



Development	Retention of partially constructed outbuilding and permission to construct extension to include outbuilding
Location	19 Castlebrooke Crescent, Castlebrooke Manor, Castletroy, Limerick
Planning Authority	Limerick City and County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560919
Applicant(s)	Hari Prasad Pesala & Prasanna Somisetty
Type of Application	Retention
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Hari Prasad Pesala & Prasanna Somisetty
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	20 th March 2026
Inspector	Clare Clancy

Table of 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 Context	5
6.0	EIA Screening	8
7.0	The Appeal	8
8.0	Assessment.....	9
9.0	AA Screening	14
10.0	Water Framework Directive	16
11.0	Recommendation	16
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	16
13.0	Conditions.....	16
	Appendix 1 – Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	19

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located in Castlebrook Crescent housing estate which is located in the Castletroy area of Limerick city approx. 6.0 km to the east of the city centre. It is located south of the Dublin Rd R445. Gaelscoil Chaladh an Treoigh backs onto the site to the west. The housing estate is newly constructed, and the site contains a two storey semi-detach dwelling with a partially constructed structure at the rear. The boundaries of the site with the adjoining dwellings are defined by concrete post and timber fencing and there is a concrete block wall at the rear of the site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Retention permission is sought for the partially constructed structure located to the rear of the existing dwelling, and permission to construct an extension to the existing dwelling which seeks to incorporate the partially construction structure. The following is noted:

- Site Area – 0.020 ha
- Gross floor space of works to be retained – 22 m²
- Gross floor space of proposed development – 33 m²

3D impression/ montages are submitted with the application.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By Order dated 06th November 2025, Limerick City and County Council refused retention permission for the proposed development for the following reason:

1. The proposed development, by reason of the excessive depth, height and the proximity to the shared boundary, would result in a structure that would be materially harmful to the visual and residential amenity of neighbouring properties and would constitute an over-development of the site. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Objective HO O3 of the Limerick

Development Plan (2022-2028), the 'Existing Residential' land use zoning in place and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

One planning report forms the basis of the assessment and recommendation. The following is noted:

- The application is made on foot of unauthorised development. A Section 5 declaration related to the existing development determined that the works carried out was development and was not exempted development.
- The existing outbuilding will be integrated with the existing dwelling as a rear extension the use of which will be a residential unit. Concerns raised that it will be for sub-letting.
- The proposed development will result in visual dominance impacting on residential amenities, due to proximity with adjoining shared boundaries and height.
- The proposed development would set undesirable precedent and would be contrary to Objective HO O3 (Protection of Existing Residential Amenity).
- EIA and Appropriate Assessment were not required.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

- Two third party objections were received in objection to the proposed development. It is noted that neither objection outlined nor raised any particular issues.
- A submission was received from Cllr Catherine Slattery in support of the application.

4.0 Planning History

Appeal Site

- DC-176-25 – Enforcement warning letter issued.
- EC-164-25 Section 5 Declaration the construction of an extension of 33 m² to the rear of an existing dwelling and all ancillary site works, is development and is not exempted development.

Recent Adjoining Site History

- P.A. Ref. 19/492 – Amendment granted in regard to previously permitted development ACP Ref. PL13.229516, P.A. Ref. 06/4024 which relates to the existing permitted housing development.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028 (as varied)

The relevant policy and objectives of the current development plan include the following:

➤ Chapter 4 Housing

- Section 4.2.5 Protecting Existing Residential Amenity

Residential amenity is influenced by a range of factors, such as private outdoor amenity space, privacy and natural light. The relationship of buildings to each other and their individual design can have a significant impact on these factors and on residents' comfort. In older residential areas, infill development will be encouraged, while still protecting the existing residential amenity of these areas.

Objective HO O3 Protection of Existing Residential Amenity

It is an objective of the Council to ensure a balance between the protection of existing residential amenities, the established character of the area and the need to provide for sustainable new development.

