



Development	Permission for proposed alteration of a previously permitted residential development (planning reference numbers PD/24/60235 and PD/25/60047). To include construction of a bungalow dwelling and site works.
Location	Lisnaree, Lisroyne, Strokestown, Co. Roscommon.
Planning Authority	Roscommon County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560598
Applicant(s)	Avenir Homes Limited
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Avenir Homes Limited
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	April 29 th 2026
Inspector	Bébhinn O'Shea

1.0 **Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The site is located beside a housing development at the edge of Strokestown, accessed from the N5 and surrounded by other existing and permitted residential development. The site, as outlined in red, is bound by a by a post and rail fence at the roadside and a timber fence to the rear of semidetached dwellings in Lisnaree. It is vacant with scrub growth/re-establishing vegetation. Lisnaree contains 20 semi-detached and 3 detached dwellings, 2 storey, finished in plaster render.

2.0 **Proposed Development**

- 2.1. The proposed development is for modification to a permission to construct an additional dwelling, on an area of permitted public open space (which under previous planning permissions had permission for a dwelling).
- 2.2. The dwelling is single storey and 77.38 sq m. The proposed dwelling and curtilage is positioned on the bend in the road; the site layout plan indicates a proposed 2m high block wall to the north east of the dwelling at the boundary as far as the access point and otherwise a 0.6 timber post and rail fence at locations along the front boundary. 1.8 m post and panel fence are proposed at rear boundaries
- 2.3. The permission is sought as an amendment to Reference Numbers PD/24/60235 and PD/25/60047 and a further permission PD/17/2 is referenced. This planning history is discussed below.

3.0 **Planning Authority Decision**

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority Refused permission for the following reasons

1. The proposed development would materially contravene condition no. 2 of Planning Register Reference Number PD/24/60235 which is for 8 no. residential units only, with the permission specifically requiring the design of that permitted scheme to be amended to omit residential unit no. 5 and the reservation of the area as communal open space to be levelled soiled seeded

and landscaped. The currently proposed modification seeks to reintroduce that additional dwelling to the permitted development and would result in the loss of the permitted communal open space, would set a precedent for the further erosion of areas of communal open space generally and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The Planning Authority is not satisfied having regard to the nature of the development proposal which seeks to substantially amend the permitted layout of planning register reference number PD/24/60235, that the proposed development is sufficiently responsive to its proposed context or conducive to sustainable placemaking outcomes. The proposed development consequently and by reason of the overall layout and design concept as proposed to be modified fails to provide the required standard of urban placemaking in the urban setting in which it is proposed. The proposed development if permitted would set an undesirable precedent for similar types of development, would be contrary to the standards set out in *Sustainable Residential Development Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)* and contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

- Notes the proposal would materially contravene condition 2 of 24/60235
- Notes that under 24/60235, an application for 8 dwellings, at FI stage the applicant added a ninth dwelling (at the south-eastern end of the site) without invitation. Condition 2 removed the dwelling at the location of the proposed development, permitting 8 dwellings.
- States that the proposed development by reason of the overall layout and design concept failed to provide the required standard of urban placemaking in the urban setting in which it is proposed

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Environment: No objection subject to conditions
Roads: No objection subject to conditions
Housing: No objection

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

TII: Transport Infrastructure Ireland requests that the planning authority has regard to the DoECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities

4.0 Submissions/Observations

None

5.0 Planning History

- 00/1319** Permission granted to develop 28 housing sites with estate road and all ancillary services together with permission for 20 no. semi-detached houses and outline planning permission for 8 no. detached houses (larger site, including current application site)
- 04/619** Permission granted to construct 8 dwelling houses. (Current application site)
- 17/2** Permission granted for 7 no. dwelling houses. (Current application site)
- 22/538** Application for permission for 7 dwellings (identical application to 17/2). Deemed withdrawn. (Current application site)
- 24/60235** Permission granted for 8 no. dwelling houses. (Current application site)
- 25/60047** Permission granted for the alteration of 7 dwelling houses from storey and a half to two storey. (Current application site)

6.0 Policy Context

6.1. Development Plan

The relevant plan is the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 (RCDP)¹.

