



Development	Permission for 1. Retention for revised front entrance including removal of wall and grassed area and 2. Extension of rear of house. 3. Storage shed to the rear of utility room.
Location	8 Gort Gréine, Ragoon, Galway
Planning Authority	Galway City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560326
Applicant(s)	Irene Elwood
Type of Application	Retention
Planning Authority Decision	Split Decision
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Irene Elwood
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	10 th March 2026
Inspector	Patricia Byrne

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The property, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling house is located at the end of a short cul-de-sac to the north of the Gort Gréine housing estate. A public road lies west of the appeal site, together with an area of incidental open space bordering the road.
- 1.2. A perimeter boundary wall to the north-west of the property appears to have been recently reconstructed. Single-storey rear extensions serve the dwelling, while a small, detached garage (without a vehicular entrance) lies adjacent the gable end of the house.
- 1.3. The rear back garden as well as the front forecourt/garden are paved extensively in tarmacadam.
- 1.4. The vehicular entrance from the cul-de-sac comprises an L-shaped opening, devoid of gate pillars or boundary walls. Informal ramping has occurred at the northwestern end to assist vehicular access to the driveway. The cul-de-sac does not contain a turning head.
- 1.5. A public footpath, dished at the original entrance, separates the site from the cul-de-sac on its northern side. This feature narrows at the end of the road, before becoming functionally redundant on the opposite side due to its reduced width.
- 1.6. The area of the site is stated as 0.034Ha. The gross floor area of existing buildings is given as 141.50sq.m.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought to retain works which have been carried out to the property:

These include retention of:

- Revised front entrance, including removal of wall and grassed areas.
- Single storey rear extension to the existing kitchen and
- Storage shed to the rear of the utility room.
- Associated site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By Order dated 15th December 2025, Galway City Council issued a Split Decision GRANTING permission to retain the extension and storage shed subject to conditions and REFUSING permission to retain the revised front entrance, removal of wall and grassed area and associated site works.

3.1.1. Reason

3.1.2. As set out in Schedule No. 2 to the decision, permission was refused for the following reason:

The retention of the paved front, side and rear gardens with impermeable materials is contrary to the Galway City Development Plan 2023 - 2029, Section 11.28 Flood Risk Management & Assessment; which requires that “All proposed development must consider the impact of surface water flood risk in drainage design. Consideration should be given in the design of new development to the incorporation of SuDS. The drainage design should ensure no increase flood risk to the site or downstream catchment”, in this case the coverage of the entire rear and front gardens in an impermeable material with no potential for surface water to drain through to the soil would add to and generate a flood risk and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.1.3. As set out in Schedule 4 to the decision, permission was granted subject to the following conditions:

1. *The development shall be retained in accordance with the application made on the 21/10/2025, but subject, however to the requirements of the further conditions hereinafter incorporated.*
2. *The shed shall not be used for commercial purposes or for human habitation or for any other purpose other than a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse as such.*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

- 3.2.1.1. The planning report refers to previous planning applications on site, including Reg. Ref. 25/60090 in which permission was refused for a substantially similar development to that now proposed.
- 3.2.1.2. The report highlighted that improved vehicular turning solutions would be reasonable in addressing constraints experienced by occupants in accessing the property and that the elements to be retained, such as the removal of the front walls and an expanded hard standing area allowing vehicles to park and turn would also be considered reasonable. It was found however, that in removing the grassed areas and paving the entirety of the site in an impermeable material with no potential for surface water to drain would be contrary to Section 11.28 Flood Risk Management & Assessment of the Galway City Development Plan and would add to/generate flood risk.
- 3.2.1.3. The planning report determined that the single storey extension and storage shed were acceptable, and while noting that the latter abutted the boundary of the adjacent dwelling to the southeast; by reason of its limited height and orientation, was considered to be acceptable. Sufficient private open space to serve the dwelling was found to remain.
- 3.2.1.4. A recommendation was made for a split decision, reflective of the decision made by the planning authority.
- 3.2.1.5. EIA Screening was conducted and the requirement for EIA excluded at preliminary examination stage. Also, the development was found not to give rise to significant effects on European sites.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

3.2.2.1. Transportation/Drainage

Report found no objection in relation to surface water drainage, subject to a condition. This included that the surface water drainage design must incorporate SuDS measures in conjunction with new construction works. Such measures could include permeable paving, rainwater harvesting/water butts, rain gardens, swales, with a particular focus on additional rainwater discharge from new roofs. The report also stipulates that the applicant is obliged

to ensure that no surface water, soil, or other material discharge onto the public road or footpath.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None on file.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None on file.