- Section 4.2.13 Housing for Dependent Relatives

The Council will encourage the provision of suitable housing for people with a sensory disability, mental health disability, physical disability and intellectual disability, in appropriate locations served by public transport, local community services and facilities. All development shall comply with Part M of the Building Regulations or any replacement hereafter.

Objective HO O11 Subdivision of Dwelling to Accommodate Dependent Relative

It is an objective of the Council to facilitate the provision of accommodation for older people and dependant relatives within the existing family home, subject to compliance with the following criteria:

- Accommodation by way of extension shall be attached to the main dwelling;
- There shall be an internal connecting door with the main residence;
- The extension shall be subservient to the main dwelling;
- In a rural location any external door shall not be located on the front elevation;
- On vacancy of the unit, the accommodation shall be integrated with the main dwelling. No such unit shall be used as rental accommodation. There will be a presumption against proposals for detached independent units within the curtilage of a dwelling, regardless of urban or rural location. Proposals must accord with planning considerations such as residential amenity, environmental and public health standards and traffic safety.

➤ **Chapter 11 Development Management Standards**

- Section 11.4.4.1.2 Rear / Side Extensions

Ground floor rear/side extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining.

First floor rear/side extensions will be considered on their merits 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 will be considered:

- Degree of overshadowing, overbearing and overlooking, along with proximity, height and length along mutual boundaries;
- Size and usability of the remaining rear private open space;
- Degree of setback from mutual side boundaries. No part of the extension shall encroach or overhang adjoining third party properties.

Any planning application submitted in relation to extensions, basements or new first/upper floor level within the envelope of the existing building, shall clearly indicate on all drawings the extent of demolition/ wall removal required to facilitate the proposed development. In addition, a structural report, prepared by a competent and suitably qualified engineer, may be required to determine the integrity of walls/structures to be retained and outline potential impacts on adjoining properties. This requirement should be ascertained at preplanning stage.

➤ **Chapter 12 Land Use Zoning Strategy**

Land Use Zoning

The appeal site is zoned 'Existing Residential'.

Objective: To provide for residential development, protect and improve existing residential amenity.

Purpose: This zone is intended primarily for established housing areas. Existing residential amenities will be protected while allowing appropriate infill development. The quality of the zone will be enhanced with associated open space, community uses and where an acceptable standard of amenity can be maintained, a limited range of other uses that support the overall residential function of the area, such as schools, creches, doctors surgeries, playing fields etc.

5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

The site is not located within any designated site. The nearest designated site is SAC: 002165 - Lower River Shannon SAC which lies approx. 1.5 km to the north and east of the appeal site.

6.0 EIA Screening

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

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

A First Party appeal against the PA's decision has been received from Hari Prasad Pesala & Prasanna Somisetty. The grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

Background/ Site History Context

- Construction commenced in relation to a granny flat. Based on advice from a builder that it would be exempt from planning permission where the structure was 25 m². It was subsequently learned that this exemption applied to sheds/ garages and not extensions.
- A Section 5 declaration was applied for an extension showing the partially constructed development of 25 m² connected to the rear of the house resulting in a total floor area of 33 m², with flat roof and height not exceeding the eaves of the main dwelling.
- The PA determined that the subject development was development and not exempted development as the extension projected 0.6 m beyond the gable end of the house. No concerns were raised at that stage regarding the height or the requirement for a 0.5 m setback from the boundary. The application for retention was made as a consequence.

Exempted Development

- The proposed development complies with the exemption Class 1, Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)_as follows:
 - Size – 33 m² within the 40 m² limit.

- Height – Flat roof below eaves height. The height of the proposed extension does not exceed the height of the eaves of the house (drawings of side elevations of proposed structure and photos appended).
- Boundary – ground floor only, no overlooking windows.
- Open space – more than 25 m² retained.
- The regulations do not stipulate that the height of the boundary wall dictates the height of the extension and the planning authority reached an incurred decision.
- There are no issues will sunlight to neighbouring properties being blocked or invasion of privacy as the proposed development is at ground floor level.
- The refusal based on a 0.46 m setback (0.04 m short of the 0.5 m requirement) could have been addressed by condition.
- There are no windows within 1.0 m of any boundary.
- The proposed extension is for additional space to provide for family needs of elderly parents.

