



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-500383-CE-25

Development	Demolition of existing extension, construction of rear extension and new building attached to house for letting purposes.
Location	Mountrivers , Doonbeg , Co. Clare
Planning Authority	Clare County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560361
Applicant(s)	Denis Murphy
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	John O'Dea
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	06 th March 2026
Inspector	Sarah O'Mahony

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Further Information	4
3.2. Decision	5
3.3. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.4. Prescribed Bodies	6
3.5. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History.....	7
5.0 Policy Context.....	7
5.1. Development Plan.....	7
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	8
5.3. EIA Screening	8
6.0 The Appeal	8
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	8
6.2. Applicant Response	9
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	11
7.0 Assessment	12
7.1. Introduction	12
7.2. Landownership.....	12
7.3. Site Notice.....	13
7.4. Unauthorised Demolition.....	14
7.5. Asbestos	15

7.6. Wastewater Connection 15

8.0 Appropriate Assessment..... 16

9.0 Water Framework Directive 16

10.0 Recommendation 17

11.0 Reasons and Considerations..... 17

12.0 Conditions 18

Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The 0.169ha site is situated 1.5km east of Doonbeg village and 300m south of the N67 at Mountrivers Bridge. It comprises a detached single storey dwelling with some agricultural sheds to the rear.
- 1.2. The dwelling fronts onto a local road to the west with a 5m setback between the front elevation and the edge of the carriageway. The vehicular entrance is formed between the southern elevation of the dwelling and a boundary wall with an adjacent residential property.
- 1.3. The dwelling comprises a vacant mid-20th century, 4-bed, hipped roof structure. It has a flat roof extension at the south (side) and another at the east (rear). There is also the remains of a semi-detached shed situated at the northern elevation; the barrel shaped roof is missing however the front elevation and north (side) elevation are still in place giving the appearance of a full structure from public viewpoints.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for development which comprises the following:
 - Demolish existing 58.5m² extensions to the side and rear of the existing dwelling, as well as remaining walls of attached outbuilding;
 - Construct 177.5m² additional floorspace to the dwelling comprising:
 - New rear extension and side extension to east and south;
 - New extension at north of dwelling to comprise a self-contained 2-bed unit for short-term letting with own-door access from north elevation.
 - Elevational changes to the existing dwelling house, and
 - All associated site works and services.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Further Information

- 3.1.1. The Planning Authority requested 3no. items of further information regarding:

- Legal title/interest in the property,
 - Details of any demolition which took place prior to making the application and
 - Details of the wastewater treatment system details together with confirmation that it can accommodate the increased loading associated with the proposed extension.
- The applicant was also requested to clarify the water supply and surface water management.

3.1.2. The applicant submitted a land registry folio demonstrating ownership of the property since January 2025.

3.1.3. A revised site layout drawing was submitted illustrating the location of sheds previously situated on the site. The response states:

“These outbuildings were demolished due to not being structurally sound when the applicant took ownership of the site on the date mentioned above. These demolition works which took place pre-date the planning application.”

3.1.4. Revised drawings also illustrated the location of a foul sewer in the adjacent public road and a proposed soakpit on the site. The written response states that ‘*The water supply is existing on site*’.

3.1.5. The further information response was deemed significant and revised statutory notices were published.

3.2. **Decision**

3.2.1. Clare County Council issued a notification of decision to grant permission on 07th October 2025 subject to 7no. standard conditions. Condition no. 4 limits the use of the smaller unit for short term tourist accommodation only.

3.3. **Planning Authority Reports**

3.3.1. Planning Reports

- There are two case planner’s reports, one recommending further information and the latter assessing it.
- The Planners report recommendation to grant permission is consistent with the notification of decision which issued.

- Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Appropriate Assessment (AA) issues were screened out.
- The report considered the principle of development to be acceptable and also stated *'the siting and design of the proposed development is acceptable having regard to the low lying and flat nature of the site'*

3.3.2. Other Technical Reports

- Climate Action, Environment and Water Services: Two reports received, one requesting further information and the latter outlining no objections subject to standard conditions.
- West Clare Municipal District: Response received stating the office has no comments to make.