4.0 Planning History

Reg Ref. 25/60090

Permission for Retention REFUSED by Galway City Council on the 8th May 2025 for works including revised front entrance including removal of wall and grassed area, associated site works, rear extension and storage shed to the rear of utility room at, 8 Gort Gréine, Ragoon, Galway. The reasons for refusal stated:

- 1. The retention of the paved front, side and rear gardens with impermeable materials is contrary to the Galway City Development Plan 2023 - 2029, Section 11.28 Flood Risk Management & Assessment; which requires that "All proposed development must consider the impact of surface water flood risk in drainage design. Consideration should be given in the design of new development to the incorporation of SuDS. The drainage design should ensure no increase flood risk to the site or downstream catchment", in this case the coverage of the entire rear and front gardens in an impermeable material with no potential for surface water to drain through to the soil would add to and generate a flood risk and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*
- 2. Any consideration of the retention of this development, which includes the removal of the rear boundary wall, would if permitted, facilitate the unauthorised removal of the rear boundary wall which facilitates the unauthorised extension of this site onto lands*

not under the applicant's ownership, and would therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Reg. Ref. 21/248

Permission GRANTED for a development comprising the construction of a one and a half storey extension/granny flat to the side elevation of the dwelling house.

Reg. Ref. 08/88

Permission GRANTED for a two-storey extension to side of dwelling to include demolition of garden shed.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029

The Galway City Development Plan, effective from the 4th January 2023 is the operative Development Plan for the area. The following provisions are of relevance to this appeal.

Volume 1 Written Statement

- **Chapter 9 Environment and Infrastructure.**
- **Policy 9.4 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS).**
- **Chapter 11 Land Use Zoning Objectives and Development Standards and Guidelines.**
- **Section 11.28 Flood Risk Management and Assessment** states inter alia *'all proposed development must consider the impact of surface water flood risk in drainage design. Consideration should be given in the design of new development to the incorporation of SuDS. The drainage design should ensure no increase flood risk to the site or downstream catchment'*.
- **Section 11.3- Car Parking - General**

- **Section 11.3.1(g) Car parking Standards (Outer Suburbs)**
- **Land Use Zoning**

The site is zoned R2 Residential *‘to provide residential development and for associated support development, which will ensure the protection of existing residential amenity and will contribute to sustainable residential neighbourhoods’*

Lands to the rear (north) are zoned Recreation and Amenity RA *‘to provide for recreational and amenity use.’*

6.0 Natural Heritage Designations

The site is not within or immediately adjacent Natura 2000 sites. The following European sites are noted:

Special Protection Areas (SPA)

Inner Galway Bay SPA (Site Code 004031) c.2.0km

Lough Corrib SPA (Site Code 004042) c.3.0km

Special Conservation Areas (SAC)

Galway Bay Complex SAC (Site Code 00268) c.2.0km

Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code 000297) c.2.2km

Proposed Natural Heritage Areas (pNHA)

Lough Corrib pNHA (Site Code 000297) c.3.0km

Galway Bay Complex pNHA (Site Code 000268) c.2.0km

Natural Heritage Areas (NHA)

Moycullen Bogs NHA (Site Code 002364) c.1.5km

7.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as

amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

8.0 The Appeal

8.1. Grounds of Appeal

The decision of the Planning Authority to issue a split decision made on the 15th December 2025, is the subject of a First Party appeal by Ms. Irene Elwood. The matters raised may be summarised as follows:

