



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500517-DF-25

Development	Construction of a first-floor flat-roof extension to the side with a new front facing window at first-floor level, partial conversion of existing garage to form a new utility room, and construction of a single-storey flat-roof extension to the rear.
Location	13 Seabury Park, Malahide, Co. Dublin K36 K138.
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	F25A/0932E
Applicant(s)	Tony Vellere
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission with conditions
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Tony Vellere
Observer(s)	None.

Date of Site Inspection

11/02/2026.

Inspector

Deirdre Scully.

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0 Planning History	7
5.0 Policy Context	8
6.0 EIA Screening	12
7.0 The Appeal	12
8.0 Assessment	14
9.0 AA Screening	18
10.0 Water Framework Directive	18
11.0 Recommendation	19
12.0 Reasons and Considerations	20

Appendix 1 –EIA Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located at no.13 Seabury Park, Malahide, Co. Dublin K36 K138 and the site has a stated area of 0.26 hectares. The site accommodates a two-storey semi-detached dwelling, located within the larger Seabury housing estate, positioned at the top of a T junction with Seabury Lawns.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development, as described within the public notices, comprises of the construction of a first-floor flat-roof extension to the side with a new front facing window at first-floor level, partial conversion of existing garage to form a new utility room, and construction of a single-storey flat-roof extension to the rear.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Fingal County Council issued a notification of decision to grant permission with nine conditions for the proposed development on the 24th of November 2025.

Condition 3 states

“Prior to the commencement of development the applicant shall submit for the written agreement of the Planning Authority a hipped roof design to tie into the existing roof, as opposed to a flat roof extension.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.”

Condition 9 requires that the applicant pay development contribution of €3,227.20 (as updated) towards public infrastructure and utilities.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

One planning report is filed for this application, dated as typed on the 21st of November 2025 and is contained within the Chief Executives Order of the 24th of November 2025.

The following provides a summary of key points made in the Planners Report:

- The report considered the design of the extension under four points (i) the principle of the development; (ii) residential amenity of the area; (iii) the visual amenity of the area (iv) water services (v) screening for Appropriate Assessment and (vi) screening for Environmental Impact Assessment.
- Principle of Development: The proposed development is located within an area zoned "RS- Provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity" in the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 and the works would be considered consistent with the zoning objective and would not have an undesirable effect.
- Objectives and policies referred to relevant to the consideration of the application are listed (Policy SPQHP41, Objective SPQHO45 and SPQHO43, See paragraph 5.5.1 of this report for text) and general text regarding residential extension development in Section 3.5.13.1 regarding residential extensions and the relevant parts of the Development Management Chapter regarding extensions in Section 14.10.2 of the Fingal Development Plan.
- Residential Amenity: With regard to residential amenity the planner is clear that the impact of the extension, which is modest in scale and well set back from property boundaries, will not have a negative impact on adjoining properties; particularly as the rear garden size at approx. 60 sq. m. is above the minimum requirements for a 5 bedroom house in the 2024 Sustainable Development and Compact Settlements which gives a 50 sq. m. minimum.
- Visual Amenity: The report recognises that a variety of extension styles have been constructed over the years within the Seabury area. The report states that the proposed flat roof would not be consistent with previous decisions within the vicinity and that a hipped roof extension would be appropriate for this site, citing a recent permission F21B/0132 which granted a side extension with a hipped roof tying into the main house, at 34 Seabury Park.

- As regards the Water Services report, which seeks additional information regarding surface water drainage, the Planner concludes that the issue raised can adequately be addressed through a planning condition.
- In the assessment of the visual and residential amenities the Planners Report concludes that the works are modest in scale, do not raise concerns regarding overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing effects and the development is generally acceptable, and aligns with policies SPQO45 and Section 14.10.2 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029.
- The planners report outlined the following in respect of Appropriate Assessment: The proposed site is located at 13 Seabury Park, Malahide, Co. Dublin. The subject site is located c.530m to the southwest of the Malahide Estuary 000205 Special Area of Conservation and the Special Protection Area for Malahide Estuary 004025. The proposed development site is not connected with any European (Natura 2000) sites and there is no realistic pathway between the proposed development, in comparison with the existing baseline, it is considered that there is no likelihood of significant effects on any European sites during construction or operation of the proposed project, and it's further considered that there are no other plans or projects that will act in combination with the proposed development to have a significant effect on any European site. It is considered that the Proposed Project, individually or in combination with another plan or project, will not have a significant effect on any European sites.
- With regard to Environmental Impact Assessment Screening, the Planners Report states that: The development seeking permission would not by virtue of size and scale represent a development for the purpose of Part 10 under Section 5 or fulfil criteria under Schedule 7 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) requiring an EIAR.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

One technical report is included in the file from Water Services, dated 12/11/2025. Additional information was sought in relation to Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems with regard to the management of surface water.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None.

