



| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Development | Attic conversion, to include a pitched slate roof and with internal alterations, to the existing dwelling and all associated site works. |
| Location | The Croft, Cross Avenue, Booterstown, Co. Dublin |
| Planning Authority | Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council |
| Planning Authority Reg. Ref. | D25B/0631/WEB |
| Applicant(s) | Ciaran & Gillian Gleeson |
| Type of Application | Permission |
| Planning Authority Decision | Refuse Permission |
| Type of Appeal | First Party Normal Planning Appeal |
| Appellant(s) | Ciaran & Gillian Gleeson |
| Observer(s) | George & Nicola Deegan |
| Date of Site Inspection | 06 th May 2026 |
| Inspector | Bernadette Quinn |

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The appeal site, with a stated area of 0.064ha, is located on the northern side of Cross Avenue in Booterstown. The appeal site contains an existing detached two storey four bedroom dwelling with a floor area of 200 sq.m. To the rear of the existing dwelling there is a two storey flat roof extension and a single storey extension. The dwelling is setback from its vehicular entrance on Cross Avenue. There is a second vehicular entrance to the property from Redwood Grove. Surrounding residential development generally comprises detached two storey dwellings in a variety of styles.

1.2. The neighbouring property to the west of the appeal site is 'Dun Ri', a detached two storey dwelling. The neighbouring property to the east is 'Bellevue (WestWing)', a two-storey dwelling which is a protected structure (RPS 109) the rear elevation of which is forward of and partially overlapping the front elevation of the property on the appeal site. To the rear there are a number of detached dwellings which are accessed from Redwood Grove.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Permission is sought for alterations to the existing dwelling on site which comprise the addition of a second floor/attic conversion. The existing pitched roof is to be increased in height and replaced with a new pitched slate roof. Three dormer windows are proposed to the rear. The proposed additional floor area measures 46.97sq.m. and will provide for a bedroom and bathroom within the attic space.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On 13th January 2026 Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council issued notification of decision to refuse permission for one reason as follows:

Having regard to the nature of the proposed development, which comprises the removal of the existing roof and its replacement at a higher level, it is considered that to permit the proposed development would negatively impact the level of amenity currently afforded to the adjoining property to the southeast by way of overshadowing and overbearance which

is contrary to the criteria set out in Section 12.3.7 Additional Accommodation in Existing Built-Up Areas of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028. Furthermore, the proposal, by virtue of its close proximity to the adjoining Protected Structure may negatively impact upon the architectural expression and character of said Protected Structure which is to Section 12.11.2.3 Development Within the Grounds of a Protected Structure. Therefore, the proposed development, if permitted, would set an undesirable precedent and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planning Officer's report dated 13th January 2026 can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed works would require the removal of the existing roof and replacement with a new pitched roof with a higher ridge line resulting in an increase from a height of 6.71m to 8.3m resulting in a change of 1.59m.
- Despite the increased ridge height, the roof slope is to remain the same which requires an increase in the height of the front wall. It is unclear what the height increase of the wall is, the front elevation drawing indicates an increase of 0.45m while the existing side elevation drawing appears to indicate that the increase will be 0.82m.
- There are concerns that an increase in the height of the front wall given the proximity to the adjoining rear window of 'Westwing Bellevue' would be setback 1.28m from the proposed increased wall and there are concerns it will diminish natural sunlight and daylight penetration through the said window below acceptable standards. The proposal would be contrary to section 12.3.7 of the Development plan by reason of overshadowing and overbearance.
- In the absence of an Architectural Impact Assessment there are concerns that the proposal may negatively impact the architectural interest, character and setting of 'Westwing Bellevue' which is a protected structure, RPS No. 109. The proposal is therefore contrary to section 12.11.2.3 of the Development Plan.

- The proposed dormer is 9.7m in length and is not setback from the eaves on the eastern elevation and fails to comply with section 12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan. Given its length the dormer window is considered disproportionate to the proposed roof and if permitted should be reduced in scale.
- A refusal of permission is recommended.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None on file.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None on file.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One submission received from George and Nicola Deegan. The issues raised are similar to the issues raised in the third-party observation.