Note to Commission

A supporting document appended to the submission provides a timeline of events in terms of the subject development from inception to commencement of construction, and a note on meetings held with neighbours, builders and planning agent.

Photographs, drawings submitted for planning, council correspondence and a copy of the Section 5 declaration, planning decision and planner’s report related to the site are appended to the submission also.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

None.

7.3. Observations

None.

8.0 Assessment

Introduction

- 8.1.1. Having regard to the planning history of the site as set out in the application details and appeal details, I note for the Commission that the subject application was made to address alleged unauthorised development carried out on the site, in addition to constructing a new extension onto the existing dwelling to incorporate the existing structure at the rear of the site. The applicant outlines in the appeal the circumstances that occurred on site thus resulting in the planning application for the proposed development.
- 8.1.2. Reference is made by both the planning authority (PA) and the applicant to a Section 5 declaration in relation to the existing structure on the site which deemed the existing development not exempted development pursuant to Class 1 of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended). Notwithstanding the foregoing, the scope of this application is limited to the development as described in the public notices only, and my consideration and recommendation to the Commission will be based on the principle of the development and on merits of the proposal. Therefore, the matters raised in the grounds of appeal by the applicant in regard to the Section 5 declaration issued for the existing development will not be revisited or assessed as part of this application. I further note that unauthorised development and enforcement are not within the remit of the Commission who has no role in regard to same.
- 8.1.3. Therefore, having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports 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:
- Principle of Development
 - Design/ Scale/ Layout
 - Residential Amenities
 - Material Contravention
 - Other Matters

8.2. Principle of Development

8.2.1. Having regard to the zoning objective of the site which is 'Existing Residential', and to the provisions of the development plan which supports proposals for extensions to domestic dwellings, in particular Section 11.4.4.1.2, and to Objective HO O11 (Subdivision of Dwelling to Accommodate Dependent Relative) of the development plan, I am satisfied that the overall principle of the proposed development would be acceptable subject to the amenities of surrounding properties being protected, and the scale and design of the proposed development respecting the character of the area. These matters will be considered below.

8.3. **Design/ Scale/ Layout**

- 8.3.1. The reason for refusal references excessive depth, height and proximity to the shared boundary, and over-development of the subject site in regard to the proposed development. The PA in its assessment found that the proposed development was unacceptable due to its proximity to the shared boundaries with the adjoining properties to the north and south. The height of the existing structure was also considered to be excessive as it would exceed the existing boundary fence, and overall result in visual dominance thereby adversely impacting on adjoining residential amenities.
- 8.3.2. The existing structure on site will be integrated with the proposed new extension of the host dwelling on site and will be internally connected to the dwelling resulting in a gross floor area of 33 m². It will be single storey in scale and in my view would be typical of a domestic/ granny flat type extension on similar urban sites.
- 8.3.3. In terms of the existing structure itself and part of the proposed new development, the PA expressed concerns in regard to height. It stated that the height of the structure is 2.865 m which is higher than the existing boundary fence. Because it is higher than the boundary fence, it was concluded that it would be visually dominant and would negatively affect the adjoining residential amenities.
- 8.3.4. The existing dwelling on site has a 29.44 FFL and the existing site layout plan drawing show that the levels marginally increase at the rear of the site. In this regard, the existing structure at 22 m² is shown to have a 29.89 FFL and a max height of 2.47 (DWG No. A101). This also shows the existing ground level post ground works as 0.450 m.