4.0 Planning History

No recent planning history is identified for the subject site.

The planners report lists a large number of planning permissions for extensions within the Seabury estate area; dating from 1997 to 2022.

Planning History Referred to in Assessment and by Appellant:

F21B/0132: no. 34 Seabury Park, Permission GRANTED for a two storey with hipped roof extension to the side of the existing dwelling and ancillary works.

F98B/0146: no. 15 Seabury Park, permission GRANTED for first floor storey extension to the side of house.

F10B/0169: no. 2 Seabury Heights, permission GRANTED for new two storey flat roof extension to side and single storey to rear and ancillary works, without altering conditions. Decision was appealed to ABP by a 3rd party. The decision of ABP to GRANT permission, with no conditions for alterations to the design.

F08B/0424: no. 29 Seabury Park, Permission GRANTED for first floor extension and rear single storey extension

F08B/0134: no.16 Seabury Park, Permission GRANTED for two storey extension to side with hip roof and single storey to rear.

F00B/0474: 4 Seabury Park, Permission GRANTED for conversion of garage and first floor extension with hipped roof over.

F98B/0827: 22 Seabury Park, Permission GRANTED for first floor extension with hipped roof over existing garage and single storey extension.

F22A/0548: 70 Seabury Park, Permission GRANTED for demolition of extension and alterations to existing house, construction of new dwelling in side garden in a modern style with flat roof.

Other planning history decisions within Seabury Listed in Planners Report:

F06B/0579: 16 Seabury Park, permission GRANTED for two storey extension to side and garage conversion

F04B/0671: 37 Seabury Park, permission GRANTED for two storey extension to side and single storey to front and rear.

F02B/0006: 50 Seabury Park, permission GRANTED for dormer window to side and alterations to previous grant of permission.

F01B/0460: 50 Seabury Park, permission GRANTED for 1st floor extension to side with two dormer windows.

F01B/0386: 60 Seabury Park, permission GRANTED for 1st floor extension to side and single storey extension to rear.

F98B/0827: 22 Seabury Park, permission GRANTED for 1st floor extension to side and single storey extension to rear.

F98B/0222: 62 Seabury Park, permission GRANTED for 1st floor extension to side and dormer windows.

F98B/0204: 31 Seabury Park, permission GRANTED for 1st floor extension to side.

F98B/0146: 15 Seabury Park, permission GRANTED for 1st floor extension.

F97B/0169: 25 Seabury Park, permission GRANTED for two storey side extension.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029

Zoning

- 5.1.1 The site is zoned for Objective RS – Residential purposes within the Fingal Development Plan with the objective to “provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity”. The vision for this zoning objective seeks to “ensure that any new development in existing areas would have a minimal impact on and enhance existing residential amenity”. Residential development is listed as a use that is “permitted in principle” under this zoning objective.
- 5.1.2 The site is located in the Landscape Character area defined as Estuary type, with a sensitivity of “high” (Section 9.6.14).
- 5.1.3 The area falls with Noise Zone D for Dublin Airport as set out Table 14.16 (“*All noise sensitive development within this zone is likely to be acceptable from a noise perspective*”) of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029
- 5.1.4 Section 3.5.13.1 of the Plan relates to Residential Extensions and outlines that: “*The need for people to extend and renovate their dwellings is recognised and acknowledged. Extensions will be considered favourably where they do not have a negative impact on adjoining properties or on the nature of the surrounding area*”.

Policies and Objectives

- 5.1.5 The following provisions of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 are of relevance:

Policy SPQHP41 – Residential Extensions: *Support the extension of existing dwellings with extensions of appropriate scale and subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities.*

Objective SPQHO45 – Domestic Extensions: *Encourage sensitively designed extensions to existing dwellings which do not negatively impact on the environment or on adjoining properties or area.*

Objective SPQHO43: Contemporary and Innovative Design Solutions:
Promote the use of contemporary and innovative design solutions subject to design respecting the character and architectural heritage of the area.