The following sections and policy objectives are most relevant

Volume 1

Chapter 2 : Core Strategy and Settlement Policy

Strokestown is a Self-Sustaining Growth Town <2000 population. The target for new residential units is 58.

Chapter 3 : People, Places and Housing

PPH 3.3. Require the provision of an appropriate mix of house types and sizes in residential developments throughout the county, in order to meet the needs of the population and support the creation of balanced and inclusive communities.

PPH 3.4 Encourage innovation in design and require development proposals to be of high quality and make a positive contribute to the built environment and local streetscape.

PPH 3.5: Require new housing developments to incorporate a variety of plot sizes and private amenity space to meet the current and future needs of residents.

Proposals are required to demonstrate compliance with the principles set out in Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (Cities, Towns and Villages) - Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DECLG, 2009)

PPH3.7 Support the development of quality residential schemes with a range of housing options having regard to the standards, principles and any specific planning policy requirements (SPPRs) set out in the 'Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas Guidelines for Planning Authorities' (2009) and Circular NRUP 02/2021 Residential Densities in Towns and Village.

Chapter 4: Towns and Villages

TV 4.19 Encourage the appropriate development of infill sites, brownfield lands, and lands identified on the Vacant Site Register and the Derelict Site Register.

Chapter 12: Development Management Standards

¹ It is noted that a report was furnished to Elected Members in March 2026, outlining the intent to vary the County Development Plan in order to ensure consistency with the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements – Guidelines for Planning Authorities. The Variation process has not however commenced

Section 12.6 Residential Development (Urban)

Communal (public or shared) open space should be appropriately integrated into the overall residential layout and should comprise of 15% of gross site area for green field sites and 10% for brown field sites.

Densities: In general, the number of units to be provided on a site should be determined with reference to the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on ‘Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas’ or any subsequent update. In achieving the appropriate densities there should also be an appropriate focus on the quality and location of the dwellings, as well as the number of dwelling units.

Volume 2

Strokestown is a settlement within Volume 2. The site is zoned New Residential.

Residential development proposals within this zone shall preserve existing amenities and have regard to the overall heritage of the area. Multi-unit residential development will be the primary form of development facilitated in this land use zone. All residential development proposals arising on New Residential lands will be required to demonstrate compliance with Section 12.6 - Residential Development (Urban) of Chapter 12 (Development Management Standards) as set out in Volume 1, Written Statement of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2021-2027

There are no other mapped objectives relating to the site.

Multi unit residential is Permitted in Principle Single residential unit is Open for Consideration².

6.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024 hereafter referred to as the “Compact Settlement Guidelines (CSG)”.

² A use which is ‘Open for Consideration’ may be permitted where the Planning Authority is satisfied it is compatible with the policies and objectives for the zone, will not conflict with the permitted, existing or adjoining land uses and conforms with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

6.3. Built and Natural Heritage Designations

The site is c. 2km from Annaghmore Lough SAC, c. 6 km from Kilgrass and Grange pNHA and c. 4 km from Ardkillen Lough pNHA.

There are no built heritage or archaeological features in the immediate vicinity.

7.0 **EIA Screening**

The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

8.0 **The Appeal**

8.1. Grounds of Appeal

- The site was granted permission under 17/2 for the same type of dwelling.
- The site was granted permission under 04/619.
- The site is zoned and serviced.
- The estate has the required amount of green open space as was granted under 04/619.
- The bungalow style dwelling will support policy objective PPH3.3 in relation to housing type mix.

- The proposed development will allow for more units within a designated serviced settlement acting as an alternative to rural housing and providing for compact growth

8.2. Planning Authority Response

No response

8.3. Observations

None

9.0 **Assessment**

9.1. As stated, the proposed development is for modification to a permission to construct an additional dwelling, on an area of permitted public open space, which under earlier planning permissions had permission for a dwelling.

9.2. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeals, 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:

- Principle of development
- Density
- Design, layout and placemaking
- Open space provision
- Residential standards

9.3. **Principle of development**

Having regard to the zoning of the site I consider that the proposed development is acceptable in principle being part of a multi-unit development. The proposal is for one additional dwelling on lands zoned New Residential and would not undermine the Core Strategy allocation for Strokestown.