- The split decision granted to retain a rear extension and storage shed. The applicant understood these elements to be exempted development (less than 40sq.m.) but was unaware of a condition of the parent permission which prohibited such development (Condition No. 6).
- The second element of the decision concerned the refusal of retention for the revised front entrance, removal of a boundary wall and grassed area and is the subject of this appeal.
- Reg. Ref. 261/96 relates to the overall estate and an extract of the approved site layout is appended. This included a short, narrow, spur road without turning area to serve units 5,6,7 and 8 Gort Gréine, with the driveway of each house facilitating one car space.
- Works to neighbouring properties at no. 6 and 7 have removed grass areas to facilitate additional onsite parking, enabling reverse parking and reducing congestion on the spur road. This option was not available to the appellant as the road terminated at her property, requiring vehicles to reverse out and down the spur road to the main estate road.
- Permission was granted under Reg. Ref. 21/248 for a granny flat which was not enacted, with a rear extension built instead due to construction costs. Works at this time were carried out to alter the entrance, removing a wall and grass area to provide additional vehicular manoeuvrability on site and to improve traffic safety.

- The works eliminate the requirement for hazardous traffic movements due to the substandard original design.
- The issue has caused inconvenience to the appellant, with the matter exacerbated by increased levels of on-street parking adjacent the house. [photograph appended]
- The rear garden contains a drainage channel to the boundary discharging to ground. The front and side gardens have been treated with tarmacadam to provide access to the garage and facilitate vehicular turning. The surface in front of the house falls directly to the road while the remaining resurfaced area falls towards the boundary wall. 4 no. gullies collect rainwater and discharge to ground.
- An amended site layout plan indicates proposals to remove tarmacadam and to topsoil and reseed areas to the front and rear of the detached garage. The appellant is amenable to a condition of planning regarding the implementation of topsoiling/reseeding.
- Sufficient safeguards are in place (4 no. gullies to the front and side and a continuous drainage channel to the rear) to prevent the possibility of flooding, further assisted by the works proposed.
- The Commission is requested to issue a positive decision.

8.2. Planning Authority Response

None on file.

8.3. Observations

None on file

9.0 Assessment

- 9.1.** This is a First Party appeal against the decision of Galway City Council to refuse retention permission as part of a split decision under Reg. Ref. 25/60326. I am satisfied, having

examined the details of the application, and all other documentation on the file, and having visited the site, that the main issues for consideration relate to the following:

- Principle of Development
- Decision under Reg. Ref. 2560326
- Surface Water Disposal
- Amended Site Boundaries

9.2. Principle of Development

- 9.2.1. The decision of the planning authority permitted the retention of a single storey extension and single storey storage shed, both to the rear of the dwelling.
- 9.2.2. The single storey kitchen extension has a stated floor area of 11.8sq.m. is finished with a lean-to roof and has an overall height of 3.6m. The extension is flush with the existing utility/w.c. block and fitted with double doors and a window. The design is in keeping with the existing dwelling house.
- 9.2.3. A shed and store have been constructed to the southeastern boundary of the site, abutting the party wall with the neighbouring property. The combined floor area extends to 6.0sq.m. The structure is served by a mono-pitched roof of height 2.84m, sloping down towards the appeal site. Given the height of the shed/store and having regard to its limited extent and orientation, it is not considered that the structures give rise to loss of amenity to the adjoining property to the southeast.
- 9.2.4. I am satisfied having regard to the design and overall extent of the single storey extension and single storey shed and store that such works are acceptable, and I agree with the planning authority in its decision to grant permission for their retention on site.
- 9.2.5. The remaining elements of the proposal relate to the retention of works to the front boundary/entrance, including the removal of front boundary walls and grassed areas, together with associated works. While not expanded upon in the public notices, the removal

of the grassed areas has enabled the hard surfacing of the site in its entirety in tarmacadam and has enlarged the vehicular entrance.

9.2.6. Sufficient private open space remains on site to meet the requirements of the dwelling house.

9.2.7. Given that the works, the subject of this appeal relate to an extant residential dwelling house, and concern both extensions to the structure as well as boundary alterations and amended surface treatment, the principle of development is considered to be acceptable.

9.3. Decision under Reg. Ref. 2560326

9.3.1. Schedule 2 of the planning authority's decision refused permission for revisions to the front entrance, including removal of boundary walls and grassed areas. The appellant refers to the Reg. Ref. 261/96 which permitted the overall estate and provides a drawing referred to as '*Approved Copy of Site Layout from Planning File 261/96*'. It is contended that the approved layout provided for a short, narrow spur road without turning area to serve units 5,6,7 and 8 with the driveway of each house facilitating one car space.

