



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-500873-SD-26

Development	Construction of a storey & half extension and all associated site works.
Location	35 Lacora Glen, Delvin, Co. Westmeath, N91 V6D0
Planning Authority	Westmeath County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560598
Applicant(s)	Bradley Investments Ltd
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Yvonne Fletcher & Bernie Mulvey obo Lacora Glen Residents Association
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	
Inspector	David Freeland

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	4
3.4. Third Party Observations	5
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	5
5.1. Natural Heritage Designations	6
5.2. EIA Screening	6
5.3. Water Framework Directive.....	6
6.0 The Appeal	7
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	7
6.2. Applicant Response in the case of a 3rd Party Appeal	9
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	9
6.4. Further Responses	9
7.0 Assessment.....	11
8.0 AA Screening.....	15
9.0 Recommendation.....	16
10.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	17
11.0 Conditions	17
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

The appeal site is located at No. 35 Lacora Glen, a residential estate positioned to the south-west of the town of Delvin, Co. Westmeath, approximately 600 metres from the village centre. The estate is accessed off the National Primary Road (N52).

Lacora Glen comprises 36 no. detached dormer-style dwellings arranged around a central communal green space. The estate has an edge-of-settlement suburban character, with mature street trees throughout and a generally attractive and well-maintained appearance.

The subject site occupies a corner position at the south-eastern end of the estate cul-de-sac oriented to the N52. The site is bounded by the internal estate road on two sides, to the front and to the west, which results in the rear and side elevations of the dwelling being visually prominent within the estate context.

The dwelling itself is a two-storey dormer-style house with a gross floor area of approximately 144 sq.m on a site of circa 0.07 hectares. The side boundary to the property consists of a block wall with timber panelling above, transitioning to a lower block wall at the front. The property has existing off-street car parking.

The neighbouring property, no. 34 Lacora Glen is located to the north-west of the site. Its side gable wall, which is windowless, faces towards the rear wall of the subject dwelling with a separation distance of approximately 16 metres. The neighbouring dwelling to the east, no. 36, its front building line is set back behind that of the subject dwelling such that the rear building line of No. 36 projects approximately c. 3.8 metres beyond the rear of No. 35.

2.0 Proposed Development

The proposed development comprises the construction of a storey-and-a-half extension (38.5 sq.m gross floor area) to the rear (north-west) of the existing dwelling (144 sq.m). The extension will provide an enlarged kitchen and sitting area at ground floor level, together with a utility room. At first-floor level, two existing bedrooms are to be enlarged and ensuite facilities added to each. The proposal does not increase the overall number of bedrooms, which remains at four.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Westmeath County Council decided to grant planning permission for the development subject to 6no. conditions. The attached conditions were generally standard in nature relating to the dwelling's single residential unit status, roads, surface water, wastewater treatment and hours of construction.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

Planning Reports

There is one planning report on file which is summarised as follows:

- The report assessed the proposal against CPO 16.27 of the Westmeath County Development Plan 2021–2027 (WCDP), concluding that the extension is subordinate in scale and form, that it is consistent with the character of the host dwelling, and that it would not result in adverse impacts on residential amenity by way of overshadowing, overlooking or loss of daylight.
- The report noted that the upper-level windows maintain a separation distance in excess of 11 metres from the boundary with No. 34, and that their orientation is such that they overlook only the front portion of that property, with no adverse impact on its private amenity space.
- Concerns raised in the third-party submission in relation to parking were not considered to be material in the context of a domestic extension.

Other Technical Reports

- District Engineer: No objection subject to conditions.
- National Roads Office: No objection.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

TII: Report dated 16/12/2025 – No objection: TII requested that the planning authority have regard to official policy for development proposals impacting national roads.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One observation was received from the Lacora Glen Residents Association which is summarised as follows:

- Overdevelopment and intensification of use inconsistent with the low-density residential character of the estate.
- Impact on the established character of Lacora Glen and risk of setting a precedent.
- Security and safeguarding concerns, suggesting the scale and layout implies use beyond typical single-family occupation.
- Loss of residential amenity by way of overshadowing and loss of daylight to properties Nos. 34 and 36.
- Overbearing and enclosing impact on private open space of Nos. 34 and 36, and overlooking resulting in loss of privacy.
- Insufficient on-site parking, with the existing dwelling already creating pressure on parking within the estate.
- Construction phase access and safety, including risk of obstruction to emergency vehicles.

