pipework shall be decommissioned and removed from the subject site under the supervision of a suitably qualified person</p> <p>(b) The wastewater treatment system hereby permitted shall be installed in accordance with the recommendations included within the site characterisation report submitted with this application on the 25th of August 2025 and shall be in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled “Code of Practice - Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10)” – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.</p> <p>(c) Treated effluent from the septic tank / wastewater treatment system shall be discharged to a percolation area / polishing filter which shall be provided in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled “Code of Practice - Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10)” – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.</p> <p>(d) Within three months of the installation of the new septic tank system, the developer shall submit a report to the planning authority from a suitably qualified person (with professional indemnity insurance) certifying that the wastewater treatment system and associated works are constructed and operating in accordance with the standards set out in the Environmental Protection Agency document referred to above.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and to prevent water pollution.</p>
----	--

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

John Duffy
Planning Inspector

20th January 2026

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

No EIAR Submitted

Case Reference	PL-500214-DL
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of revised front elevation, attic conversion, gable windows and skylights, domestic shed to rear and permission for new septic tank system.
Development Address	Kinnea, Clonmany, Co. Donegal
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project.' Proceed to Q2. <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No No Screening required.	The development to be retained and proposed is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory

	requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination.
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold

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

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____