4.0 Planning History

D25B0305: Permission granted on 28th August 2025 for single storey extensions and alterations to the rear of an existing two storey single family house.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1. The Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan, 2022-2028 is the statutory development plan for the area. The site is zoned Objective 'A' residential with the objective to: 'provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities' under which residential development is listed within the 'Permitted in Principle' category of this zoning objective.

5.1.2. Chapter 12 of the development plan deals with Development Management. Section 12.3.7.1 (iv) Sets out standards for Alterations at Roof/Attic level and includes the following:

- Alterations at Roof/Attic Level: 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.
- Dormer extensions to roofs, i.e. to the front, side, and rear, will be considered with regard to impacts on existing character and form, and the privacy of adjacent properties. The design, dimensions, and bulk of any roof proposal relative to the overall size of the dwelling and gardens will be the overriding considerations. Dormer extensions shall be set back from the eaves, gables and/or party boundaries. Dormer extensions should be set down from the existing ridge level so as to not read as a third storey extension at roof level to the rear. ... regard should also be had to size of fenestration proposed at attic level relative to adjoining residential amenities. Particular care will be taken in evaluating large, visually dominant dormer window structures, with a balance sought between quality residential amenity and the privacy of adjacent properties. Excessive overlooking of adjacent properties should be avoided.

5.1.3. Chapter 11 Heritage and Conservation includes specific objectives and guidance relating to the protection of the County's heritage. Policy Objective HER8 of the Development Plan seeks to protect the character and special interest of Protected Structures against any works that would negatively impact their distinctive character and appearance.

5.1.4. Section 12.11.2.3. Development within the Grounds of a Protected Structure states that 'any proposed development within the curtilage, attendant grounds, or in close proximity to a Protected Structure, has the potential to adversely affect its setting and amenity. The overall guiding principle will be an insistence on high quality in both materials, and design, which both respects and complement the Protected Structure, and its setting'. This section also states that 'All planning applications for development in proximity to a Protected Structure must be accompanied by a design statement, with supporting illustrative material, demonstrating how it has been developed having regard to

the built heritage, topography, and landscape character of the site. An accredited conservation architect or equivalent should be engaged at the outset of the design process to assist in determining the appropriate siting of the development in order to minimise the impact on the Protected Structure’.

5.1.5. Appendix 4 includes the Record of Protected Structures wherein the adjoining property to the southeast is included and identified as RPS 109 Bellevue (West Wing).

5.1.6. There is an objective ‘To protect and preserve Trees And Woodlands’ close to the northeastern site boundary on Redwood Grove.

5.2. Ministerial Guidelines

5.2.1. Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities

Section 6.4.15 refers to Architectural heritage impact assessment. This section states that for more extensive or complex works with a potential to have a major impact on the architectural heritage, a planning authority may require an applicant to submit a more detailed impact statement. This may be necessary to allow the planning authority to assess the full implications of the proposals and allow an informed decision to be made on the appropriateness of the development.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

5.3.1. South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024) and South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) are located approx. 400m north of the appeal site.

5.4. EIA Screening

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

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal in relation to the decision can be summarised as follows:

- The decision stops the property owner from stabilising the house in line with proper planning and development.

- The existing house has been extended and altered a number of times prior to the current occupants taking ownership. The proposal seeks to remove the piecemeal nature of the pitched and flat roofs that currently exist. Existing flashings and steps make it difficult to fully seal or insulate the property.
- The reference to overshadowing and overbearing is unjustified as the roof as proposed is 1.681m higher than the existing apex and due to the slope of the roof would be difficult to perceive in 3 dimensions.
- Given the disparate nature of recent decisions in the area the decision is in no way valid.
- The protected structure referred to has been changed, subdivided, extended and adjusted many times and to allow it to affect the property on the appeal site is not relevant.
- The reference by the local authority to overdevelopment has no reference to the reality of the area.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

Response received states no new issues raised.

6.3. Observations

One observation received can be summarised as follows:

- The proposal fails to meet the criteria set out in Section 12.3.7.1 (iv). The extent of glazing will directly overlook and substantially diminish privacy within the neighbouring property Dun Ri with no mitigation proposed.
- The scale and positioning of the glazed elements will diminish daylight to the master en-suite and rear bedroom at Dun Ri in breach of the guidance on daylight and sunlight standards in Section 12.
- The height and scale results in an overly elevated and bulky roof form and constitutes a third storey extension contravening Development Plan requirements relating to roof/attic level.
- The proposal is visually intrusive and overbearing and out of character and form to the existing dwelling and will result in increased overshadowing and

reduced sky visibility and winter daylight availability at Dun Ri and is contrary to Section 12.3.7 of the Development Plan.

