



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

**PL-501061-GC-26**

### Development

The removal of the existing front boundary wall, excavation/dig back of ground levels, and the construction of a new carport and bin storage, together with all associated site works.

### Location

34 St Mary's Road, Galway. Co. Galway.

### Planning Authority

Galway City Council

### Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

26 60013

### Applicant(s)

Eoghain Ryan.

### Type of Application

Permission.

### Planning Authority Decision

Refuse

### Type of Appeal

First

### Appellant(s)

Eoghain Ryan.

### Observer(s)

None

**Date of Site Inspection**

29<sup>th</sup> May 2026.

**Inspector**

Aisling Dineen

## Contents

|                                         |    |
|-----------------------------------------|----|
| 1.0 Site Location and Description ..... | 4  |
| 2.0 Proposed Development .....          | 4  |
| 3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....   | 4  |
| 4.0 Planning History.....               | 6  |
| 5.0 Policy Context.....                 | 7  |
| 6.0 EIA Screening.....                  | 10 |
| 7.0 The Appeal .....                    | 10 |
| 8.0 Assessment .....                    | 12 |
| 9.0 AA Screening.....                   | 16 |
| 10.0 Water Framework Directive .....    | 17 |
| 11.0 Recommendation .....               | 17 |
| 12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....    | 18 |

## Appendix 1 –EIA Screening

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The site is located on St. Marys Road, Galway City in a designated Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). The ACA consists of a grouping of 5 no dwellings on the west side of St Marys Road, three of which are terraced and two are detached dwellings. The subject site forms part of the terrace of three dwellings and it occupies an end of terrace position.
- 1.2. The terrace is at an elevated position from road level and front gardens of the dwellings contain pedestrian access steps.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. The proposal comprises the removal of the existing front boundary wall with excavation of a significant portion of the front ground levels with 'dig back' towards the front elevation of the existing house and the construction of a new car port with associated bin storage and an EV charging point in the area to the front of the established house, and all associated site works, at No 34 St Mary's Road, Galway.
- 2.2. The proposed car port/bin storage area would measure 5.9 metres in width and have a height (covered port) of between 2.1 to 2.2 metres.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Decision**

The planning authority made a decision to refuse permission on the 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2026 for the following reason:

The site is located within a designated Architectural Conservation Area, indicated in the Galway City Development Plan 2023 – 2029, Section 8.3, Fig 8.11, where it is the policy, set out in Policy 8.2, points No.1 and 3, “to Protect and enhance the character and special interest of designated Architectural Conservation Areas”, and, “Ensure that developments within an Architectural Conservation Area respects and enhances the character and special interest of the ACA”. If permitted, the development would have significant adverse impacts on the building and character

of the ACA which is contrary to and would contravene the above stated policies of the Galway City Development Plan 2023 – 2029.

The Chief Executive's decision reflects the planner's report

### **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

#### **3.2.1. Planning Reports**

The site is within an area zoned R: 'To provide for residential development and for associated support development, which will ensure the protection of existing residential amenity and will contribute to sustainable residential neighbourhoods'.

The planners report refers to reports received from internal departments within Galway City Council.

The report refers to policy reference Section 8.2 of the plan; Architectural Conservation Areas'. This policy aims to: Protect and enhance the character and special interest of designated Architectural Conservation Areas, in accordance with legislation and DEHLG Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines 2011.

And,

Ensure that developments within an Architectural Conservation Area, respects and enhances the character and special interest of the ACA.

The planners report concludes that the proposed development would contrary to the above referenced policies and should be refused permission.

#### **3.2.2. Other Technical Reports**

##### Transport Department, Galway City Council

- No Objection – No effect on road traffic.

##### Architectural Conservation, Galway City Council

- No.34 St. Mary's Road is an end of terrace dwelling located in the St. Mary's Road Architectural Conservation Area (ACA), The ACA comprises of a terrace of three dwellings and two detached dwellings dating to the early 20th century, with the Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029 noting the streetscape importance of these buildings and their boundary curtilage in that 'this group of houses retain their historic fabric, with rendered facades,

decorative quoins and panelled front boundary walls. They have a setback address and are elevated above St. Mary's Road giving an intact, unified character to the streetscape'.

- Similarly, No.34 is recorded in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage ('Regional' rating of significance) with its description noting the presence of a 'rendered and red-brick enclosing wall to front with cast-iron railings and gate' with the appraisal noting 'the simple string course at first floor level links the three houses of the terrace creating a visual unity emphasised by the same design and similar form of the front boundary walls'. The railing appears to have been removed since the NIAH record, however notwithstanding this, the removal of the front garden and creation of car parking will have a significant impact on the building and the character of the ACA, and from a built heritage perspective would be contrary to Policy 8.2 (1 and 3) of the Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029.

