



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-500388-MO-25

Development	Construction of a dry store agricultural shed and concrete apron including all associated site works.
Location	Pollranny (Lynchaghan), Achill, Co. Mayo.
Planning Authority	Mayo County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560261.
Applicant(s)	Paraic Kilbane.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions.
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal.
Appellant(s)	Mark and Maura Gallagher.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	6 th February 2026.
Inspector	C. Daly.

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site, of area 0.485 ha., consists of a long rectangular field defined by wire and post fencing and which consists of long grass and some bushes including gorse towards the front of the site and part of an open drain running diagonally across the front portion of the site. There is a ditch between the front of the site and the public road and there is a telegraph line and pole which traverses the front site boundary. The site is relatively flat.
- 1.2. There is an agricultural gate at the southern end of the site frontage which is adjacent to the site of a detached single storey dwelling house with rear garage/shed. An Cartún, a substantial hill, is located c.600m to the rear of the site. The lands around the site are relatively flat and open consisting mainly of grasslands.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development, in summary, consists of the following:
 - Mono pitch agricultural dry store with narrow elevation facing the road and concrete apron and driveway access.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Mayo County Council initially decided to request further information in relation to clarification of the use of the proposed agricultural shed and the associated agricultural land holding, demonstrate a clear need to locate it in this area and written evidence of an Uisce Éireann pre connection for water.

Subsequently, the P.A. decided to grant permission subject to 9 no. conditions.

Notable conditions include:

- Condition no. 2 requires the shed only be used for agricultural machinery storage and animal feed and general agricultural equipment and shall not be

used for the housing of livestock, human habitation, commercial or industrial purposes.

- Condition no. 3 requires the submission of details for a two metre high berm with native planting along the site's southern boundary to run adjacent to the shed and access road, the relocation of the shed to ensure a 5m separation distance to the southern boundary, additional landscaping to the north and west of the shed.
- Condition no. 4 requires no storage or stockpiling of any materials on the hard stand area.
- Condition no. 5 requires gutters and downpipes for the building and its maintenance in a satisfactory condition.
- Condition no. 6 requires all surface water gullies to ensure no polluting matter enters the surface water collection/drainage system or groundwater.
- Condition no. 8 requires the roof to be dark in colour.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The initial Planner's Report noted the site location along a designated scenic route with a designated scenic view to the rear of the site. It noted the dry store shed would be in an agricultural field in a rural area but that there are no agricultural structures or farm complex at the site. In relation to the new connection to the public water mains, it noted no correspondence from Uisce Éireann. In relation to access, it noted the widened access on to the L1404 with sightlines of 120m to be acceptable. Further information was recommended to be requested in relation to the two items referred to in Section 3.1 above.

Following F.I., the second Planner's Report noted the F.I. response whereby the shed height was reduced to 4.3m to reduce the visual impact, that the shed was noted to be primarily for the storage of agricultural plant and animal feed/bedding and to house sick or injured animals in an emergency. It noted the land registry maps and that the location is more suitable than at their dwelling to the north-east where there is not sufficient space. It considered the shed to be justified but that

conditions are required in relation to the proximity to the adjacent residence including no housing of animals, additional landscaping between the shed and the neighbouring house in the interest of visual amenity and to the north and west, and the relocation of the shed to ensure a minimum 5m separation with the southern boundary.

The F.I. advised no proposal to connect to the public mains given that a rain water harvesting system with a tank would be located to the rear of the shed which was considered satisfactory. It recommended that permission be granted subject to conditions.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Roads Design: Recommended permission be granted subject to condition in relation to the entrance being recessed and splayed and maintenance of the existing roadside drainage.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Not applicable.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One third party observation was received which can be summarised as follows:

- There is an existing permission for a dwelling house on the site.
- The shed would be close to the boundary with the existing domestic shed and residence.
- The existing shed has structural cracks associated with possible subsidence.
- There is no need for the shed on the site.
- Negative impact on the SAC and NHA's in the vicinity.
- The existing entrance is unauthorised and the location beside the entrance to the adjacent house is inappropriate in relation to traffic safety.
- Lack of provision for roadside drainage.
- Absence of detail in relation to stormwater and soakaway details.

4.0 Planning History

Subject Site

None.

Sites in the Vicinity

13169: Permission granted by the P.A. at adjacent site to the south for construction of a dwelling, garage and proprietary effluent treatment system.