3.4. Prescribed Bodies

- Development Applications Unit of DoH LG: No response.
- TII: Two responses received, one requesting the Planning Authority has regard to the provisions of official policy and the latter, following receipt of the further information response, stating no further comments.
- Uisce Éireann: No response.
- The Heritage Council: No response.
- An Taisce: No response.

3.5. Third Party Observations

1. Representation made by Cllr. Dinny Gould
2. Submission received from John O'Dea raising the following matters:
 - Legal title
 - Unauthorised demolition of 3no. sheds which contained asbestos.

4.0 Planning History

None

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1. The site is governed by the policies and provisions contained in the Clare County Development Plan 2023-2029 (referred to hereafter as the CDP). The site is situated in a rural area and as such is not subject to a land zoning objective.

5.1.2. Development Plan Objective CDP 9.5 refers to Visitor Accommodation as follows:

It is an objective of Clare County Council:

- a) To promote, encourage and facilitate the provision of new visitor accommodation and the expansion/upgrade of existing hotels, guesthouses, B&Bs and other tourist accommodation at appropriate locations throughout the County, particularly in areas with existing services;
- b) To support the redevelopment of brownfield sites, both in settlements and in rural areas, for the provision of tourist accommodation; and
- c) To support the development of new camping and glamping facilities and facilities for campervans/motor homes/touring caravans both within settlements and in rural locations at a variety of locations across the County. Sites in rural locations should be located in close proximity to, and have good connectivity to, existing tourism assets.
- (d) To support the development of overnight accommodation in the County ensuring existing visitor attractions deliver, as far as practicable, the aims of 'Our Rural Future: Rural Development Policy 2014-2022' and the 'Town Centre First Policy'.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.2.1. The site is situated 1.1km south of White Strand/Carrowmore Marsh proposed Natural Heritage Area. It is also situated 1.6km southeast of Mid-Clare Coast Special Protection Area (SPA) and Carrowmore Dunes Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

5.3. EIA Screening

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

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- The applicant is not the legal owner of the property. A letter is submitted from the Financial Services and Pensions Ombudsman addressed to another third party and outlining that an investigation is underway. The appeal submits that this investigation is regarding a particular bank's authority to sell the property.
- The site notice was erected on the incorrect date of 21st June 2025 and not 06th June 2025 as stated.
- A revised site notice was not erected as required by the significant further information response. This impacted the appellant's response time to lodge an appeal. The appellant raised this with the Planning Authority who stated they do not have resources to check site notices. The Planning Authority should check site notices. A photograph is submitted together with a dated letter from the Planning Authority.
- The applicant carried out unauthorised demolition of 3no. outbuildings which contained asbestos and should have required specialist contractors. A considerable amount of asbestos was scattered and buried in the grounds around the dwelling. The further information request required a detailed submission on the method of

demolition which was not provided. The response states the buildings were removed as they were structurally unstable prior to the applicant taking ownership of the premises. The applicant instructed an unqualified contractor to remove the buildings in December 2024. Photographs are provided of asbestos in numerous locations on the site.

- The agent stated 'not applicable' in the application form for both water and wastewater services. The application therefore should have been invalidated as these services are required.
- The applicant is increasing the number of bedrooms and therefore the applicant has to apply for a main sewage connection which should have been stated. Irish Water has not been invited to make a submission.

6.2. Applicant Response

- The grounds relied upon do not disclose any basis upon which the Board could reasonably conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. The appeal relies predominantly on matters which are either misconceived, outside the remit of the planning code, or relate to enforcement or other statutory regimes.
- The appeal does not advance any substantive challenge to the principle of development. No issue is taken with the design and layout of the development. No case is taken that the development would adversely affect matters such as traffic, drainage etc.
- The Planning Authority assessed the development and concluded that it was acceptable in principle and in detail. No material planning policy conflict has been identified in the appeal.
- With regard to legal title, the applicant wishes to go on record by saying that the purchase of the property was carried out in a correct and legal manner and the applicant's title is unimpeachable. The Land and Conveyancing Law Reform Act 2009 is the legislation relied upon by purchasers of property from banks exercising a power of sale. As such the applicant is well within his rights to apply for planning

permission and carry out the subsequent works. It is submitted that this ground of appeal is not a material planning consideration and should be disregarded.