Heritage Officer, Galway City Council

- The boundary wall is an essential part of the curtilage and in my view adds to the building and its character and significance as well as to the general character of the streetscape.
- It is essential to keep the boundary wall and not to allow car parking and new hard surfaces to dominate the streetscape.

### **3.3. Prescribed Bodies**

None

### **3.4. Third Party Observations**

None

## **4.0 Planning History**

None on subject site.

Adjacent history referred to in appeal submission and will be discussed under the assessment below.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

#### Galway City Development Plan 2023 – 2029

#### Section 2.4 (Figure 2.1)

Support the just transition to a climate resilient, biodiversity rich, carbon neutral economy.

#### Section 8.3

An Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) is a place, area, group of structures or townscapes which is either of special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical interest in its own right or which contributes to the appreciation of protected structures. The designation of an ACA ensures that the special character of an area is protected and can be enhanced through sympathetic redevelopment. As part of measures to protect and enhance the built heritage, ACAs can revitalise areas and be a catalyst for economic investment. The protection afforded by an ACA applies to the exterior of structures and generally does not apply to works to the interior, unless they impact on the external appearance of the structure.

Galway has eleven designated ACAs, which in terms of streetscape, arrangement of streets and spaces, composition of buildings and structures and architectural styles create a character worthy of protection. These areas of special character require management, protection and enhancement. They represent different periods in, and functions of, the development of the city and assist in protecting the strong legacy of architectural heritage of the city and preserving the defining character of the urban environment.

#### St. Mary's Road Number 34-38 ACA

Number 34-38 St. Mary's Road (Fig 8.11) comprise a terrace of three dwellings and two detached dwellings dating to the early 20th century. This group of houses retain their historic fabric, with rendered facades, decorative quoins and panelled front boundary walls. They have a setback address and are elevated above St. Mary's Road giving an intact, unified character to the streetscape.

## Policy 8.2 Architectural Conservation Areas (ACAs)

1. Protect and enhance the character and special interest of designated Architectural Conservation Areas, in accordance with legislation and DEHLG Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines 2011.
2. Prepare and implement management plans for the conservation and enhancement of designated Architectural Conservation Areas.
3. Ensure that developments within an Architectural Conservation Area, respects and enhances the character and special interest of the ACA.
4. Ensure the character of Architectural Conservation Areas is preserved by protecting and conserving historic street furniture and paving features and ensure that new street furniture and surfacing is designed to be compatible with the character of the ACA

### Section 8.8. Urban Design and placemaking

The Plan seeks to actively promote the awareness and understanding of the contribution of good design to the general well-being of the city. It places emphasis on urban design and sustainable placemaking supporting high quality modern architecture and incorporating architectural heritage in a holistic integrated manner.

## 5.2. **Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines (where relevant)**

### Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011)

#### Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht.

Section 1.3.1 (b) Planning authorities are obliged to preserve the character of places and townscapes, which are of special architectural, historic, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical interest or that contribute to the appreciation of protected structures, by designating them architectural conservation areas (ACAs) in their development plan.

### Section 3.10: Criteria for Assessing Proposals within an Architectural Conservation Area.

When it is proposed to erect a new building in an ACA, the design of the structure will be of paramount importance. Generally, it is preferable to minimise the visual



impact of the proposed structure on its setting. The greater the degree of uniformity in the setting, the greater the presumption in favour of a harmonious design.

The scale of new structures should be appropriate to the general scale of the area and not its biggest buildings. The palette of materials and typical details for façades and other surfaces should generally reinforce the area's character.

Section 3.10.2 Where it is proposed to demolish a structure that contributes to the character of an ACA or to demolish behind a retained façade, the onus should be on the applicant to make the case for demolition. The planning authority should consider the effect both on the character of the area and on any adjacent protected structures. When it is proposed to demolish an undistinguished building in an ACA, the proposed replacement should not be of lesser quality or interest than the existing one and should not adversely affect the character of the area.

The applicant and the planning authority should consider the material effect that that proposed demolition may have on the character of the ACA:

- (a) Does the structure (or part of the structure) to be demolished contribute to the character of the area?
- (b) What effect would removal of the structure have on the setting of other structures in the area, the balance of an architectural composition or the setting of any adjacent protected structures?
- (c) Would the character and special interest of the whole of the structure or of the ACA be diminished by the demolition of a part?

Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoEHLG, 2004).

### **5.3. Natural Heritage Designations**

Galway Bay Complex SAC (Site Code: 000268), c. 2.6 km south.

Inner Galway Bay SPA (Site Code: 004031), c. 2.6 km south.

Galway Bay Complex pNHA (Site Code: 000268), c. 2.6 km south.

## **6.0 EIA Screening**

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

## **7.0 The Appeal**

### **7.1. Grounds of Appeal**

- The reasoning of the decision is not well founded, is inconsistent with Galway City Councils own planning history on St Mary's Road and fails to engage with the material considerations set out in the planning application.
- The site is accepted to be within the identified ACA covering Nos 34-38 St Marys Road as depicted under Fig 8.11 of the Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029. It is accepted that Policy 8.2 applies. It is submitted that Policy 8.2 is not a blanket prohibition on all works within the ACA (Architectural Conservation Area) and that the planning authority has failed to undertake an assessment of whether the development 'respects and enhances' the character and special interest of the area, with reference to established facts on the ground.
- The ACA description identifies the 'character and special interest' of the group as residing in the historic fabric of the buildings themselves – specifically the rendered façades, decorative quoins, and the elevated set back set back address of the houses above St. Mary's Road. It is submitted that the proposed car port does not alter, damage or obscure any of these features, does not affect the built form of the house, does not break the roofline, and is subordinate to the principal elevation. The proposed structure is at low level within the front curtilage and does not break the roofline and is subordinate to the principal elevation.

- The decision to refuse planning permission is inconsistent with the planning authority's own prior decision on St Marys Road, including at properties within and immediately adjacent to the ACA Group at Nos 34 – 38.
- No 36 St Mary's Road: Planning permission was granted under planning register reference number 98/14 for the retention of a reduced level to the front garden and removal of garden wall as carried out at No 36 St Marys Road. This property forms part of the identical ACA grouping identified in Figure 8.11. It is submitted that this permission established the following:
  - Alteration of the front garden is acceptable in the ACA context
  - Removal of the panelled front boundary wall was permitted
  - The planning authority previously judged that such alterations did not materially harm the character and special interest of the ACA.
- No 37 St. Marys Road: Under planning register reference number 07/411 permission was granted for the demolition of an existing garage and the construction of a two bay parking area with electronic sliding gates, this was followed by two retention applications for retention and completion of changes to site entrance, steps and gate under 08/309 and further retention under 09/466 for stone facing to car park walls and steps.
- It is submitted that the planning authority's assertion that the proposal would have a significant adverse impact on the character of the ACA is not supported by a detailed assessment. The proposed development does not alter the rendered façade, quoins or principal elevation of the house in any way. The special interest of the building is entirely preserved.
- The 'unified' wall arrangement as described under Fig 8.11 of the plan is already interrupted and has been for two decades. Locations where the front wall boundary have been interrupted are indicated.
- The carport is designed to be modest and scale and subordinate to the principal elevation.
- The proposal complies with various policy in the plan including EV charging and climate policy.

- The proposal promotes safe access and movement in residential areas and improves safety for children and pedestrians.

## 7.2. Planning Authority Response

None

## 7.3. Observations

None

## 8.0 Assessment

Having examined all the application and appeal documentation on file and having regard to the relevant local and national policy and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal and the planning authority's reason and considerations, and I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise. AA also needs to be considered.

The main issues, therefore, are as follows:

- Impacts on Architectural Heritage
- Traffic/Pedestrian/Cyclist Safety

### Impacts on Architectural Heritage

- 8.1. The planning authority issued a decision to refuse planning permission based essentially on one central issue, which is that, in essence, the proposal would have significant adverse impacts on the building and character of the ACA. The Galway City Council Architectural Conservation Department report on file refers to the development and notes the streetscape importance of these buildings and their boundary curtilage. In addition, the Heritage Officer, Galway City Council states that *'The boundary wall is an essential part of the curtilage and in my view adds to the building and its character and significance as well as to the general character of the streetscape'*. This report continues; *'It is essential to keep the boundary wall and not to allow car parking and new hard surfaces to dominate the streetscape'*.
- 8.2. The dwelling house on the site is a protected structure in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage ('Regional' rating of significance) with its description noting the

presence of a 'rendered and red-brick enclosing wall to front with cast-iron railings and gate' with the description noting 'the simple string course at first floor level links the three houses of the terrace creating a visual unity emphasised by the same design and similar form of the front boundary walls'. It is noted that the cast iron railing has been removed from the front boundary since the record was observed. However, the front boundary containing wall is in situ.