2460345: Permission granted by the P.A. at second site to the south for construction of a dwelling, garage and proprietary effluent treatment system.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 (the CDP)

Chapter 4 – Economic Development

Section 4.4.9 Agriculture, Agri-Food, Agri-Tech

Policy EDP 23 To maintain a vibrant and healthy agricultural sector based on the principles of sustainable development, whilst at the same time supporting alternative employment in or close to rural areas to sustain rural communities.

Policy EDO 57 To support, promote and consider, on their individual merits, the reuse of redundant agricultural buildings and the development of new buildings to accommodate farm diversification / enterprise within an overall farmyard complex.

Chapter 10 – Natural Environment

Per Map 10.2 (Scenic Routes and Views) the site is located along a designated scenic route and with a scenic view to the rear.

Policy NEP 14 To protect, enhance and contribute to the physical, visual and scenic character of County Mayo and to preserve its unique landscape character.

Objective NEO 25

To consider applications for development, along Mayo's' Scenic routes, that can demonstrate a clear need to locate in the area concerned, whilst ensuring that it:

- *Does not impinge in any significant way on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of the area.*
- *Meets high standards in siting and design.*
- *Contributes to and enhances local landscape character.*
- *Satisfies all other criteria, with regard to, inter alia, servicing, public safety and environmental considerations. Rural housing applications along Scenic Routes must comply with the requirements set out in Objective RHO 3 (Chapter 3).*

5.2. National Policy

S.I. No. 113/2022 –European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2022 refers to standards for disposal and collection of farm waste based on the Government’s Nitrates Action Programme which seeks to protect waters from pollution arising from agriculture.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

In relation to designated sites, I note that the subject site is located:

- c.2.3km north of the Corraun Plateau SAC and PNHA (site code 000485).
- c.3.45km west of the Lough Gall Bog PNHA (site code 000522).
- c.3.5km west of the Lough Gall Bog SAC (site code 000522).
- c.5km east of Sraheens Bog NHA (site code 002403).
- c.5.8km west of Bellacragher Saltmarsh SAC and PNHA (site code 002005).
- c.6.3km west of Owenduff/Nephin Complex SPA (site code 004098).
- c.6.3km west of Owenduff/Nephin Complex SAC and PNHA (site code 000534).
- c.6.8km east of Keel Machair/Menaun Cliffs SAC and PNHA (site code 001513).
- c.7.2km south-east of Doogort East Bog NHA (site code 002381).

- c.7.5km south of Corraun Point Machair/Dooreel Creek PNHA (site code 001488).
- c.9.6km south-east of Doogort Machair SPA (site code 004235).
- c.9.6km south-east of Doogort Machair/Lough Doo SAC and PNHA (site code 001497).
- c.9.8km south of Blacksod Bay/Broad Haven SPA (site code 004037).
- c.11km east of Achill Head SAC (site code 002268).
- c.11.9km south of Tullaghan Bay and Bog NHA (site code 001567).

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of the third party appeal by Mark and Maura Gallagher can be summarised as follows:

- The development will result in overlooking and loss of privacy for their adjacent dwelling.
- The visual and landscape impact is inconsistent with the character of the area.
- The potential for noise, disturbance and increased activity in close proximity to their residence.
- Additional vehicular movements along the heavily used narrow road will create avoidable hazards, particularly for pedestrians and residents.
- Issues in relation to water drainage and wastewater treatment should be fully assessed given their environmental impacts.
- Concerns about site management given they say that concrete was poured across the area providing access to their existing residential water connection.
- The sick animal shelter was only included at F.I. stage with no change in the public notices or opportunities for the public to comment.

- A comprehensive and detailed AA screening is required given the potential for significant environmental impacts.
- There is no evidence that the applicant is engaged in farming activities such that the shed is not justified.
- Their previous concerns submitted to the P.A. on 18th November in response to the F.I. (attached) were not considered but remain valid grounds for this appeal.
- Attachments including previous submissions, aerial photographs and Site Characterisation Form.