- The appeal considers the application was premature and should be invalidated due to reasons relating to an incomplete application form, the absence of consultation with Irish Water and the omission of bedroom occupancy numbers. These arguments are misconceived. The application relates to an existing dwelling where no change in water services is proposed and therefore 'not applicable' is procedurally correct. There is no statutory requirement to consult with Irish Water where no connection or modification is proposed. The Environment Department confirmed that the site is adequately serviced and that surface water disposal via soakway was acceptable. No outstanding servicing or environmental concerns remain and the Planning Authority was therefore entitled to make a decision with no prematurity concerns on the basis of the information before it. These matters do not render the grant of permission premature or invalid.

- With regard to the site notice, the application was validated by the Planning Authority. The appellant made a submission and was afforded an opportunity to comment further following lodgement of the further information response. The applicant disputes the allegation that the June site notice was erected 2 weeks later than the date stated on the notice. The applicant reaffirms that the notice was erected on the 06th June.

- With regard to the second site notice advertising significant further information and the appellants allegation that it was not erected on the site, the applicant also disputes this and confirms it was erected on the site on 10th October 2025. Suggestions that the absence of a site notice impacted the appellant's timeframe to make an appeal is flawed as the Local Authority sent notification to the appellant dated 02nd October 2025 stating that the further information response was deemed significant and that submissions may be made. The notice was also published in the local newspaper as required. It is therefore clear that public participation was not impeded and no procedural defect arises undermining validity of the decision. This ground of appeal does not warrant interference with the decision to grant permission.

- Responding to allegations of unauthorised demolition, the appeal response states that unauthorised development is a matter for enforcement provisions of planning

legislation and does not determine the planning merits of a new application. This application is for new development and was assessed on its own merits by the Planning authority.

- The response states that no unauthorised development was carried out at the site by the applicant. This was clarified to the Planning Authority in an unsolicited further information response in October 2025. The structures were remnants of old steel farm sheds which were substantially dilapidated and derelict following removal of all sheeting at an unspecified date. The remaining steel frame was removed by the applicant for safety reasons and disposed off-site. *“As such, there was no demolition of sheds, but more a removal of unsafe structural elements and the remaining unsafe steel sheeting.”*
- Matters regarding the improper handling of asbestos fall under health, safety and environmental legislation and are regulated by statutory regimes outside the planning code. No expert evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development would give rise to unacceptable environmental or public health impacts. The photographs submitted by the appellant allegedly portraying asbestos are poor quality and the applicant therefore cannot confirm if it comprises asbestos.
- The applicant was on-site a number of times to assess the condition of the structures, and he is a building contractor with a certificate in Asbestos and Lead Awareness, a copy of which is provided with the response. The applicant confirms there was no asbestos containing materials present in the material removed from the site. The response also provides a Certificate of Destruction from the waste management company where the materials were disposed of.
- The appeal conflates alleged construction-stage practices with the land-use planning merits of the proposed development and such matters do not provide a basis for refusal of planning permission but, if necessary, could be conditioned.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- Appeal noted. The Planning Authority is satisfied that the issues raised have been addressed on the reports on file.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Introduction

- 7.1.1. The proposed development comprises two main elements, the first is a domestic extension to an existing dwelling which is acceptable in principle due to the lack of change in land use. The scale, layout and design of the extension are all appropriate in my view and will not negatively impact the landscape or any nearby residential amenity.
- 7.1.2. The second aspect of development relates to a self-contained 2-bed unit for short term letting. Objective CDP9.5 seeks to promote, encourage and facilitate the provision of new visitor accommodation. The proposed unit is on a brownfield site close to Doonbeg beach which is a tourist attraction and while it is a self-contained unit, it's location adjacent the main dwelling provides a subservient character which retains and does not impact on fulltime residential occupation in the main dwelling. I note the Planning Authority granted planning permission for the unit and I agree with this approach.
- 7.1.3. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the report/s 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
- Landownership
 - Site Notice
 - Unauthorised Demolition
 - Asbestos
 - Wastewater Connection

7.2. Landownership

- 7.2.1. The appellant suggests that the property was sold inappropriately and there is therefore a question over the rightful owner of the site. To support this, the appellant

submitted a letter from the Financial Services and Pensions Ombudsman addressed to a third party who is not a named party in this appeal. The letter refers to a dispute process but does not identify the property subject of this appeal. In this regard, I consider the appellant has not submitted sufficient evidence to demonstrate their own legal interest in the site, while the applicant has submitted a copy of the land registry folio which names the applicant as the full registered owner.

