



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-500705-DR-26

Development	Modifications and extension to house with associated internal, external, and site works.
Location	42, Joyce Avenue, Kerrytown, Foxrock, Dublin 18, D18N2E4
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D25A/0854/WEB
Applicant(s)	Ruslan and Antonia Sandulescu
Type of Application	Planning permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission with conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Appeal
Appellant(s)	Mairead Bolger & others
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	15 th March 2026
Inspector	Susan Clarke

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site (No. 42, measuring 0.067ha) is located on Joyce Avenue along a sweeping bend in an established residential area and comprises a single story plus attic level detached dwelling with a pitched roof profile.
- 1.2. The site is bounded by adjacent dwellings: No. 43 Joyce Avenue to the north, No. 41 to the south, and Nos. 48 and 50 Hainault Road to the rear. The site slopes downwards from southwest to northeast. The streetscape along Joyce Avenue is characterised by detached dwellings of similar form and appearance to that of the subject dwelling.
- 1.3. The existing 3-bedroomed dwelling (c.172 sq m) is setback from the public roadway and is served by off street parking and a pedestrian access to the front. The primary amenity space is situated to the rear of the property. The dwelling overlooks an open green space area with mature trees on the eastern side of the roadway.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the following modifications and extensions to the existing dwelling:
 - a) Provision of additional bedroom (bringing total to 4 bedrooms)
 - b) Increased floor area at ground and first floor (162.6 sq m)
 - c) Replacement of existing pitched roof, providing a revised dormer style arrangement to the front (east)
 - d) Partial two-storey structure to the rear (west) and side (east)
 - e) Exterior elevational modifications including single storey porch to the front (east)
 - f) Ancillary working including internal modifications, widening of vehicular entrance, and
 - g) All associated site works and services including landscaping and boundary treatments.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.2. On 13th January 2026, Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council issued a Notification of Decision to Grant Permission for the proposed development, subject to 10 No. Conditions.

3.3. Planning Authority Reports

3.3.1. Planning Report (13th January 2026)

The Notification of Decision to Grant Permission reflects the recommendation of the planning case officer, who stated that having regard to the scale and nature of the proposed development, it would not adversely impact on the amenities of existing adjacent residential properties by way of overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing appearance and satisfies the relevant provisions of the CDP.

3.3.2. Other Technical Reports

Environmental Enforcement/Waste Management (17th November 2025) - No objection subject to conditions.

Drainage Planning (12th December 2025) – Recommended further information be requested in relation to the disposal of surface water run-off.

Transportation Planning (7th January 2025) – No objection subject to condition.

3.4. Prescribed Bodies

3.4.1. None on file.

3.5. Third Party Observations

3.5.1. Seven third party observations were submitted to the Planning Authority during its determination of the planning application. The substantive issues raised in these observations have also been raised in the Third-Party Appeal submitted to the Commission.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Subject Site

- 4.1.1. DLRCC Ref. D25A/0456: DLRCC refused permission in July 2025 for the partial demolition, modification and extension of the existing dwelling to provide a 4-bedroom dwelling measuring 326sqm with a two-storey pitched roofed dwelling. The proposed development included (a) demolition of existing rear boiler house & side garage; (b) construction of two-storey extension to the side and rear (with part single-storey flat-roof extension to rear); (c) construction of new two-storey front porch with pitched roof; d) addition of new bay window to front elevation; e) removal of existing dormer roof and construction of full first-floor with a new hipped roof; f) internal modifications at ground and first floor together with the provision of new 38sqm attic storage space with skylights; g) widening of vehicular entrance; and all associated site works, services, landscaping and boundary treatments.

Permission was refused for two reasons:

1. The application failed to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of Section 12.3.9 Demolition and Replacement Dwellings; Policy Objective CA6: Retrofit and Reuse of Buildings; and Policy Objective PHP19: Existing Housing Stock – Adaptation of the County Development Plan.
2. The proposed development by virtue of its design features, massing, and detailing would fail to successfully integrate with the prevailing character of the area.

4.2. Neighbouring Sites

49, Joyce Avenue, Foxrock, Dublin 18, D18C1PO

DLRCC Ref. D25B/0637: DLRCC granted permission in February 2026 for:

- (i) The demolition of the side south-east single storey garage to facilitate the construction of single storey extension to the side south-east.
- (ii) The demolition of the side north-west single storey utility and the construction of new rear single storey extension.

- (iii) Renovations to internal layouts at ground and first floor increasing dwelling from 4-bedroom house to 5-bedroom house with front and rear elevational changes.
- (iv) All associated site and ancillary works, including internal alterations, hard and soft landscaping, drainage and SuDS measures to facilitate the development.