9.4. **Density**

The site area is .486 hectares. The proposed development would be the 9th dwelling on the site giving a density of 18.5 uph (increased from 16.5 uph). Taken with the overall Lisaree development this equates to 32 dwellings on a site of 2 ha and is a density of 16 units per hectare.

The policy in the RCDP is that density should be determined with reference to the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on 'Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas' or any subsequent update. The relevant subsequent update is the Compact Settlement Guidelines. Section 3.7 states

Rural Towns and Villages are small in scale with limited infrastructure and services provision. It is a policy and objective of these Guidelines that development in rural towns and villages is tailored to the scale, form and character of the settlement and the capacity of services and infrastructure (including public transport and water services infrastructure). Lands zoned for housing at the edge of rural towns and villages at locations that can be integrated into the settlement and are connected to existing walking and cycling networks can offer an effective alternative, including serviced sites, to the provision of single houses in the countryside. The density of development at such locations should respond in a positive way to the established context.

Density is not prescribed. The Guidelines note the need to respond to the scale and form of surrounding development, to protect the amenities of surrounding properties and to protect biodiversity, and there should also be an appropriate focus on the quality and location of the dwellings, as well as the number of dwelling units.

I am satisfied that the proposed development will not result in an inappropriate density of development, having particular regard to the scale, form and low density of

surrounding development, and the minor increase in density compared to that permitted i.e. and increase of 2 units per hectare.

9.5. Design and layout and placemaking

I do not consider that the open space permitted at this location under 24/60235 and 25/60047 contributes significantly to placemaking as set out in the Compact Settlement Guidelines. The indicators of Quality Design and Placemaking area stated in that guidance (Figure 4.1) to be

- Sustainable and Efficient Movement,
- Mix and distribution of Uses,
- Green and Blue Infrastructure and
- Responsive Built form.

The permitted open space does not benefit the site in terms of movement, mix of uses, or built form. In terms of green infrastructure, the site is re-colonising bare ground, not integrating with an particular landscape or biodiversity feature, or connecting with other paces. It does not enable any particular diverse use, or allow nature based SuDs.

In terms of visual amenity, the location of the dwelling no. 4 adjacent the open space as permitted under 24/60235 and 25/60047 is bound to the south west by a 2m block wall and a 0.6m post and panel fence. To the south east it is bound by a timber fence. The dwelling (no. 4) is oriented to the road and there are no windows in the north eastern elevation looking onto the space; the built form is unresponsive in this sense. However I acknowledge the space is well overlooked by existing detached dwellings opposite and a landscaped area would be provided under Condition 2 b) of 25/60235, reflecting that proposed under 25/60047.

The proposed dwelling (no. 5) has the same design and layout as permitted dwelling no. 4, and I consider the design style of the proposed dwelling acceptable. However, it responds poorly to the site orientation; it would be preferable to have a double fronted design which 'turns the corner'. The proposed 2m block wall along the north eastern boundary would also protrude significantly beyond the existing building line

and be visually obtrusive. However, this wall could potentially be set back to the front building line of no. 15 subject to satisfactory provision of access/parking and private open space (c. 125sqm would remain), if the Commission were minded to grant planning permission.

I therefore consider the difference between the permitted development and the proposed development marginal in terms of place-making.

9.6. Open space provision

I note the following planning history in relation to the development of a house at this location.

- 00/1319 – a dwelling was permitted at this location as part of a scheme of 28 dwellings (larger site including Lisnaree)
- 04/619 – a dwelling (no. 5) was permitted at this location as part of a permission for 8 dwellings (current site as outlined in red)
- 17/2 – a dwelling (no. 7) was permitted at this location as part of a permission for 7 no dwellings (current site as outlined in red)
- 24/60235 - dwelling was proposed at this location (unit no. 5) as part of an application for 8 dwellings. A 9th dwelling was incorporated at FI stage elsewhere on the site. Permission was granted for 8 no. dwelling houses, omitting dwelling at unit no. 5. (Current site as outlined in red)
- 25/60047 - a dwelling was not proposed/permitted at this location as part of the permission granted for change of house type of 7 dwellings (current site as outlined in red)

I note, having reviewed the current application and 24/60235 including the Planning Reports, FI and CFI requests on same, that while the reasons for refusal on the subject case now refer to the erosion of communal open space, the primary reason for omitting this dwelling on 24/60235 was based on design, layout, relationship with contiguous development and on placemaking issues. There is no assessment within the LA Planning Report of adequacy of open space provision.