Development Management Standards

5.1.6 Development Management Standards are set out within Chapter 14 of the Development Plan. Section 14.10.2 of the Development Plan relates to residential extensions and outlines that: The following text is of relevance to the proposal:

“The need for housing to be adaptable to changing family circumstances is recognised and acknowledged and the Council will support applications to amend existing dwelling units to reconfigure and extend as the needs of the household change, subject to specific safeguards. In particular, the design and layout of residential extensions must have regard to and protect the amenities of adjoining properties, particularly in relation to sunlight, daylight and privacy. The design of extensions must also have regard to the character and form of the existing building, its architectural expression, remaining usable rear private open space, external finishes and pattern of fenestration. Additionally, careful consideration should be paid to boundary treatments, tree planting and landscaping. The following section provides guidance in relation to, front extensions, side extensions, rear extensions, first floor rear extensions, roof alterations including attic conversions and dormer extensions.

14.10.2.2 Side Extensions: Side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation) and impacts on residential amenity. First floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable. In certain cases, a set-back of the extension’s front facade and its roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape and avoid a ‘terracing’ effect. External finishes shall generally match the existing.

14.10.2.4 First Floor Extensions: First floor rear extensions will be considered on their merits, noting that they can have potential for negative impacts on the amenities of adjacent properties, and will only be permitted where the Planning Authority is satisfied that there will be no significant negative impacts on surrounding residential or visual amenities. In determining applications for first floor extensions the following factors will be considered:

- Overshadowing, overbearing, and overlooking – along with proximity, height, and length along mutual boundaries.*
- Remaining rear private open space, its orientation and usability.*
- Degree of set-back from mutual side boundaries.*
- External finishes and design, which shall generally be in harmony with existing.”*

Also relevant with regard to design is the following guidance for infill housing in existing areas:

14.10.1. The development of infill housing on underutilised infill and corner sites in established residential areas will be encouraged where proposals for development are cognisant of the prevailing pattern of development character of the area and where all development standards are observed.. Contemporary design is encouraged and all new dwellings shall comply with Development Plan standards..”

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The site is not located in or adjacent to any site designated for Natural heritage. The nearest designated sites to the appeal site are approximately 0.51km to north- the

Malahide Estuary SAC (000205), Malahide Estuary SPA (004025), and the Malahide Estuary proposed NHA (000205).

6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. 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 in respect of Condition no.3 of the permission has been submitted by the owner of the subject property. The following provides a summary of the grounds of appeal

- The Commission is requested to remove Condition no. 3 from the Grant of Permission as in the view of the appellant the condition is unnecessary; unsupported by technical, visual and residential amenity grounds; not compliant with existing precedent in the area and is unreasonable.

Unnecessary and Not Supported by Objectives of the Development Plan

- The appellant points out that the extension is modest in scale and the residential amenity of the house and adjoining properties is not negatively impacted
- The decision to require a hipped roof is not justified as no amenity harm from the flat roof design is identified.

- There is no specific requirement in the Development Plan to require matching roof profiles.
- The Development Plan supports contemporary design approaches.

Precedent in the Area

- The planners report recognises that there are a variety of designs of extensions and new infill housing within the estate.
- The appellant sites two examples of granted and constructed extensions proximate to the site on the same road (F98B/0146 and F03B/0450) that are wholly or majority built with a flat roof at first floor level; and to F10B/0169 granted by ABP for a flat roof that projects beyond the eaves. A list of other permitted examples in the estate is given to demonstrate the mix of approaches taken for side extensions.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority states in their response to the appeal “..The Planning Authority considers the grant of permission of the development seeking permission appropriate as it complies with Objective SPQHO45 and Section 14.10.2 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 subject to the conditions attached, specifically condition 3 which states ‘Prior to commencement of development the applicant shall submit for the written agreement of the Planning Authority a hipped roof design to tie in with the existing roof, as opposed to a flat roof extension’. The development seeking permission is considered to be acceptable subject to conditions. The development seeking permission is consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area and complies with Objective SPQHO45 and Section 14.10.2 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 subject to conditions.”