- 8.3.5. Following measurements taken at time of site inspection, I noted that the existing structure sits on a concrete base (approx. 0.13 m above garden level) where the ground level at the rear of the site is higher as a result. A block concrete base was laid (approx. 0.33 m) on same which the existing structure is built upon. This has resulted in the ground level at this location being raised by approx. 0.46 m which generally correlates with the levels shown on the plans and drawings in the application details.
- 8.3.6. The height of the existing structure indicated on DWG number A101 is 2.47 m. With the addition of the increased ground level 0.45 m, it results in an overall height of 2.92 m. At time of site inspection, the existing structure was measured at approx. 2.4 m at FFL and with the addition of the increased ground height recorded, it results in a height of approx. 2.86 m.
- 8.3.7. From measurements taken from the plans, drawings and cross sections, I note that with the addition of a flat roof, the overall height of the proposed extension on the existing ground level 0.45 m will have a max roof height of 3.23 m at a depth of approx. 7.13 m adjacent to the northern boundary of the site. This I note generally correlate with Cross Section 2 on DWG number A103 and 'Rear Elevation' shown on DWG number A101, although I note that the height of the structure to the northern elevation will be marginally higher giving a slight sloping gradient to the roof (DWG No. A101). The height will be stepped resulting in it being slightly lower between the internal corridor that will connect the proposed extension to the existing dwelling.
- 8.3.8. In relation to the northern shared boundary with no. 19, the proposed development will be approx. 1.61 m higher than this boundary. In considering this, I note that due to the increase to the ground level, this will result in approx. 0.45 m being added to the overall height of the proposed development. The question is whether this materially affects the residential amenities of neighbouring property, in particular to the north as the structure will be sited adjacent to the boundary.
- 8.3.9. At an overall height of approx. 3.23 m, it is my consideration that the proposed extension would be modest in scale and in height and would generally be comparable with single-storey domestic outbuildings/ extensions in urban settings. While the additional height due to the ground works carried out and proposed to be carried out will result in the overall height being increased by c. 455 mm and will result in the structure being higher than the adjoining shared boundary to the north by approx. 1.61

m and the boundary to the south by approx. 1.38 m, given the site context, as the existing structure will be integrated with the main dwelling and its use typical of a modest accommodation unit for family members, I consider the height to be acceptable and comparable to similar type domestic extensions. I therefore do not consider that it will appear overly visually dominant to either adjoining property.

8.3.10. In terms of separation distances between boundaries, I noted at time of site inspection that there is a separation distance of approx. 0.45 m between the appeal site and the adjoining property to the north, and approx. 0.61 m between the adjoining property to the south. There is a separation distance of approx. 0.57 m between the rear wall of the existing structure and the boundary wall with the Gaelscoil backing onto the property. The proposed extension will retain the separation distance with the shared boundary to the north. Section 11.4.4.1.2 (Rear / Side Extensions) does not provide a set standard for separation distances, however while the physical gap available would be tight, it is unlikely to give rise to overhanging of rainwater goods. Such separation distances would not be uncommon on similar sites in urban settings. Should permission be granted, I would recommend that the Commission include a condition to address overhanging concerns.

8.3.11. Accordingly, having regard to the foregoing, I consider that the proposed development in terms of use, design, scale and layout to be acceptable, it adequately integrates within the existing dwelling on site, is appropriate to the site context, and will not result in overdevelopment of the site. I further consider it to be in accordance with Objective HO O11 (Subdivision of Dwelling to Accommodate Dependent Relative) and Section 11.4.4.1.2 (Rear / Side Extensions) of the development plan.

8.4. Residential Amenities

8.4.1. In terms of impacts on adjoining residential amenities arising from overlooking, no direct overlooking of the adjoining residential properties to the north and south will occur due to the proposed development being single storey in scale. There are no windows proposed that would give rise to direct overlooking or impact on the private amenity spaces serving these dwelling.

8.4.2. In terms of loss of day light/ overshadowing, the appeal site and the adjoining dwellings bounding the site to the north and to the south have the benefit of a south/ south westerly aspect. Therefore, given the direction of the sun path from east to west, this

allows for ample daylight. I am therefore satisfied that no undue loss of day light to these properties will occur. Also, due to the height of the proposed development, I am satisfied that there will be no undue overshadowing, particularly of the adjoining property to the north.