2, Joyce Avenue, Foxrock, Dublin 18, D18VY13

DLRCC Ref. D25A/0374: DLRCC granted permission and retention permission in August 2025 for alterations to the existing house to include:

- (i) Omission of: approved 3 No. rooflights to the east elevation, closing of existing vehicular entrance to front on Joyce Avenue, new separate vehicular entrance to side on Hainault Park, exterior insulation and brick finish, first floor window to south elevation and patio doors to the west elevation.
- (ii) Retention permission for the following: reconfiguration of the internal floor plan and elevational changes to include patio doors and pedestrian doors to the north elevation, a low level bay window to replace an original window to the south elevation and a rooflight and porch canopy to the west elevation, minor changes to window and door positions on east and west elevations, relocation of approved new pedestrian entrance to the rear garden on Hainault Park and minor alterations to the front boundary wall and gate entrance piers to the south boundary.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028

- 5.1.1. The site is governed by the policies and provisions contained in the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 (CDP).
- 5.1.2. The site's land use zoning objective is 'A' which seeks 'to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities'. Residential is a 'permitted in principle' land use.

- 5.1.3. Section 4.3.1.2 of the CDP refers to actively promoting and facilitating adaptation of existing housing stock to accommodate changing household size and needs. It says that retention and adaption of stock will be further encouraged by facilitating suitably designed domestic extensions.
- 5.1.4. Section 4.3.1.3 Policy Objective PHP20 – Protection of Existing Residential Amenity
- 5.1.5. Chapter 12 of the CDP provides development management details. Section 12.3.7.1 relates to extensions to dwellings.
- 5.1.6. Section 12.3.7.1 Extensions to Dwellings
- Porch extensions, other than those deemed to be exempted development, should be of appropriate design and scale relative to the design of the original house. The scale, height, and projection from the front building line of the dwelling should not be excessive so as to dominate the front elevation of the dwelling. The porch should complement the existing dwelling, and a more contemporary design approach can be considered.
 - Front extensions, at both ground and first level will be considered acceptable in principle subject to scale, design, and impact on visual and residential amenities. A break in the front building line will be acceptable, over two floors to the front elevation, subject to scale and design however a significant break in the building line should be resisted unless the design can demonstrate to the Planning Authority that the proposal will not impact on the visual or residential amenities of directly adjoining dwellings. Excessive scale should be avoided.
 - Ground floor rear extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining.
 - Ground floor side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size, and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation) and impacts on adjoining residential amenity.
 - First floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable. However, in certain cases a set-back of an extension's front façade and its roof profile and ridge may

be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape, and avoid a 'terracing' effect. External finishes shall normally be in harmony with existing.

- Roof alterations/expansions to main roof profiles - changing the hip-end roof of a semi-detached house to a gable/ 'A' frame end or 'half-hip' for example – will be assessed against a number of criteria including:
 - Careful consideration and special regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.
 - Existing roof variations on the streetscape.
 - Distance/contrast/visibility of proposed roof end.
 - Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures, and prominence.

5.1.7. Section 12.3.9 relates to Demolition and Replacement Dwellings.

Policy Objective PHP19: Existing Housing Stock – Adaptation: It is a Policy Objective to:

- Conserve and improve existing housing stock through supporting improvements and adaption of homes consistent with NPO 34 of the NPF.
- Densify existing built-up areas in the County through small scale infill development having due regard to the amenities of existing established residential neighbourhoods.

5.1.8. Section 12.4.8 refers to Vehicular Entrances and Hardstanding Areas.

5.1.9. Section 12.4.8.1 refers to General Specifications. For new entrances for a single residential dwelling, the maximum width of an entrance is 3.5m.

5.1.10. Section 12.4.8.3 refers to Driveways/Hardstanding Areas. It states that a minimum of one third of front garden areas should be maintained in grass or landscaped in the interest of urban greening and SUDS.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1. The appeal site is not located in or immediately adjacent to a designated European Site, a Natural Heritage Area (NHA) or a proposed NHA.

5.3. EIA Screening

5.3.1. The proposed development is not a class of development set out in Schedule 5, Part 1 or Part 2 of the Planning and Development Regulation 2001, as amended, and therefore no preliminary examination is required. See Appendix 1.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. One third-party appeal has been received from Mairead Bolger and Others in respect of the Local Authority's Notification of Decision to Grant Permission. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The proposal more than doubles the size of the parent dwelling and represents an increase of 6 sq m when compared to the site's previous refusal (D25A/0456).
- The proposal would be out-of-place on an inappropriately sized site.
- The proposal contravenes PHP19 as it is likely that the parent dwelling will have to be demolished.
- The height is significantly taller than all the other house on the road.
- The proposal is not in harmony with dwellings on Joyce Avenue and represents a departure form the front elevation of all the other dwellings, which have a central single window in the roof apex reflecting a former character of the houses.
- The proposal will result in an unacceptable loss of light, loss of privacy and intrusion.
- The size and height of the proposal will restrict daylight and impact on the bungalows across the road, which are a single storey and built at a lower level.
- The proposal will also result in overlooking of neighbouring properties.