4.0 Planning History

There is no planning history relating to the subject site.

5.0 Policy Context

Westmeath County Development Plan 2021–2027 (WCDP)

The subject site is located on lands zoned 'Established Residential' within the WCDP. The land zoning policy objective for established residential lands (CPO 15.1) supports high quality residential consolidation and sustainable intensification at appropriate locations in a manner that does not impact negatively on the amenities or character of an area.

Policy Objective CPO 16.27 is relevant in the consideration of the subject appeal. It provides that when assessing alterations and extensions to existing dwellings, the planning authority will consider whether:

- Extensions and/or alterations should respect the main dwelling.
- Where contemporary designs are proposed, proposals should not detract from the visual amenities of the main dwelling or neighbouring properties.
- Extension works should not encroach, oversail or otherwise physically impinge third party properties.
- Proposals should be designed in such a way as to eliminate overshadowing or overlooking of adjoining property.

5.1. Natural Heritage Designations

The appeal site is not located within or adjacent to any designated European site (SAC or SPA) or Natural Heritage Area (NHA or pNHA). The closest natural heritage designations to the subject site include; Lough Shesk pNHA (Site Code: 000556) – 4.25km to north-east. The closest European site to the subject site includes; River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (Site Code: 002299) – 2.15km to east.

5.2. 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 requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

5.3. Water Framework Directive

The subject site comprises a detached two-storey dwelling located within Lacora Glen which forms part of an established residential estate located to the south-west edge of the settlement of Delvin. The proposed development comprises a two-storey extension to the rear of the dwelling. The site is serviced by public water/wastewater.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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 and ground water bodies 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 significant risk to any surface and groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively. The reasons for this are as follows:

- The nature of the works comprising a small scale of development.
- The location of the nearest surface waterbody is situated approximately 1.4km to the north-west of the subject site, is the River Waterbody Stonyford_020 (Code: IE_EA_07S020075) which is separated by urban development.
- The lack of direct hydrological connections from the site to any surface and transitional water bodies.

I conclude 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.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A third-party appeal was lodged by the Lacora Glen Residents Association. The appeal is against the Council's decision to grant permission. The grounds raised in the appeal substantially mirror the observations submitted to the planning authority, but include the following additional or more detailed arguments:

- Loss of daylight: The appellants submit that No. 36 has a south-east orientation and that the rear of that dwelling, including the kitchen and dining areas, is reliant on afternoon daylight. It is argued that the extension will

introduce additional built height of approximately 1.8 metres along the shared boundary, obstructing daylight to the rear of No. 36 during afternoon hours and resulting in a measurable loss of 1–3 hours per day in autumn and winter, and up to 1 hour per day in summer.

- Overbearing and enclosing impact: The scale, height and proximity of the development to the shared boundary is said to create an overbearing and enclosing effect when viewed from the rear garden and rear-facing windows of No. 36.
- Overdevelopment and estate character: The extension materially increases the built footprint of the site and reduces private open space, representing overdevelopment in a low-density estate and risking setting a precedent for further erosion of garden space.
- Parking provision, visibility and road safety: Existing on-street parking already creates congestion and visibility hazards. Any additional parking demand will exacerbate this.
- Obstruction of utilities: On-street parking already obstructs access to utility cabinets, manholes and drainage infrastructure. Increased parking demand will worsen this.
- Inadequate turning facilities: The estate cul-de-sac does not provide adequate turning for service vehicles, requiring refuse vehicles to reverse out. Additional intensification will exacerbate this.
- Cumulative impact: The appellants contend that the combined weight of the above issues renders the development unacceptable.
- Scale and intensity of accommodation: The appellants note that the existing dwelling already has extensive accommodation (four double bedrooms, one ensuite, one bathroom, a utility room, kitchen, sitting room and dining room) and that the extension would add two further bedrooms with ensuites, an additional utility room, a second kitchen, a study and a further sitting area. This level of expansion is said to be excessive for a single-family dwelling.