The subject site is .486 hectares. The dwelling is proposed on the location of open space permitted under 24/60235 alongside the 8 no. dwellings. This would leave a

strip of green space approximately 5m in width remain along the inside of the roadside boundary measuring c. 0.048 hectares. This area would be limited in terms of active open use, by its width and proximity to public road, a national route. However, I still consider it of such a configuration such that it would be usable to a reasonable extent and should be counted as usable open space. It totals 9.9% of site area.

The standard in the RCDP is that public open space should be a minimum of 15%.

Communal (public or shared) open space should be appropriately integrated into the overall residential layout and should comprise of 15% of gross site area for green field sites and 10% for brown field sites.

I note that the 15 % is therefore a target, but not a required minimum, and in this regard I do not consider that a material contravention of the plan occurs.

The CSGs states under Policy and Objective 5.1 Public Open Space: *The requirement in the development plan shall be for public open space provision of not less than a minimum of 10% of net site area³ and not more than a minimum of 15% of net site area save in exceptional circumstances.*

I note that this site originally formed part of a larger overall development on a site of 2 hectares under 00/1319. There is a larger area of 0.16 hectares open space at the rear of the site, and an area of passive open space of .02 hectares at the front of the site, adjacent no. 6 Lisnaree. This, along with .0486ha within the subject site, totals .22 hectares, or 11% of the original site area. Again, this falls short of the RCDP target but meets that of the CSGs and the quantity is consistent with that permitted under 01/1099 (I note this is labelled as 15% on the site layout drawing on 01/1099).

In relation to the quality of the permitted open space at the location of the proposed dwelling, I consider that the location of this space in proximity to the main entrance to the estate, where vehicles pick up speed after entering, and adjacent a junction, would limit its potential for safe active use. The space therefore would primarily benefit more passive use and visual amenity.

³ For clarity, while densities are to be calculated based on net site area, as per the Compact Settlement Guidelines, the net site area in this case is the same as gross as there are no relevant areas for exclusion having regard to Table 1 of Appendix B of the CSGs

9.7. Residential standards

The proposed dwelling is 2 bedroom and meets required standards for a single storey 2 bedroom 4 person dwelling in terms of overall floor area, aggregate living area and bedroom sizes, having regard to standards within the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Guidelines. The dwelling lacks internal storage however, 4 sq m is required.

10.0 AA Screening

- 10.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of S.177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The subject site is located within an established urban area. The application site is located c. 2km from Annaghmore Lough SAC. The proposed development comprises the construction of dwelling and vehicular entrance in an existing housing development. Water and wastewater connections to the public network are proposed.
- 10.2. No submissions relating to Appropriate Assessment were received.
- 10.3. 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:
- The urban infill nature and scale of the works.
 - The location of the site within a built-up residential area connected to existing public water services.
 - Distance from European sites and waterbodies and lack of any hydrological connectivity.
- 10.4. 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, as amended) is not required.

11.0 Water Framework Directive

- 11.1. The surface waterbody Scramogue_020 is c. 600m west of the site (Status good) (Moderate water body status and the surface waterbody Strokestown_101 is c. 425 east of the site (status poor). The groundwater body is Carrick on Shannon (IE_SH_G_048) (status good).
- 11.2. The subject site is located on zoned land within a settlement. The proposed development comprises the construction of a dwelling and vehicular entrance. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal or by observers.
- 11.3. 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 water and ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- 11.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The small scale of the works and their nature
 - The location of the site, distance from nearest water bodies and lack of hydrological connections.
 - Proposed connection to public wastewater network.
- 11.5. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

12.0 Conclusion and Recommendation

- There is a history of planning permission for a dwelling at this location under 00/1319, 04/619, 17/2.