6.2. Applicant Response

The response to the appeal on behalf of the applicant can be summarised as follows:

- The shed will be within a short distance of the applicant's house and he does not have sufficient lands at his dwelling to accommodate such a dry-store agricultural shed as demonstrated to the P.A..
- Agriculture is the predominant land use in the area and there are numerous agricultural type buildings in the immediate area.
- There are numerous developments in the area located at a higher level than the subject site.
- The existing site access is exempted development.
- The applicant is a sheep farmer and the shed will not be used for the housing of animals and the shed would be used for the housing of sick animals only.
- At F.I. stage the height was lowered and the shed was relocated away from the southern boundary.
- Per Condition no. 3, a two metre high berm could be an alien feature at this location with more appropriate landscaping welcomed.
- The Development Plan has a presumption in favour of agricultural development in such rural areas. Policies in favour include Section 4.4, Policy

EDP 23, EDO 57, Section 4.4.9, Policy NEP 14, Policy Objective NEO 25, Section 10.1 and the development complies with these.

- The appellants have failed to show how the development will materially negatively impact on their residential amenity as the shed is to be 5m from the boundary adjacent to their garage and away from their house, it is modest in size with no windows or doors facing their property and with the same floor level will not result in any overlooking.
- Normal typical agricultural use in a predominantly rural agricultural area will not result in the creation of a nuisance or disturbance.
- The shed will have minimal visual impact by virtue of the hill backdrop and the adjacent garage and house and given the several agricultural sheds nearby.
- The long established agricultural entrance adjacent to the straight road with good vertical alignment ensures adequate sightlines and the development should not be confused with a residential development.
- No arguments have been put forward to substantiate the claims in relation to environmental impacts and the building will utilise rainwater harvesting for water supply with additional storm water to be collected from the apron and channelled to a soakaway. No foul effluent or wastewater will be generated.
- The issue raised about concrete pouring across the water connection area for the adjacent dwelling is a private civil matter between the appellants and another third party and is irrelevant.
- The predominant use of the shed is to store animal feeds, fertilizers, feeding troughs/barrels, plant and equipment and this was not deemed a material change requiring revised public notices.
- The applicant would be amenable to a similar condition to condition no. 2 requiring that the shed not be used for housing livestock.
- Noting that all storm water would be treated on site, no foul or wastewater would be generated, that the shed would require minimal excavation and that the nearest European sites are 2.4km and 4.07km away with no hydrological connection or other pathway, no appropriate assessment issues arise.

- The applicant's herd number is listed and he does not have sufficient space around his dwelling to erect such a shed.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the 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 and Justification
- Residential Amenity
- Visual Amenity
- Drainage
- Access
- Other Matters

7.2. **Principle of Development and Justification**

7.2.1. The proposed development of a mono pitch agricultural dry store is for an agricultural type land use in a rural agricultural area. I note the proposed use is stated to be primarily for the storage of agricultural plant and animal feed/bedding that may be used on an infrequent basis and that the field is intended to be used for grazing a modest flock of sheep. Noting this I consider the proposed agricultural use on the agricultural site to be acceptable in principle.

7.2.2. In terms of the appellants' questioning of the justification for the agricultural shed on the site, I note the appeal response notes the applicant is a sheep farmer who has maintained field boundaries and planted native hedging along boundaries. I also note the landholding folio and map submitted and that the applicant states there is insufficient room for the shed adjacent to his house which is c.285m to the north-east. Based on this, the nature of the agricultural landholding and surrounding lands and CDP policy which generally favours agricultural development (e.g. Policies EDP

23 and EDO 57), I am satisfied that the proposed agricultural shed is justified subject to the below assessment.

7.3. Residential Amenity

- 7.3.1. The appeal has raised issues in relation to impacts on their residential amenity as their dwelling would be located adjacent to the south of the site. I note that the height of the shed would range from 3.537m closest to the common boundary up to 4.309m at the other end of the mono pitch roof. The structure, 10m deep and 5m wide, would be aligned with the garage of the adjacent dwelling. I note that it would be 2m from the common southern boundary.
- 7.3.2. I note there would be no windows or doors facing the southern boundary and its floor level would be the same as the ground level such that I am satisfied there would be no significant overlooking impacts. I note its position to the north of the adjacent residence is such that there would be no significant overshadowing impacts.
- 7.3.3. Given the scale of the shed, I consider that the P.A. condition requiring it be set back by 5m from the boundary, to be reasonable to avoid undue overbearing impacts. This and requiring a two metre high berm between the structure and the southern boundary would, in my opinion, be sufficient to mitigate any significant negative visual impacts on the residential amenity of the adjacent dwelling where regard should be had to its location in a predominantly agricultural area and not in a residential area.
- 7.3.4. Contrary to the appellants, I do not consider that such a typical agricultural use would give rise to significant noise, increased activity or disturbance over and above that which would normally be expected on agricultural lands. Subject to standard conditions to control the use for agricultural purposes and to explicitly disallow use by animals, I note no significant issues in this regard.