- The proposal will negatively impact upon the architectural expression and character of the adjoining protected structure.
- Adjoining owners were not consulted.
- The proposal follows shortly after planning reference D25B/0305 raising concerns that the development is being pursued in incremental phases to avoid full scrutiny of its cumulative impact which is contrary to the Planning and Development Act and the Development Plan.

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 are as follows:

- Design
- Other matters

7.2. Design

7.2.1. The existing two storey dwelling on the appeal site, known as The Croft, has a pitched roof with a ridge height of 6.7m and an eaves height on the front elevation of approx. 5.3m which is below the ridge and eaves height of adjoining properties at Dun Ri to the west and Belleview (West Wing) to the east. It is proposed to remove the existing pitched roof, increase the wall height and provide a new pitched roof to allow for head height in the proposed new bedroom within the roof space. The proposed pitch roof will have a stated ridge height of 8.45m. As noted in the Planning Officers report the proposed increase in wall height is unclear from drawings submitted, on drawing PL-15 'Proposed Sections and Elevations' the side elevation drawing indicates a proposed increase in the wall height of approx. 0.82m and the front elevation drawing indicates an increase of 0.45m. No clarity is provided in relation to this matter in the first party appeal.

7.2.2. The PA refusal reason states that the proposal would negatively impact the level of amenity currently afforded to the adjoining property to the southeast by way of overshadowing and overbearance which is contrary to the criteria set out in Section 12.3.7 of the Development Plan. The refusal reason also states that the proposal, by virtue of its close proximity to the adjoining Protected Structure, may negatively impact upon the architectural expression and character of said Protected Structure.

7.2.3. Section 12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan refers to extensions to dwellings and includes sub-section (iv) Alterations at Roof/Attic level which states that roof alterations/expansions will be assessed against a number of criteria including, inter alia, careful consideration and special regard to the character and size of the structure and proximity to adjacent structures; distance / contrast / visibility of proposed roof end, and harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures, and prominence.

7.2.4. The appeal outlines that the existing house has been extended and altered a number of times and the proposal seeks to remove the piecemeal nature of the pitched and flat roofs that currently exist. It is also stated that existing flashings and steps make it difficult to fully seal or insulate the property and that reference to overshadowing and overbearing are unjustified as the roof as proposed is 1.681m higher than the existing apex and due to the slope of the roof would be difficult to perceive in 3 dimensions. The appeal also states that the protected structure referred to has been changed, subdivided, extended and adjusted many times and to allow it to affect the property on the appeal site is not relevant.

7.2.5. The observer to the appeal raises concerns that the proposal will result in negative impacts on the visual and residential amenities of the adjoining property to the west, Dun Ri, as a result of overlooking, loss of daylight and sky visibility, overshadowing, visual intrusion and overbearing and is contrary to the Development Plan. Concern is also raised in relation to the impact on the adjoining protected structure.

7.2.6. In assessing the proposal, the Planning Officer noted that there is an adjoining rear window of Belleview which appears to be serving a habitable room and that this existing window serving Belleview would be setback 1.28m from the proposed increased wall. The Planning Officer noted that this existing window is located on the northern side of Belleview resulting in low levels of natural sunlight and daylight penetration and raised concerns that the proposal will diminish natural sunlight and daylight penetration through

this window below a standard considered acceptable by the PA. The PA concluded that the proposal would be contrary to section 12.3.7 of the Development plan by reason of overshadowing and overbearance on this adjoining property. The Planning Officer also raised concerns that the proposal may negatively impact the architectural interest, character and setting of Belleview which is a protected structure and would therefore be contrary to section 12.11.2.3 of the Development Plan.

7.2.7. Having reviewed the 'Existing Site Layout' drawing and having inspected the site I note that the rear elevation of Belleview is forward of and partially overlapping the front elevation of The Croft and that there is minimal separation where the two properties overlap with a distance of approx. 0.15m indicated on the 'Existing Site Layout' drawing. I also observed that there is an existing first floor rear elevation window serving Bellevue (West Wing) located directly behind the front elevation of The Croft.