6.2. Applicant Response in the case of a 3rd Party Appeal

6.2.1. The applicant submitted a response to the appeal which is summarised as follows:

- Daylight and Sunlight: the extension is modest in scale, faces a windowless gable wall and remains set forward of the rear building line of no. 36. Shadow analysis has been submitted in support. No loss of daylight to either neighbouring property is contended.
- Scale: the extension sits within the height and width envelope of the existing dwelling, extends only 1.8m to the rear and is subordinate to the host dwelling. Private Open Space: the rear garden will reduce from 199.7 sq.m to 182.6 sq.m, remaining significantly in excess of the development plan standard and larger than the adjoining property at no. 36.
- Parking: the number of bedrooms is unchanged and no additional parking is required. The site can accommodate three vehicles, consistent with the development plan standard.
- Utilities and Access: the development is to the rear and will not obstruct access to utilities. An existing turning circle serves the cul-de-sac. All parking will be retained within the site.
- Bedroom Count: the applicant disputes the appellant's assertion that the extension adds two bedrooms. The extension enlarges existing bedrooms and adds ensuite facilities; the number of bedrooms remains at four. The sole purpose of the extension is to improve the functionality of the existing dwelling.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

No response was received from the planning authority.

6.4. Further Responses

6.4.1. The appellant submitted a further response which is summarised as follows:

- The submission is accompanied by signatures from residents of the estate. The appellant notes that it would be financially prohibitive for each resident to submit an individual observation and that the association coordinates objections on their behalf.
- It is contended that the original site notice was ambiguously worded and that the official drawings were not made available online for a considerable period following receipt of the application.
- The appellant has submitted correspondence between the Residents' Association and the applicant concerning grounds maintenance and grass cutting within the estate.
- The shadow analysis submitted by the applicant is said to be inaccurate and misleading, with the appellant contending it fails to account for the upward extension of the roof and therefore understates the extent and duration of overshadowing.
- The submitted drawings are said to be incomplete, inconsistent and misleading and therefore inadequate for the purposes of assessing the impact of the development.
- The proposed extension is said to be contrary to conditions attached to the original planning permission for the estate requiring architectural uniformity and will be conspicuous from the estate road and surrounding public areas.
- While acknowledging the absence of formal evidence, the appellant maintains that the design could affect the reasonable enjoyment of neighbouring properties by way of overlooking and intrusion into private open space.
- The front driveway is said to be insufficient to accommodate four vehicles, on the basis that four adults of driving age are expected to reside at the property.
- While accepting that the extension itself will not obstruct utility access, the appellant contends that construction vehicles will do so during the build phase.
- The property is owned by a limited company and is contended not to be intended as a primary residence. It is submitted that the drawings suggest

accommodation for four adults of driving age, which the appellant argues does not reflect a typical family unit.

7.0 Assessment

7.1.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Zoning and Principle of Development
- Visual amenity and compliance with CPO 16.27
- Impact on the Residential Amenities of Lacora Glen
- Parking and Road Safety

7.2. Zoning and Principle of Development

7.2.1. The subject site is located on lands zoned 'Established Residential' within the WCDP. The land zoning policy objective for established residential lands (CPO 15.1) supports high quality residential consolidation and sustainable intensification at appropriate locations in a manner that does not impact negatively on the amenities or character of an area. I am satisfied that the proposed development comprising a two-storey extension to the rear of no. 35 Lacora Glen is acceptable in principle subject to an assessment against relevant policy and criteria within the Development Plan.

7.2.2. I note the area of the proposed extension (38.5sq.m) is below the maximum permissible floor area (40sq.m) under a Class 1 exempted development of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended. While the first-floor element exceeds the 12sq.m limit under the exempted development provisions, having regard to the scale of the proposed development (in the context of the Regulations), I am satisfied that the proposed development will not result in overdevelopment of the site.