No elaboration is made in the submission to defend the decision to include the condition beyond referencing the general objectives and DM standards relevant for assessing side house extensions.

7.3. Observations

None.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file in relation to the appeal, the report of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the policies and objectives of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Visual Amenity & Design
- Precedent

As per Section 139 of the PDA, this report will restrict its determination to the condition appealed only and I have limited my consideration of the planning application to the matters raised in relation to the terms of the condition. With regard to the other elements of the permission- the garage conversion and single storey extension and ancillary works, no concerns are evident and the report will not examine these elements of the permission.

This restriction reflects that I consider the development form and use proposed is supported by and in compliance with the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029; taking into account the zoning of the lands as 'RS'; the opinion in the planners report, and the decision to grant permission by the Local Authority.

8.2 Precedent

All applications should be considered on their merits and within the policy context of the statutory plans that are in place. Whilst certain works or extensions may be suitable for a house of the same design in one location; in another location and setting they can be inappropriate. It is therefore important to consider the impact of the extension on its own merits and the impact it will have within the relevant environment context. However precedent and seeking to maintain a particular style

of extension has been raised in the planners report and the appellants submission and this is therefore examined in this report with regard to the points made by both.

An extensive list of granted permissions is referred to in both the planners report and the appeal statement regarding house extensions in the Seabury Estate. (See paragraph 4.0 for the full list and details.) Having examined the list contained in the general planning history in the planners report, it is clear for those that do refer to side extensions; in all cases where a hipped roof was granted permission; this was a grant of what the applicant sought- not a change of design by condition. The Seabury estate, as with any estate over 40 years old, has a wide mix of extensions and alterations to the front elevations of the housing (porches, canopies etc), as well as a mix of infill housing designs in side gardens. Whilst many opted to put in hipped roof applications as their preference (it does provide greater space for attic rooms), it is not established in the planning history that this is the only approach accepted or constructed in the estate. There are several other styles adopted for first floor side extensions including hip roof with dormer at eaves (e.g. F02B/006), flat roof (F10B/0169) and partial flat roof with an edging of tiling and hip roof (F98B/0146).

It is clear that Seabury estate does not have a rigidly established precedent in planning decisions regarding the more appropriate form of side extension. Nor is it justified to seek to establish a new "precedent" or standard for the estate based on a recent pattern of house extensions led by the preference of individual owners.

8.3 Visual Amenity and Design:

The planners report states with regard to "*integration and impact on visual and residential amenity*" that "*the subject property is situated within a well-established residential neighbourhood where numerous nearby dwellings have been extended in a variety of styles. The proposed flat roof extension would not be consistent with previous decisions within the vicinity most notably F21B/0132 in which the extension tied into the existing roof by way of a hipped roof extension. I consider a roof extension of a similar design to be appropriate in this instance and as such a condition can ensure that the applicant submits a revised hipped roof design*"

In considering the reason for the decision to impose the condition the planners report solely relies on a preference for a particular hipped roof style at first floor level from a

visual amenity perspective. However, alongside this, the report also recognises that the area already has a mix of house extension types at first floor level.

The report, whilst not explicit, appears to link the impact on visual amenity to Objective SPQHO45 and Section 14.10.2.2 of the Development Plan.

However, the objectives of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 do not support a requirement that established housing estates can only be extended in one particular matching style; nor can a decision seek to “establish” a precedent as to a singular design approach for a particular location.

The question arising from assessing the application, is whether a flat roof extension in a long established housing estate, with a variety of design styles already established, considered not to be “sensitively designed”?

In considering this question one must also consider other objectives within the Development Plan. The Plan also contains a number of statements and Objectives supporting contemporary design, including within existing housing areas.

*Objective SPQHO43: Contemporary and Innovative Design Solutions:
Promote the use of contemporary and innovative design solutions subject to design respecting the character and architectural heritage of the area.*

Also of consideration with regard to design is the following guidance for infill housing in existing areas:

For infill housing the Development Management chapter states “the development of infill housing on underutilised infill and corner sites in established residential areas will be encouraged where proposals for development are cognisant of the prevailing pattern of development character of the area and where all development standards are observed.. Contemporary design is encouraged and all new dwellings shall comply with Development Plan standards..”