7.2.8. I note the requirements of Section 12.3.7.1(iv) of the Development Plan include that alterations to roof level will be assessed against a number of criteria including proximity to adjacent structures; distance/contrast/visibility of proposed roof end; and harmony with adjacent structures. Having regard to the location of an existing window on the rear of Bellevue (West Wing) and its proximity to the proposed development, I agree with the Planning Officer's assessment that the proposed increase in roof height is likely to diminish sunlight and daylight penetration through this window. I note that the first party appeal has not addressed this matter. I agree with the PA refusal reason that the proposal would be contrary to Section 12.3.7.1(iv) of the Development Plan and I recommend that permission should be refused for this reason.

7.2.9. I note that the applicant has not submitted supporting information to demonstrate potential impacts on the adjoining protected structure, other than to note that the protected structure has been modified and extended over the years. The Development Plan includes in Section 11.4.1.2 Policy Objective HER8 which relates to work to protected structures and includes a requirement that 'any development, modification, alteration, or extension affecting a Protected Structure and/or its setting is sensitively sited and designed, and is appropriate in terms of the proposed scale, mass, height, density, layout, and materials'. Section 12.11.2.3 states that 'any proposed development within the curtilage, attendant grounds, or in close proximity to a Protected Structure, has the potential to adversely affect its setting and amenity. The overall guiding principle will be an insistence on high quality in

both materials, and design, which both respects and complement the Protected Structure, and its setting’.

7.2.10. Having reviewed the drawings and details submitted with the planning application and having regard to the scale of the proposed roof alterations and its proximity to the Belleview (West Wing), I share the Planning Authority’s concerns that the close proximity of the proposed increased roof height to Bellevue (West Wing) has the potential to negatively impact upon the character of the adjoining Protected Structure. The proposed roof height is to be increased to a height similar to the roof height of the protected structure. I consider the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal is appropriate in terms of its impact on the protected structure and has failed to demonstrate compliance with Section 12.11.2.3 and Policy Objective HER8 of the Development Plan. I consider the proposed height combined with the proximity to the protected structure has the potential to negatively impact on that structure and I recommend that permission should be refused.

7.2.11. The proposed new roof includes a dormer feature which will be set below the ridge height by approx. 0.02m, set back from the western gable by approx. 0.13m and will be in line with the eastern gable with the window opening positioned 0.43m from the eastern gable. The dormer feature includes three windows which will serve a landing, bedroom and bathroom.

7.2.12. In relation to dormer extensions, Section 12.3.7.1 (iv) states that these will be considered with regard to impacts on existing character and form, and the privacy of adjacent properties and dormer extensions shall be set back from the eaves, gables and/or party boundaries. Dormer extensions should be set down from the existing ridge level so as to not read as a third storey extension at roof level to the rear. Particular care will be taken in evaluating large, visually dominant dormer window structures, with a balance sought between quality residential amenity and the privacy of adjacent properties. Excessive overlooking of adjacent properties should be avoided

7.2.13. The observer’s property, ‘Dun Ri’, is a detached two storey dwelling located to the west of the appeal site. Dun Ri has a hipped roof with a rear dormer and a ridge height indicated at approx. 8.9m which is above the existing and proposed ridge height on the appeal site. The side elevation of Dun Ri is approx. 1.1m from The Croft.

7.2.14. I note the concerns in the observation relating to loss of daylight to an ensuite and rear bedroom and reduced sky visibility and overshadowing. I note that daylight standards apply only to habitable rooms and therefore I do not have concerns in relation to potential impacts on the observer's ensuite. Having regard to the scale of the existing property at Dun Ri and to the scale of the proposed works, as well as the location of the proposed works relative to Dun Ri, I do not consider the proposal is likely to result in negative impacts on any rear windows in terms of loss of daylight, overshadowing or overbearing. Whilst the proposed dormer windows may give rise to lateral overlooking I do not consider this will result in a substantially increased level of overlooking beyond that which currently exists from first floor windows. I am satisfied that the proposal will not give rise to unacceptable impacts on the residential and visual amenities of Dun Ri.

7.2.15. I also note that the appeal site is surrounded by mature landscaping and that there are no directly opposing windows to the rear. I am satisfied that the proposed dormer would not give rise to unacceptable impacts of overlooking on neighbouring properties.