7.2.2. An Coimisiún Pleanála has no remit for disputing such legal conflicts which are a civil matter and not a planning matter. Article 22(2)(g) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, states that where the applicant for permission is not the legal owner of the land or structure concerned, the application shall be accompanied by the written consent of the owner to make the application. The evidence submitted demonstrates that the applicant is the registered owner of the land or structure concerned and therefore consent is given to the making of the application.

7.2.3. Lastly, section 5.13 the Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (June 2007) states:

If notwithstanding the further information, some doubt still remains, the planning authority may decide to grant permission. However such a grant of permission is subject to the provisions of section 34(13) of the Act, referred to above. In other words the developer must be certain under civil law that he/she has all rights in the land to execute the grant of permission.

7.2.4. I also note the provisions of Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, provide that if the applicant lacks title or owner's consent to do works permitted by a planning permission, the permission does not give rise to an entitlement to carry out the development. Having regard therefore to the submissions made by both parties, I recommend that planning permission is granted and that a note is included to highlight section 34(13) of the Act.

7.3. **Site Notice**

7.3.1. The appellant contends the further information stage site notice was not erected as required when the further information response was deemed significant. The appellant suggests that this notice was not checked on-site by the Planning Authority

as it should have. This matter is however outside the scope of an appeal as it is a matter for the Planning Authority in its own internal procedures. I will therefore not comment on it further.

7.3.2. I note the Planning Authority validated the application and the Case Planner's report states that the initial site notice was deemed compliant with the relevant articles of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended.

7.3.3. With regard to the appellants suggestion that the lack of the latter site notice impacted his ability to prepare a submission, I note the appellant was advised by letter from the Planning Authority that the further information response was received and that observations/submissions could be made. This letter is dated 02nd October 2025. Copies of the revised site notices were subsequently submitted to the Planning Authority on 10th October 2025 and therefore the appellant had prior notice that submissions could be made, regardless of the presence of the site notice. In this context I am satisfied that sufficient public consultation was carried out to provide interested parties with adequate response periods.

7.4. Unauthorised Demolition

7.4.1. The appeal refers to the presence of sheds previously located to the rear of the dwelling which were removed prior to making the application. It suggests that this allegedly comprised unauthorised development. The applicant's response correctly highlights that enforcement matters are under the remit of the Planning Authority and are outside the scope of an appeal.

7.4.2. I note the Planning Authority sought further information regarding the demolition of the structures in the context of determining if those works were exempt or not. Following receipt of the further information response as outlined above, the Case Planner's report states:

"These new drawings and development description outlining the demolition works that has previously taken place on the site adequately show and address this issue and are deemed acceptable.

The issue raised in the further information request has been satisfactorily addressed."

7.4.3. No references are to any enforcement cases on the site. I am satisfied therefore that this aspect of the appeal is insufficient grounds to refuse permission for the proposed development.

7.5. **Asbestos**

7.5.1. I note the matters raised in relation to the disposal of asbestos. Asbestos is, however, a notifiable substance and is therefore the subject of a separate legal code. Further, the appeal raises the topic of asbestos in the context of the above alleged unauthorised development which is outside the scope of this appeal.

7.6. **Wastewater Connection**

7.6.1. The appeal puts forward a number of issues relating to wastewater collection at the site. In the first instance it suggests that the application should be invalidated as the application form was incorrectly completed. I note the detail of the appeal and the applicant's response in this regard, as well as the further information requested by the Planning Authority regarding the same matter. I therefore do not agree with the invalidation suggestion.