6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. A response received on behalf of the Applicant can be summarised as follows:

- Queries the validity of the Appeal as it is made on behalf of a number of objectors, notwithstanding that only one fee was paid to the Commission.
- Confirmation that the first-floor area has been included in the total floor area calculation (332 sq m).
- The proposal represents a reduction in the overall scale and massing of the site's previous refusal.
- A number of dwellings along Joyce Avenue had been altered over time with extensions ranging in size from 200 sq m to 310 sqm.
- The proposal represents contemporary family living standards rather than excessive expansion.
- The proposal is compliant with PHP19 as only limited demolition is proposed.
- The property is subject to a Vacant Homes Property Refurbishment Grant.
- A sunlight and shadow analysis has been submitted with the Response, which demonstrates that the proposal will not result in significant loss of light to neighbouring properties and does not give rise to overlooking concerns.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

6.3.1. Response received states that the grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which, in the opinion of the Planning Authority, would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

6.4. Observations

6.4.1. None.

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 inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal relate to:

- Principle of development and compliance with Policy PHP19
- Impacts on neighbouring residential amenity
- Validity of the Third-Party Appeal.

Each of these issues is addressed in turn below.

7.2. Principle of Development and Compliance with Policy PHP19

7.2.1. The proposal comprises modifications and extensions to a dwelling on a site zoned Objective A with an aim “*To provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities*”. The provision of residential development is consistent with the zoning objective of the site and established uses on adjoining sites. I consider the proposed development to be acceptable in principle, subject to quantitative and qualitative safeguards in respect of design and amenity.

7.2.2. The Third-Party Appeal contends that the proposal is not consistent with Policy PHP19 as it is likely that the parent dwelling will be demolished to accommodate the proposed development. Having reviewed the drawings submitted as part of the planning application, I am satisfied with the extent of proposed demolition works involved insofar as the proposal does not comprise the complete demolition of the existing dwelling, but rather alterations and extensions resulting in an improved residential amenity for its occupants and an increase in BER rating (currently F rating). I note that the Applicant stated that the property is subject to a Vacant Homes Property Refurbishment Grant. Having regard to the foregoing, I am satisfied that the proposed development is consistent with Section 12.3.9 (Demolition and Replacement Dwellings) and Policy Objective PHP19 of the Development Plan.

7.3. Impacts on Neighbouring Residential Amenity

7.3.1. The Third-Party Appeal raises concerns in relation to the scale of the proposed development and states that the proposal would be out of place on such an inappropriately sized site. It is argued that the proposal represents an increase in size in comparison to the site’s previous refusal.

- 7.3.2. The proposed development involves extending the existing dwelling from 172.3 sq m to 332 sq m, with ground and first floor extensions measuring 162.6 sq m. Having regard to the scale of the proposed development in the context of the site's size (0.067 sq m), which is located on a bend, the plot sizes of neighbouring dwellings and the separation distances between the dwellings, I do not consider that the proposed development is excessive or represents overdevelopment.
- 7.3.3. The proposal will be located within 1.53m to 3.34m from its northern boundary with No. 43 and 0.84m to 2.24m to its southern boundary with No. 41. Having regard to the design, massing and scale of the proposal, in addition to the configuration of the existing dwelling on the plot in the context of the neighbouring dwellings, I do not consider that the proposal would be dominant nor have any overbearing impacts on the neighbouring properties that would adversely impact their residential amenity.
- 7.3.4. As is evident from Drawing PL008, there is one ground floor window proposed on both the northern and southern elevations. However, due to the separation distance and boundary treatments between the subject site and the adjacent properties, no adverse overlooking will occur. There is an ensuite window proposed at First Floor Level along the southern elevation. Should the Commission be minded to grant permission for the proposed development I recommend that a condition be attached to the decision requiring that the window is opaque. Due to the separation distance and lines of orientation between the subject site and No. 24 on the opposite side of Joyce Avenue, no undue overlooking will arise. In addition, the sunlight and shadow analysis clearly illustrates that there would be no significant overshadowing or loss of daylight to neighboring properties.
- 7.3.5. Whilst I note that the dwellings located on the northeastern side of Joyce Avenue are at a lower elevation than the subject site and that the proposal includes increasing the dwelling's ridge height from 6.6m to 7.5m, having regard to the separation distances between the proposed development and these dwellings, there will be no overbearing impacts or loss of residential amenity. I concur with the Local Authority's assessment that the proposed roof change does represent a departure from the existing pitched roofs and dormer elements present along Joyce Avenue. However, I highlight that the area is not a designated Conservation Area nor does it include any Protected Structures. I do not consider that the deviation in design would have any

adverse visual impacts on the neighbouring dwellings or the prevailing character of the area.