7.2.16. I note that Section 12.3.7.1 (iv) of the Development Plan states that dormer extensions shall be set back from the eaves, gables and/or party boundaries and should be set down from the existing ridge level so as to not read as a third storey extension at roof level to the rear. I note that the proposed dormer is flush with the eastern gable and as such I consider fails to comply with the Development Plan requirement that dormer extensions shall be set back from the eaves, gables and/or party boundaries. Whilst I consider this matter could be addressed by a condition requiring the proposed dormer be setback from the eastern gable edge, I refer the Commission to my findings above wherein I consider the proposed increased roof height is unacceptable and as such I recommend that permission should be refused.

7.3. Other Matters

7.3.1. The appeal outlines that the PA's decision to refuse permission stops the property owner from stabilising the house in line with proper planning and development and that existing flashings and steps make it difficult to fully seal or insulate the property. Having regard to my findings above I do not consider that this is sufficient justification to overrule concerns outlined above in relation to the design of the proposal.

7.3.2. The appellant states that having regard to the disparate nature of recent decisions in the area the decision is in no way valid. No details of the decisions which are being

referred to are included in the appeal. I consider each application should be considered on its own merits and having regard to my findings above I do not consider the proposal is appropriate for the site.

7.3.3. In relation to concerns relating to overdevelopment, I note that the property has an overall area of 0.064ha and contains a generous front and rear garden and I do not consider the proposal results in overdevelopment of the overall site.

7.3.4. In relation to the observers concerns that adjoining owners were not consulted, I note that there is no obligation to undertake consultation beyond that which is set out in the legislation and I do not consider the observers concerns in this regard are relevant to the assessment of the appeal.

7.3.5. The observer raises concerns that the proposal follows shortly after a previous planning application on the appeal site and raises concerns that the development is being pursued in incremental phases to avoid full scrutiny of its cumulative impact. I do not agree with the observers concerns in this regard and I am satisfied that the proposal has been adequately assessed.

8.0 AA Screening

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

I have considered case PL-500777-DR-26 in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The proposed development is located within a residential area and comprises modifications to an existing dwelling and all associated site works. The closest European Sites are South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024), both located approx. 400m north of the proposed development.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the proposed development 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:

- Small scale and domestic nature of the development

- The location of the development in a serviced urban area, distance from European Sites and urban nature of intervening habitats, absence of ecological pathways to any European Site.
- Having regard to the screening determination of the PA.

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

9.0 Water Framework Directive

9.1. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, it is concluded that the proposal will not result in any risk of deterioration in the status of any water body, including surface waters (rivers and lakes), groundwater, transitional waters, or coastal waters. This applies to both qualitative and quantitative status, and in respect of temporary and permanent effects. In addition, the proposed development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the protection, maintenance, and improvement of water body status, as required under the Directive. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

10.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be refused for the reasons and considerations set out below.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

It is considered that the proposed increase in wall height and roof height would seriously injure the amenities of the adjoining property Belleview (West Wing) due to its proximity to an existing first floor window on the rear elevation of Belleview (West Wing) and resulting impacts of overshadowing and overbearance which is contrary to the criteria set out in

Section 12.3.7.1 Extensions to Dwellings of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028. Furthermore, the proposal, by virtue of its close proximity to the adjoining property Belleview (West Wing) which is a Protected Structure (RPS 109), has the potential to negatively impact upon the character and special interest of this Protected Structure which is contrary to Section 12.11.2.3 and Policy Objective HER8 of the Development Plan which seek to protect the character and special interest of Protected Structures against any works that would negatively impact their distinctive character and appearance. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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.”

Bernadette Quinn
Planning Inspector

07th May 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

| | |
|---|---|
| Case Reference | PL-500777-DR-26 |
| Proposed Development Summary | Attic conversion, to include a pitched slate roof and with internal alterations, to the existing dwelling and all associated site works |
| Development Address | The Croft, Cross Avenue, Booterstown, 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? | <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 | State the Class here |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>be requested. Discuss with ADP.</p> | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3</p> | |
| <p>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?</p> | |
| <p><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.</p> | |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p> | <p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p> |
| <p><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)</p> | <p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</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)?

Yes

No

Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____