7.4. Visual Amenity

- 7.4.1. I note the appeal has raised concerns in relation to the visual impact particularly that the agricultural shed would be out of character in the receiving landscape. I note that the site is along a scenic route with a designated scenic view to the rear of the site. I note the scale of the agricultural shed, its agricultural form and that it would be aligned with the adjacent garage. I note the landscaping conditions recommended

by the P.A. including for a berm to its southern side and planting to the west and north which I consider would aid in setting the building appropriately into the landscape. In this regard should permission be granted, I also recommend that the external materials be required to be in dark standard agricultural building colours.

- 7.4.2. In this context, I consider that the proposed dry store building and apron would integrate with the site and surroundings, including the surrounding agricultural landscape and the substantial hillside to the rear. In my opinion it would appear consistent with other agricultural structures in the rural area and would not significantly obscure the protected view in the vicinity.
- 7.4.3. Therefore, I consider it would be consistent with Policy NEP 14 of the CDP which seeks to preserve the unique landscape character of the county and contribute to its character. I note the requirements of Policy Objective NEO 25 for development along Mayo's scenic routes which I consider would be met as noted above and below in this assessment.

7.5. **Drainage**

- 7.5.1. I note the appellants have expressed concerns in relation to drainage on the site. I note there would be a soakaway in the front area of the site. The applicant has responded that in addition to the rainwater harvesting proposed that storm water will be collected on the concrete apron and would be channelled to the soakaway. Based on this approach, I do not consider that there would be any significant environmental impacts on the site or in the vicinity. I recommend a standard SUDS condition and a requirement for rainwater goods to ensure that all on-site surface water is adequately catered for on the site.
- 7.5.2. I note the applicant is required to comply with the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2022 (as amended) where applicable for the regulation of pollution and emissions from agricultural development and I recommend this be incorporated into the drainage conditions to ensure this requirement is clear.

7.6. **Access**

- 7.6.1. I note the appeal has noted road safety issues with the entrance and additional vehicular movements along the public road. I note the adjacent public road is a

single lane width roadway that is relatively straight and that there is an existing agricultural entrance to the site. On my site visit on a weekday morning I observed low levels of vehicular traffic on the road and unrestricted visibility in both directions along the road from the site entrance. I note the site is within a 60kph speed zone where a 90m sightline is required from 3m set back for regional and local roads per Section 7.6 of Volume 2 of the CDP.

- 7.6.2. I note that 120m sightlines from 3m back would be available in both directions from the site entrance along the L1404 local road. I have no concerns in relation to significant intensification of development for such an agricultural use and I have no safety concerns in relation to the location of the entrance beside the vehicular entrance to the adjacent dwelling. I note there would be no significant impact on traffic on the adjacent road given modest scale and nature of the development. I also note that the Council's Road Design section had no objection subject to standard conditions.

7.7. Other Matters

- 7.7.1. I note that the appellant has raised concerns that the sick animal shelter was only included at F.I. stage with no change in the public notices or opportunities for the public to comment as it was not deemed to be a material change. I agree with the P.A. interpretation that such an emergency use, temporary in duration and nature, would not result in significant planning impacts requiring new public notices. Nevertheless, I noted this did not prevent this matter being raised in the appeal and as outlined in the above assessment, I recommend a condition to ensure no housing of animals in the structure to be consistent with the proposed use of the shed. I note this would avoid any materially different planning impacts like those suggested by the appellant.
- 7.7.2. In relation to the appellants' concerns in relation to the environment and wastewater, noting the proposed use which does not include provision for animals and which can be conditioned to require this, I note that there would be no foul effluent or wastewater discharges. I am therefore satisfied in relation to this issue.
- 7.7.3. I note the issue raised in relation to concreting over of an area providing access to the residential water connection. I note that this is a civil matter outside the scope of

the application. I consider it to be matter to be resolved between the relevant parties having regard to the provisions of Section 34(13) of the 2000 Act.

7.7.4. I note no development contributions are due for agricultural developments below 750sqm and the proposed floor area is 45sqm in this case.