9.3.2. While I note the appellants argument surrounding a perceived error in the draughting of plans associated within the consenting application for this estate, I contend that the issue is moot given the passage of time and the measures now available to resolve such concerns.

9.3.3. It is stated that while amendments to no.'s 6 and 7 have removed areas of grass to facilitate additional onsite parking, enable reverse parking and reduce congestion on the spur road; this option is not available to the appeal site, given where the spur road terminates. The appellant indicates that the truncation of the roadway necessitated vehicles to reverse out of the site and down the spur road until reaching the main estate road, a concern now exacerbated by the parking of vehicles on the adjoining carriageway.

9.3.4. In order to assist access and egress, the boundary walls to the front of the property have been removed in their entirety, leaving an L-shaped entrance with a rudimentary shallow ramp in tarmacadam adjacent the concrete footpath which bounded the removed wall.

9.3.5. The appellant argues that the works eliminate the requirement for hazardous traffic movements necessitated by the substandard original design. I note in the planning report that the planning authority were of the view that improved turning solutions for vehicles would be reasonable and that measures including removal of front walls and an expanded hard standing to facilitate vehicles to park and turn were also considered to be a reasonable approach. No concerns were raised by the authority in relation to the removal of the front boundary walls in question and no issues of pedestrian or traffic safety as a result of such removal were identified. In this regard, the reason for refusal is concerned primarily with the issue of surface water disposal.

9.4. Surface Water Disposal

9.4.1. Where the planning authority disagrees however, is in the extent of hard surfacing which has been applied, with the front, side and rear garden areas paved over in impermeable material, with no soft landscaping or planting remaining. In this regard it was determined that the works run contrary to the requirements of Section 11.28 of the Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029 which requires inter alia that *'all proposed development must consider the impact of surface water flood risk in drainage design. Consideration should be given in the design of new development to the incorporation of SuDS. The drainage design should ensure no increase flood risk to the site or downstream catchment.*

9.4.2. The planning report held that the coverage of the entire rear and front gardens in an impermeable material with no potential for surface water to drain through the soil would add to and generate a flood risk and would be contrary to proper planning and sustainable development.

9.4.3. I note that the report of the Transportation/Drainage Division indicates no objection to surface water drainage subject to a somewhat general condition that surface water drainage design must incorporate SuDS measures (a range are listed) to be agreed with the Local Authority.

9.4.4. I agree with the premise of Section 11.28 that care must be taken in replacing soft landscaping measures with an impermeable material that such works do not result in

increased surface water runoff. Given that the material applied in this instance, tarmacadam, does not have permeable qualities, the extent of such coverage as has been applied in this instance, is of concern. While a suite of SuDs measures is listed in the report of the Transportation/Drainage Division, the report is otherwise silent on the level of intervention which would be required to balance the extent of hard standing introduced on site.

- 9.4.5. The appeal documentation states that the rear garden, extending to 57.2 sq.m. incorporates a drainage channel to the rear boundary discharging to ground. Surfacing to the front of the house falls directly to the road and the appellant indicates that the remaining resurfaced area falls towards the site boundary wall where 4 no. gullies collect rainwater and discharge to ground. This has not been verified and I note on the plans provided an existing storm water drain in the estate road flowing away from the site.
- 9.4.6. In seeking to address the concerns of the planning authority, the appellant as part of the appeal, submits an amended proposal under Drawing Title: Site Layout Ref: E049/02/ACP/01 prepared by Oliver Higgins Chartered Engineers and lodged on the 15th January 2026. This indicates the removal of hard surfacing in two areas to the front and rear of the garage. A footpath is shown adjacent the dwelling house and to the southwest of the garage. It is further stated that the extent of impermeable surface area would then extend to 105.2sq.m. in the front garden.
- 9.4.7. Given the flexibility inherent in Section 11.28 of the Development Plan and in the report of the Transportation/Drainage Division, I am of the view that the measures proposed would assist in the natural disposal of surface water on site. I am also of the opinion that the amended proposals could be further augmented by the introduction of a 1.0m wide grass margin along the northwestern boundary wall to the front of the dwelling house, extending from the proposed grass area in front of the garage to the boundary with no.9 Gort Gréine.
- 9.4.8. Where the Commission is minded to grant permission for retention of the development, consideration should be given to the imposition of a condition giving effect to the measures proposed by the appellant in the amended plans lodged with the appeal, and to the additional measure to further increase levels of permeability on site by the incorporation of a planting strip to the north-west boundary wall.