7.6.2. The appeal suggests that Uisce Éireann should have been consulted and I note that the application was referred to Uisce Éireann who did not respond.

7.6.3. Lastly, the appeal suggests that the applicant should be required to apply for a connection to the public network as the number of bedrooms are increasing. As a connection is already in place, a pre-connection enquiry is not required. Further, as the number of bedrooms is only increasing by 2no. in the short-term-letting unit, which would not be subject to fulltime occupation, I consider the increase in loading is immaterial and further consultation with Uisce Éireann is not required.

7.6.4. I am therefore satisfied that this aspect of the appeal is addressed and that the development can be adequately serviced by the existing water and wastewater connections. Surface water will be managed via a new soakway to the rear of the site which is acceptable in my view.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment

- 8.1.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 8.1.2. The subject site is situated 1.6km southeast of Mid-Clare Coast Special Protection Area (SPA) and Carrowmore Dunes Special Area of Conservation (SAC).
- 8.1.3. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 8.1.4. 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.
- 8.1.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The small-scale and domestic nature of the works on an existing residential site.
 - The 1.6km separation distance between the site and the closest European site and the lack of connectivity.
 - The existing connection to the public wastewater network, and
 - Taking into account screening report/determination by Clare County Council.
- 8.1.6. 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.

9.0 Water Framework Directive

- 9.1.1. The subject site is located 320m southwest of the Creegh_030 river. There is a land drain/stream situated adjacent to the rear (eastern) boundary of the site which may also discharge to the river further downstream. The river discharges to the sea at Doughmore Bay/Doonbeg bay beach 1.5km north of the site.
- 9.1.2. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

9.1.3. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. 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.

9.1.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small-scale and domestic nature of the works on an existing residential site.
- The separation distance between the site and waterbodies.
- The existing connection to the public wastewater network

9.2. Conclusion

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

10.0 Recommendation

10.1. I recommend that planning permission is granted in accordance with the conditions set out below.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the location of the existing residential site with connections to the public water and wastewater networks, the provisions of the Clare County Development Plan 2023-2029 and the nature and scale of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would be appropriate in terms of design, scale and layout and would not seriously injure the amenities of the area. The proposed

development would, therefore, 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, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 25th day of 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>Prior to commencement of development the applicant shall enter into a legal agreement with the planning authority under Section 47 of the Planning Act 2000, as amended, specifying that:</p> <p>(a) The lands encompassed by the application site as outlined in red on the plans and particulars received by the planning authority shall be held in single ownership with the entire holding; and</p> <p>(b) The proposed holiday unit shall be used for tourism purposes only and shall not be used as a permanent place of residence by any person.</p> <p>Reason: To regulate the use of the development [and to comply with the provisions of the Development Plan/Local Area Plan for the area.</p>
3.	<p>The holiday unit development hereby permitted shall be used solely for holiday accommodation and shall not be occupied by any person as a sole or main residence. The owners/operators of the development shall maintain an up-to-date register of the names and addresses of all owners/occupiers</p>

	<p>of this unit and shall make this information available to the planning authority on request.</p> <p>Reason: To regulate the use of the development.</p>
4.	<p>Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed dwellings shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure an appropriate high standard of development.</p>
5.	<p>(a) All foul sewage and soiled water shall be discharged to the public foul sewer.</p> <p>(b) Only clean, uncontaminated storm water shall be discharged to the soakpits.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</p>
6.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Friday inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the [residential] amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
7.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid</p>

<p>prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.</p>
--

Note to Applicant: Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, states: A person shall not be entitled solely by reason of a permission under this section to carry out any development.

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

Sarah O'Mahony

18th March 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-PL-500383-CE
Proposed Development Summary	Demolish domestic extensions and shed, construct new extensions including new 2-bed self contained unit for tourist accommodation, maintain existing public water and wastewater connections and all associated development.
Development Address	Mountrivers, Doonbeg, Co. Clare

	In all cases check box /or leave blank
<p>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</p> <p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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) 	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.</p>
<p>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.</p> <p>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</p>	<p>State the Class here</p>

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1	Proceed to Q3
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.	No Screening required.
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
<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)	

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: _____