7.3.6. Notwithstanding that each application is considered on its own merits, I do not concur with the Appellant's comparison to the site's previous refusal for development (DLRCC Ref. D25A/0456), as the proposal's scale and massing is reduced when compared to the previous scheme. The scale and form of the proposed extensions are now common practice as residents refurbish and extend their dwellings to meet modern day living requirements.

7.3.7. In summary, I am satisfied that the proposed development can be accommodated on the site, without undue impact on neighbouring residential properties or the residential character of the area.

7.4. Validity of the Third-Party Appeal

7.4.1. The Applicant queries the validity of the Appeal as it is made on behalf of a number of objectors, notwithstanding that only one fee was paid to the Commission. The Appeal was made by Mairead Bolger on behalf of six parties: Sean and Mairead Bolger, John Burke, Joseph Gallagher, Denis and Geraldine Hinchy, John Kilbride, and Sylvian Mulholland. A copy of each parties' submission originally made to the Local Authority and receipts for such submissions are attached to the Appeal. I am satisfied that the Third-Party Appeal complies with the requirements of Section 127 of the Planning and Development Act. There is no restriction on an appellant representing other parties. Having regard to the foregoing, I consider the Appeal to be valid.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment

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

8.1.1. I have considered the proposed development, which comprises modifications and extension to an existing dwelling, in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is not located within or adjacent to a European site. There are no protected sites in the vicinity.

8.1.2. 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 an appreciable effect on a European site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale of the development involving domestic extensions and modifications.
- The location of the development in a built up, serviced urban area.

8.1.3. I consider that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually or in-combination with other plans or projects, on a European site and appropriate assessment is therefore not required.

9.0 Water Framework Directive Assessment Screening

9.1.1. The subject site is located in Foxrock within a suburban area. The proposed development comprises modifications and extensions to an existing dwelling as outlined in Section 2.1 of this Report.

9.1.2. Whilst I note the Drainage Department raised queries in relation to surface water disposal, no water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal. I am satisfied that the issues raised by the Drainage Department can be addressed via condition, should the Commission be minded to grant permission for the proposed development, as the matters relate to standard construction methods and techniques. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

9.1.3. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale of development and the nature of works
- The location-distance from nearest water bodies and lack of hydrological connections.

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

10.0 Recommendation

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

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan, 2022-2028, the zoning objective to 'provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities', the pattern of development in the area, and the scale, form and design of the proposed development, it is considered that, the proposed development would constitute an acceptable form of development at this location and would not seriously injure the residential amenity of surrounding properties by reason of overlooking, overshadowing, overbearing appearance or loss of daylight. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, 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 existing dwelling and the proposed extension shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit and the extension shall not be used, sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.</p> <p>Reason: To restrict the use of the extension in the interest of residential amenity.</p>
3.	<p>The window serving the ensuite at First Floor Level on the southern elevation shall be glazed with obscure glass.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent overlooking of adjoining residential property.</p>
4.	<p>Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed development shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
5.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
6.	<p>The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interests of sustainable drainage.</p>

7.	<p>(a) The width of the proposed widened vehicular entrance shall be a maximum of 3.5m.</p> <p>(b) The footpath and the grass verge in front of the proposed widened vehicular entrance shall be dished and strengthened at the Applicant's own expense including any moving / adjustment of any water cocks /chamber covers. With regard to both the dishing and strengthening of the footpath and the grass verge in front of the widened vehicular entrance, the Applicant shall contact the Road Maintenance & Control Section to ascertain the required specifications for such works and any required permits.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of orderly development.</p>
8.	<p>All necessary measures should be taken by the applicant and contractor to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on the public road network, repair any damage to the public road arising from carrying out works and avoid conflict with between construction activities and pedestrian and vehicular movements on the surrounding public roads.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of amenities, public health and safety and environmental protection</p>
9.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the</p>

	<p>terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.</p>
--	--

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.

Susan Clake
Senior Planning Inspector

16th March 2026

Appendix 1: Environmental Impact Assessment

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	500705-DR-26
Proposed Development Summary	Modifications and extension to house with associated internal, external, and site works.
Development Address	42, Joyce Avenue, Kerry Mount, Foxrock, Dublin 18, D18N2E4
	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 type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
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 type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2,	

<p>Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	

<p>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</p>
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>