9.5. Amended Site Boundaries

- 9.5.1. The Commission is advised that the block boundary wall of the site appears to extend beyond the northwestern boundary as per the red line of the application site shown on the plans provided. Under a recent substantially similar application, Reg. Ref. 2560090, the planning authority refused permission for development, citing that if permitted, the proposal would *'facilitate the unauthorised removal of the rear boundary wall which facilitates the unauthorised extension of this site onto lands not under the applicant's ownership'*.
- 9.5.2. The current proposal does not refer to the additional lands, and all works are provided within the planning application's red line boundaries. The planning authority in its assessment of the current proposal noted the omission of the said lands and the matter is not referenced in the current planning authority decision.
- 9.5.3. I note under Section 5.13 of the Development Management – Guidelines for Planning Authorities that the planning system is not designed as a mechanism for resolving disputes about title to land or premises or rights over land; these are ultimately matters for resolution in the Courts. In this regard, it should be noted that, as Section 34(13) of the Planning Act states, a person is not entitled solely by reason of a permission to carry out any development.

10.0 AA Screening

- 10.1.** I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

The proposed development comprises extensions and alterations to an existing dwelling.

No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of the works e.g. small scale and nature of the development.
- Distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.

- Taking into account determination of the Planning Authority.

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.

11.0 Water Framework Directive

- 11.1.** The subject site concerns No. 8 Gort Gréine Rahoon Galway, a two-storey semi-detached dwelling connected to public services.
- 11.2.** The development comprises the retention of a single storey extension and storage shed to the rear of the dwelling house and for retention of the revised front entrance, including removal of a wall and grassed area.
- 11.3.** The property is located approximately c.40m from the River Knocknacarragh_010 (IE_WE_31K160960) to the west. The appeal site lies in the Galway Bay North WFD Catchment ID 31 and is underlaid by the Spiddal Ground Water Body IE_WE_G_0004.
- 11.4.** I have assessed the development seeking permission and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and ground water 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 is as follows:

- Nature of works comprising small scale extensions to the residential property and works to amend the boundary and surface treatment of the site, noting existing connections to public wastewater and water supply.
- Location-distance from nearest water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections.

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.

12.0 Recommendation

I recommend that retention permission is granted for the reasons and considerations set out below:

13.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature, scale and extent of the development, the existing pattern of development in the wider area, the provisions of the Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity and would therefore, be in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.

14.0 Conditions

1	<p>The development shall be retained in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of clarity.</p>
2	<p>The following shall be complied with:</p> <p>(a) The development shall accord with Drawing: Proposed Site Layout Ref: E049/02/ACP/01 Oliver Higgins Chartered Engineers, received by An Coimisiún Pleanála on the 15th January 2026 and providing for the removal of hard surfacing and the provision of areas of grass to the front and rear of the existing garage.</p>

	<p>(b) In addition, a 1.0m wide linear grass strip shall be provided, extending from the grass area in front of the garage to the south-western boundary of the site with No. 9 Gort Gréine, running adjacent the north-western boundary wall of the property.</p> <p>(c) All works to achieve the foregoing shall be completed on site within six months of the date of this decision. Confirmation, including photographic evidence of completion, shall be submitted to the planning authority for written agreement on completion of the works.</p> <p>Reason: To assist the disposal of surface water.</p>
3.	<p>The dwelling and extensions to be retained shall be occupied as a single residential unit.</p> <p>Reason: To restrict the use of the extension in the interest of residential amenity</p>
4.	<p>No surface water shall drain from the site onto the public road or to third party properties.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of orderly development.</p>

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

Patricia Byrne
 Planning Inspector

17th April 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-500643-GC-26
Proposed Development Summary	Permission for 1. Retention for revised front entrance including removal of wall and grassed area and 2. Extension of rear of house. 3. Storage shed to the rear of utility room.
Development Address	8 Gort Gréine, Ragoon , Galway
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	

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?

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.

Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.
EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required

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 Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)

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

Inspector: _____

Date: _____ .