7.3. Visual Amenity and Compliance with CPO 16.27

- 7.3.1. The core policy test for extensions to existing dwellings is set out in CPO 16.27 of the WCDP. The policy requires that extensions respect the main dwelling, do not detract from the visual amenities of the host structure or neighbouring properties, do not physically impinge on third-party properties, and are designed to eliminate overshadowing or overlooking of adjoining property.
- 7.3.2. The proposed extension has a gross floor area of 38.5 sq.m, which is relatively modest in the context of the area of the existing dwelling (144 sq.m) and is subthreshold for development contributions.
- 7.3.3. The extension is to the rear of the dwelling and does not alter the dwelling's frontage, footprint visible from the street, or overall massing as experienced from within the estate. The dwelling will remain a single-family residential unit. Condition 2 of the planning authority's grant of permission ensures this.
- 7.3.4. The proposed extension is located wholly to the rear of the dwelling and is not visible from the front of the property or from the N52. It comprises two gable elements connected by a flat roof. The use of matching materials, window proportions and wall finishes ensures the extension reads as consistent with the host dwelling. The ridge height of the existing dwelling is not increased.
- 7.3.5. By reason of its corner position in the estate cul-de-sac, the rear of No. 35 is more visible within the estate than would the case with majority of dwellings within Lacora Glen. In his instance, the extension will be visible, particularly from the north although existing street trees will provide some screening. I note that the extension involves the projection of two rear gables, one extending the existing rear gable by 1.8 metres and a new gable extending 2.4 metres from the rear wall connected by a flat-roof section. This arrangement creates a somewhat asymmetric rear elevation. A more symmetrical design, with matching gables of equal projection linked by a set-back flat roof, would present a more balanced composition, particularly given the visibility of the rear elevation from the surrounding estate. I note, however, that the projection to the rear is modest and the extension, while not the most elegant solution in formal design terms will not appear incongruous with the existing dwelling or read as a incongruent addition to the streetscape of the estate. On balance, I am satisfied that the proposal respects the main dwelling in terms of scale, form and materiality, and that it does not detract from the visual amenities of the area to a

degree that would warrant refusal. The proposal is consistent with CPO 16.27 in this regard. Having regard to the scale and design of the extension and the layout of the site, I am satisfied that the proposed development will not have undue impacts upon the character of the existing dwelling or the visual amenities of Lacora Glen. These grounds do not provide a basis for refusal.

7.4. Impact on the Residential Amenities of Lacora Glen

7.4.1. Daylight, Sunlight and Overbearing Impacts

- 7.4.2. The appellants have raised concerns about loss of daylight and an overbearing impact on No. 36 Lacora Glen which is located to the east of the subject dwelling.
- 7.4.3. No. 36 sits to the east, with its front building line set back behind that of No. 35 resulting in the rear building line of No. 36 projecting approximately 3.8 metres beyond the rear wall of the subject dwelling. This means that the proposed extension, which extends between 1.8 and 2.4 metres beyond the existing rear wall of No. 35, will remain set back behind the existing rear building line of No. 36. In this context, the scope for the extension to cause significant overshadowing or an overbearing impact on No. 36 over existing levels is limited. The extension is subordinate in depth to the existing built form of No. 36, and the relative building lines are not significantly altered by the proposal.
- 7.4.4. The appellants have submitted annotated photographs and argue that the extension introduces additional depth of approximately 1.8 metres along the shared boundary obstructing the afternoon daylight path to the rear of No. 36. I note that there is an existing south-western facing window to no. 36. The window is secondary in nature with the larger windows/French doors to rear. While this south-western window may be somewhat impacted, I do not consider the overall daylight provision to the dwelling will be impacted to a level injurious to the amenities of its occupants.
- 7.4.5. Having regard to the orientation of the site and the staggered relationship of the two dwellings, I am not satisfied that the daylight loss claimed by the appellants would be as significant as suggested, or that it would be so material as to constitute an undue impact on the amenities of No. 36.
- 7.4.6. Having regard to No. 34 Lacora Glen which is located to the north-west, the side gable wall of that property is windowless and faces towards the rear wall of the

subject dwelling. The existing separation distance of approximately 16 metres between the upper rear window of No. 35 and the side wall of No. 34 will reduce to approximately 13.5–17.9 metres as a result of the extension, with a distance in excess of 11 metres maintained to the boundary itself. Given the absence of windows in the side gable of No. 34, and having regard to the separation distances that will be maintained, I am satisfied that the proposed development will not result in adverse impacts on No. 34 by way of overshadowing, loss of daylight or an overbearing appearance.

7.4.7. I am satisfied that the proposal will not give rise to undue overshadowing or overbearing impacts on adjoining properties and that it is consistent with CPO 16.27 in this regard.

7.4.8. Overlooking and Privacy Impacts

7.4.9. The appellants contend that the proposed extension will create substantial overlooking of Nos. 34 and 36. In relation to No. 34, the rear windows of the proposed extension overlook the side gable and front garden of that property. Given the orientation and the separation distances maintained, I do not consider that there will be excessive overlooking into the private rear amenity space of No. 34. The existing arrangement already involves oblique views towards the front garden of No. 34, and the proposed extension does not materially worsen this.