8.0 EIA Screening

8.1. 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.

9.0 AA Screening

9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located c.2.3km north-west of Corraun Plateau SAC (site code 000485) and c.3.5km north-east of Lough Gall Bog SAC (site code 000522), the nearest European sites.

9.2. The proposed development comprises construction of an agricultural dry store and concrete apron. 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.

9.3. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The relatively small-scale nature of the development and absence of wastewater generation.
- The distance from the nearest European site and lack of ecological connections thereto.
- Taking into account the screening determination by the P.A..

9.4. 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.

9.5. 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

10.1. The subject site is located c.68 m north of the Bunanioo_010 river waterbody (status “good”)(IE_WE_33B090100), is c.334m south-west of the Cartron_010 river waterbody (status “poor”) (IE_WE_33C020100) and is above the Belmullet (IE_WE_G_0057) ground waterbody (status “good”). The proposed development comprises an agricultural dry store and concrete apron.

10.2. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seeks to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and 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.

10.3. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The relatively small-scale nature of the development, the absence of wastewater generation and the incorporation of SUDS measures.
- The distance from the nearest surface water bodies.

10.4. I conclude on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would 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 jeopardize any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that permission be granted for the proposed development.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Mayo County Development Plan, to the position, design and scale of the dry store structure, it would not result in excessive visual impacts in the receiving landscape or on the adjacent site where no undue loss of privacy or significant disturbance would occur, with no significant traffic safety issues or environmental impacts noted, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the development would be acceptable. The proposed development would therefore not unduly negatively impact on the residential or visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity and would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience. The proposed development 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 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 24th day of October 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.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. (a) The dry store building shall be used only for the purpose of storing agricultural machinery, animal feed and general agricultural equipment and shall not at any time be used for industrial or commercial purposes or for the housing of livestock and shall not be converted or used for human habitation.
(b) No storage or stockpiling of materials shall be conducted on the hard stand areas associated with the building.

Reason: In the interest of residential, visual and environmental amenities.

3. The proposed development shall be amended as follows:
- (a) The dry store building shall be relocated to ensure a minimum 5 metre separation distance from the site southern boundary and a line of native planting shall be planted to the north and west of the building to align with its side and front facades.
 - (b) A two metre high berm with native planting shall be located along the southern boundary of the site in the area adjacent to the dry store building and which shall extend for three metres to the rear and to the front of the dry store building.
 - (c) The dry store building shall not commence into use until the berm and associated planting have been provided on the site.
 - (d) The colour of the external materials of the building shall be either dark red, dark green, dark brown, dark grey or black.

Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

4. (a) Water supply and drainage arrangements for the site, including for the disposal of surface and soiled water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. In this regard-
- (i) uncontaminated surface water run-off shall be disposed of directly in a sealed system to ground in appropriately sized soakaways.
 - (ii) all soiled waters shall be directed to an appropriately sized soiled water storage tank (in accordance with the requirements of the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for the Protection of Waters (Amendment) Regulations 2022, as amended, or to a slatted tank.
- (b) The building shall be provided with gutters and down-pipes and these shall be maintained in a working condition. Clean surface water run-off from roof areas shall not be discharged onto soiled yard areas. Roof rainwater and clean yard water shall be discharged separated in closed pipes to a suitable soakpit system.

(c) All surface water generated within the site boundaries shall be collected and disposed of within the curtilage of the site. No surface water from roofs, paved areas or otherwise shall discharge onto the public road or adjoining properties.

(d) The access driveway to the proposed development shall be provided with adequately sized pipes or ducts to ensure that no interference will be caused to existing roadside drainage.

The above drainage details shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority, prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of environmental protection and public health.

5. All construction waste associated with the development shall be disposed of in accordance with national waste regulations.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to avoid pollution.

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.

Ciarán Daly
Planning Inspector

6th March 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1
EIA Pre-Screening

An Coimisiún Pleanála Case Reference	PL-500388-MO-25		
Proposed Development Summary	Mono pitch agricultural dry store with narrow elevation facing the road and concrete apron and driveway access.		
Development Address	Pollranny (Lynchaghan), Achill, Co. Mayo.		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	X
		No	
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	X		Proceed to Q.3
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)
			Conclusion
No	X		No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes			Proceed to Q.4

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?

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

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____