8.4.3. Having regard to the foregoing, and to the south / southwest orientation of both the appeal site and the adjoining properties, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not contribute to significant overshadowing or unduly impact on the level of daylight being received and would therefore be acceptable.

8.5. **Material Contravention**

8.5.1. The PA in its reason for refusal deemed that the subject development would be contrary to Objective HO O3 of the Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028, however I note that the decision did not go as far to say that the proposed development would materially contravene the development plan.

8.5.2. Section 37(2)(b) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) sets out the criteria that allows the Commission to grant permission in the event of material contravention. As I do not consider that such a scenario arises in this case, I therefore submit that the Commission is not constrained by the terms of Section 37(2)(b) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

8.6. **Other Matters**

Section 48 Development Contribution

8.6.1. I note for the Commission that no development contribution is required to be included as a condition in the event of a grant, in regard to the proposed development pursuant to Section 6.0 of the 'Limerick City and County Council Development Contribution Scheme 2025-2023 Section 48 Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) September 2025'. In this regard, it is stated that development contributions in relation to a domestic extension up to the first 60 m² is exempt from payment of the contribution.

9.0 **AA Screening**

**Screening the need for Appropriate Assessment: Screening Determination
(Stage 1, Article 6(3) of Habitats Directive)**

I have considered case PL-500349LK-25 in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The appeal site is located in the Castletroy suburbs of Limerick city. It is located on lands developed for low-density residential development and is serviced by piped public water and wastewater infrastructure.

The closest European site relative to the appeal site is the SAC: 002165 - Lower River Shannon SAC which lies approx. 1.5 km to the north and east of the appeal site.

The appeal site comprises of retention of an existing outbuilding, and the construction of an extension to the existing dwelling to incorporate the existing outbuilding (gross floor area 33 m²).

No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning 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 limited nature of the proposed works, including proposed demolition works.
- The confined nature of the works within the curtilage of an existing dwelling.
- The distance from European site(s) and lack of direct connections.
- Taking into account the screening determination of the PA.

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.

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

10.0 Water Framework Directive

An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive.

Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, it is concluded that the proposal will not result in any risk of deterioration in the status of any water body, including surface waters, groundwater, transitional waters, or coastal waters. This applies to both qualitative and quantitative status, and in respect of temporary and permanent effects.

In addition, the proposed development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the protection, maintenance, and improvement of water body status, as required under the Directive. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend that retention permission and permission are granted, subject to conditions as set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the residential zoning objective for the area, the pattern of development in the vicinity, the nature of use, scale and design of the proposed extension and the provisions of the Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028 (as varied), it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would be appropriate to the site context, would not seriously injure the residential amenities of adjoining properties in the vicinity or detract from the character of the area, and would, therefore be, in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out and retained in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the planning application on the 12 th day of
----	--

	<p>September 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>The existing dwelling and the proposed extension shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit and the extension 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>The proposed development shall not overhang any adjoining third party properties.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard residential amenity and in the interest of orderly development.</p>
4.	<p>The external finishes of the proposed extension (including roof tiles / slates) shall match those of the existing dwelling in respect of colour and texture, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority, prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
5.	<p>The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interests of sustainable drainage.</p>
6.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays.</p> <p>Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p>

	Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.
7.	<p>Construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise management measures and off site disposal of construction demolition waste.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of public safety and residential 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.

Clare Clancy

Planning Inspector

19th May 2026

Appendix 1 – Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500349-LK-25
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of partially constructed out building and construction of extension to include outbuilding
Development Address	19 Castlebrooke Crescent, Castlebrooke Manor, Castletroy, Limerick
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a ‘Project’. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(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)	
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	

<p>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?</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><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)</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>	

No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)
--	--

Inspector: _____ Date: _____