7.4.10. In relation to No. 36, given the staggered building line and the fact that the extension remains set back behind the rear of No. 36, I do not consider that the proposal will create additional overlooking into the private rear garden of that property beyond what currently exists.

7.4.11. I am satisfied that the proposal will not give rise to undue overlooking or loss of privacy for neighbouring properties and that it is consistent with CPO 16.27 in this regard.

7.5. **Parking, Traffic and Road Safety**

7.5.1. The appellants raise concerns about security and safeguarding, suggesting that the scale of the proposal implies use beyond typical single-family residential occupation. This concern is adequately addressed by Condition 2 of the grant of permission,

which restricts the dwelling and extension to joint occupation as a single residential unit.

- 7.5.2. The appellants raise concerns about existing parking pressures in the estate and the risk that the proposed development will generate additional parking demand. They also raise concerns about inadequate turning facilities for service vehicles within the cul-de-sac and obstruction of utility infrastructure. The appellant's subsequent response to the applicant's submission raises concerns that the submitted drawings suggest occupancy by driving age adults.
- 7.5.3. The proposed development is a rear extension to a single dwelling. It does not increase the number of bedrooms (which remains at four) and does not create an additional residential unit. The planning authority concluded that the extension does not materially alter the parking demand associated with the site. The District Engineer raised no objection.
- 7.5.4. The proposed development does not increase the scale of the existing dwelling so as to result in additional or any significant pressures on car parking in-curtilage or on-street. I do not consider that the appellant's grounds in this regard provide a basis for refusal.
- 7.5.5. Construction Phase
- 7.5.6. The appellants raise concerns about access and safety during the construction phase. These concerns are adequately addressed by the construction hours condition (Condition 5) and the roads condition (Condition 3) imposed by the planning authority. Construction phase management is a practical matter and does not provide a basis for the refusal of planning permission.

8.0 AA Screening

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

The proposed site is not located within a designated site, the River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (Site Code: 002299) is located 2.15km to east of the subject site.

The proposed development comprises a two storey extension to the rear of an existing detached dwelling located within a residential development within the

settlement of Delvin. 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:

- Scale and size of the proposed development within an existing urban residential setting.
- Distance to the nearest European site - The closest European site to the subject site is the River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC (Site Code: 002299) located 2.15km to east.
- The lack of pathways to the SPA.
- Connection to public water, public sewer and public drain.

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.

9.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be granted for the proposed extension to the rear of no. 35 Lacora Glen based on the below reasons and considerations and subject to the conditions hereunder.

Planning Authority Conditions

The conditions imposed by the planning authority are reasonable and appropriate. Condition 2 (restriction to single residential unit) is particularly important in the context of this appeal and should be retained. The remaining conditions are standard and appropriate. No additional conditions are required.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the policies and objectives of the Westmeath County Development Plan 2021–2027, in particular CPO 16.27 relating to alterations and extensions to existing dwellings, and having regard to the nature, scale and design of the proposed extension, its relationship with the host dwelling and the character of the wider estate, the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

1. 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.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The single dwelling and the proposed domestic 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.

Reason: In the interests of clarify, development management and to avoid any misunderstanding as to the implementation of the development permitted.

3. Roads

a) The applicant is responsible for the repairs of any damage caused to the public footpath and roadway as a direct result of the proposed works.

Reason: In the interests of road and traffic safety

4. Surface Water

i. All uncontaminated surface water, including roof water, shall be separately collected and discharged to drain or to on-site soakaway, and shall not in any

circumstances be allowed discharge to the septic tank or proprietary foul sewage treatment system.

ii. All soakaways shall be designed and constructed and maintained to BRE Digest 365.

Reason: In the interests of public health and orderly development

5. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0900 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.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

6. Wastewater Treatment All foul sewage generated at the proposed shall be directed to the existing connection to the public wastewater network operated by Uisce Eriann.

Reason: In the interests of public health, environmental; protection and orderly development.

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.

David Freeland
Planning Inspector

20/05/2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening [EIAR not submitted]

An Coimisiún Pleanála Case Reference	PL-500873-WH-26		
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a storey & half extension and all associated site works.		
Development Address	35 Lacora Glen, Delvin, Co. Westmeath, N91 V6D0		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)	Yes		
	No	X	
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes		Class.....	EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	X		Proceed to Q.3
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)
No	X	N/A	No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes			Proceed to Q.4
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?			
No	X		Preliminary Examination required
Yes			Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____ Date: _____