- Public open space within the overall 'parent' site is as per the original permission for 28 dwellings and exceeds 10%.
- The site is within a low density housing development where all houses have a good standard of private open space.
- The contribution to placemaking of the permitted public open space under 24/60235 and 25/60047 at the location of the proposed dwelling is marginal.
- The potential for active use of the permitted public open space at the location of the proposed dwelling is limited.

On balance, having regard to the history of the site, the adequacy of public open space within, and the marginal contribution of the permitted open space to placemaking, I consider that, in the current climate, the provision of housing outweighs the benefit of the land as public open space. As such, subject to revisions of design and boundary treatment, I recommend that permission be granted.

The application is a modification of 24/60235 and 25/60047 and as such the duration of permission is recommended to be linked to same. I note the conditions attached to 24/60235 are suitable for the proposed development, including part V, occupation by individual purchasers etc. Condition 18 requires boundary treatments to be agreed (wooden fences are currently shown to the front of dwellings). I consider an additional contribution and bond payment is appropriate - previous unfinished development on site/site restoration plan is noted. There is one condition attached to 25/60047, relating to the change of house type, which is not relevant.

13.0 **Reasons and Considerations:**

Having regard to the zoning objective relating to the site, the planning history of the site, the adequacy of public and private open space within the overall parent development and the need to deliver housing, it is considered that the principle of the development is acceptable and that subject to conditions the development would not detract from visual amenity or placemaking in the area and would therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and development of the area.

14.0 Conditions.

1	<p>Apart from any departures specifically authorised by this permission, the development shall comply with the conditions of the parent permission Register Reference 24/60235 unless the conditions set out hereunder specify otherwise.</p> <p>Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>This permission shall expire on the same date as the parent permission.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity and to ensure that the overall development is carried out in accordance with the previous permission.</p>
2	<p>The development shall be modified as follows to the written agreement of the Planning Authority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) The dwelling design shall be revised to provide active frontage and improved design articulation on the north-eastern elevation, including the relocation of a bedroom window.b) A dedicated area of internal storage of 4 sq m shall be provided.c) The proposed 2m curved roadside boundary wall shall be set back such that it does not protrude forward of the front building line of no. 15 Lisnaree and terminates at the rear building line of the dwelling hereby permitted.d) A landscaped area shall be provided on the public side of the wall. <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity/quality of public realm.</p>
3	<p>Prior to the commencement of development the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreement with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connections to the public water supply and wastewater collection network.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities</p>

4	<p>Prior to commencement of development, and having regard to Condition 22 of PL Ref 24/60235, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority an additional cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or other security to secure the provision and satisfactory completion and maintenance until taken in charge by the local authority of roads, footpaths, watermains, drains, public open space and other services required in connection with the development, coupled with an agreement empowering the local authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory completion or maintenance of any part of the development. The form and amount of the security shall be as agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion and maintenance of the development until taken in charge.</p>
5	<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 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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

Bébhinn O'Shea

Senior Planning Inspector

27th May 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	500899
Proposed Development Summary	Dwelling house
Development Address	Lisnaree, Lisroyne, Strokestown, Co. Roscommon.
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)	

<p>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</p>	
<p><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.</p>	<p>State the Class here</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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p>	<p>Class 10 (b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units</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>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	500899
Proposed Development Summary	Dwelling house
Development Address	Lisnaree, Lisroyne, Strokestown, Co. Roscommon.
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	The development is modest in scale, comes forward as a standalone project, does not require demolition works, does not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature	The development is at the edge of a small settlement, removed from sensitive natural habitats and designated sites and landscapes of identified significance in the County Development Plan.

<p>reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).</p>	
<p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p>	<p>Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development, its location, normal construction practices, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>	
<p>Likelihood of Significant Effects</p>	<p>Conclusion in respect of EIA</p>
<p>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p>	<p>EIA is not required.</p>
<p>There is significant and realistic doubt</p>	

regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____