The Development Management Standards includes guidance on extensions in general and specifically side extensions:

14.10.2 The design of extensions must also have regard to the character and form of the existing building, its architectural expression, remaining usable rear private open space, external finishes and pattern of fenestration.

14.10.2.2 Side Extensions: Side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation) and impacts on residential amenity. First floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable. In certain cases, a set-back of the extension's front facade and its roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape and avoid a 'terracing' effect. External finishes shall generally match the existing.

Whilst this statement makes clear that extensions generally match the house will generally be acceptable, the comment regarding roof design are only seeking to avoid a terrace effect. As the extension as proposed would be flat roofed, it complies with this intent by not providing an extended roof profile over the entire front elevation of the property. The condition included in the grant would increase the bulk and scale of the roof; but is considered generally acceptable.

From a consideration the wording of the relevant policy and objectives identified in the planners report and the reason given for the condition "*in the interests of visual amenity*" the report has not demonstrated that the phrasing of such policy and objectives or the Development Standards in Chapter 14 can be interpreted to only permit absolute matching style extensions as the only acceptable design response, and that any other approach creates a negative precedent. Therefore I consider that the policy and objectives of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 do not support taking a mandatory requirement with a particular design.

The design of the flat roof extension is a simple design approach that is not inappropriate in housing estates such as Seabury, where over the decades many design approaches to house improvements have been taken. The visual impact of the extension is low and the plain finish is in keeping with the existing house. The size, height and scale of the extension is sensitive to adjoining properties and will not create any significant negative impact. The flat roof reduces the visual scale of the extension and clearly subservient to the house. I consider that the extension as applied for is appropriate in scale, visually acceptable and well designed to be in keeping with the house and there is no need to condition a hipped roof for visual amenity reasons.

9.0 AA Screening

I have considered the proposed first storey extension to the side, conversion of garage and single storey extension to the rear of the dwelling in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located within a well serviced suburb of the town of Malahide and circa 0.51km from the nearest European Sites to the north- the Malahide Estuary SAC (000205), Malahide Estuary SPA (004025).

The proposed development comprises of first storey extension over the existing garage and side of the existing dwelling (See Section 2.0). 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 there is no conceivable risk to any European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows

- The limited scale and nature of the works
- The location of the site within an established, serviced residential area
- Lack of connection to nearest European sites.

I conclude that 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 (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

The subject site is located in Seabury housing estate, a built-up suburb of Malahide town and is approx. 0.51km to the south of the Malahide Estuary. The proposed development comprises new single-storey extension to the rear, conversion of existing garage to side and 1st floor side extension to the existing dwelling; (see Section 2 above for description.) No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal or the planners report.

I have assessed the works proposed to the dwelling 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.

The reason for this conclusion are (i) the nature of the works proposed, which are modest in scale and also (ii) the lack of hydrological connection and distance from the nearest Water bodies.

Conclusion

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.

11.0 Recommendation

Having regard to the nature of the condition the subject of the appeal, I am satisfied that the determination by the Commission of this application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted and, based on the reasons and considerations set out below, directs the said Council under subsection (1) of section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 to

REMOVE condition number 3 which states:

“Prior to the commencement of development the applicant shall submit for the written agreement of the Planning Authority a hipped roof design to tie into the existing roof, as opposed to a flat roof extension.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.”

12.0 REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

Having regard to the residential land use zoning for the site, and to the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that the conditioned requirement for a hipped roof to the side extension, by reason of its limited scale, nature and design, and its location with respect to adjoining properties, would not detract from the character of the dwelling and would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity by reason of overlooking or loss of privacy. The planning authority's Condition 3 requiring the replacement of the flat roof with a hipped roof is, therefore, not warranted.

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.


Deirdre Scully
Planning Inspector

23rd of February 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a first-floor flat-roof extension to the side with a new front facing window at first-floor level, partial conversion of existing garage to form a new utility room, and construction of a single-storey flat-roof extension to the rear.
Development Address	13 Seabury Park, Malahide, Co. Dublin
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. <input type="checkbox"/> No
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)?	
<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.	No, not a class for Part 1
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1.	
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.	No, not a class for Part 2
<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"/>	

No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No, Schedule 7A information not provided.

Inspector: Derek J. Gully

Date: 03/02/26