- 8.3. The appellant submits that there will be no impacts on the house itself and that the proposal will not alter, damage or obscure any of the protected features. I would agree with the appellant in this regard with reference to the actual features of the physical house, but I consider that the actual curtilage of the building is an intrinsic part of its character and setting and, in this instance, I consider the removal of the front boundary and the encroachment into the front curtilage and the significant alteration of ground levels, with the proposed car port measuring approximately 2.1 x 5.9 metres, would certainly negatively impact the character and setting of the building on site.
- 8.4. The subject site is situated within the designated ACA at St Mary's Road, Galway. The plan describes the ACA, located at St. Marys Road as comprising, '*A terrace of three dwellings and two detached dwellings dating to the early 20th century. This group of houses retain their historic fabric, with rendered facades, decorative quoins and panelled front boundary walls. They have a setback address and are elevated above St. Mary's Road giving an intact, unified character to the streetscape*'.
- 8.5. Having inspected the site and the streetscape and having reviewed all of the information on file, I am of the viewpoint that the issue at hand is whether the proposed car port would or would not detract from the building and the special interest and character of the subject ACA.
- 8.6. With regard to the claim by the appellant that the historical precedent justifies the proposed development I have the following opinion. The planning precedent cited dates back to 1998 (Planning Register Reference Nos 98/14, 07/411, 08/309 and 09/466). Both the 1998/14 in addition to the 2007/411 planning precedents predate the current Galway City Development Plan 2023 – 2029. They also predate the previous development plan. Importantly, these decisions also predate that current Architectural Heritage Guideless for Planning Authorities (2011). Furthermore,

planning reference 1998/14 predates the original Architectural Heritage Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2004). This guideline for planning authorities was first published in 2004 by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government. It was created as a practical guide for planning authorities and developers to comply with Part IV of the Planning and Development Act 2000. In this context, it is reasonable to say that guidance in law and in policy has evolved considerably since these decisions were made and it is also reasonable to say that such law and policy have evolved in the interest of the preservation of architectural heritage and of sustainable development.

- 8.7. With regard to planning register reference number 98/14 at No 36 St Mary's Road, which the appellant submits relates to the same identical ACA grouping, as per Figure 8.11 of the Development Plan, the appellant submits that this precedent allowed for the alteration of the historic front garden arrangement, the removal of the panelled front boundary wall and in doing so the planning authority judged that these alterations did not materially harm the character or the special interest of the ACA.
- 8.8. With regard to the stated precedent at No 37 St. Mary's Road, it is not considered this is a like-with-like comparison. No 37, albeit within the subject ACA, is a detached dwelling house set within a clearly defined separated curtilage from adjacent dwellings. Additionally, it does not have the same steep increase in front ground levels, as the subject dwelling. Therefore, the inclusion of an access to the front and side of the that dwelling is not directly comparable to the inclusion of an access directly in front of the subject appeal dwelling, nor did it require significant encroachment into ground levels in the curtilage of the house directly forward of its building line. These are material differences based on the site-specific contexts.
- 8.9. While the issue of planning precedent is relevant in general terms, it is important in this instance to impress that poor planning decisions historically are not sufficient reason to justify ongoing poor bad planning decisions or to compound a situation whereby a precedent would be established under present day policy and practice, which could lead to the further degradation of the character and special interest of an ACA.

- 8.10. I note that the proposed design is a sensitive one and avoids the inclusion of a large enclosed front gate and I also note that EV charging requires certain service facilities. However, I also note that the removal of the front boundary wall and significant excavation of ground levels at the front of the site, to allow for the car port would be required (2.1 x 5.9 metres). The wall removal and ground excavation, to the proposed extent, would depart from the established pattern of development and ground levels and would, in my view, materially alter the set-back area, established to the front of the subject dwelling and the adjacent dwelling at number 35 St. Mary's Road, which contribute to the special interest and distinctive character of the ACA, notwithstanding the addition of such a car port at No 36, nearly thirty years ago.
- 8.11. It is noted that the description of the ACA includes the feature of the distinctive set back; *'They have a setback address and are elevated above St. Mary's Road giving an intact, unified character to the streetscape'*. It is considered that, this set back address and elevated levels are intrinsic elements of the special interest and character of the ACA, which give it unified character. It is considered that such an intrusion of the streetscape would undoubtedly detract from the unified character of the streetscape and the visual harmony of the ACA. In this regard, I concur with the planning authority that to permit the car port/bin storage area would in fact have a significant adverse impact on the building and character of the ACA.
- 8.12. Furthermore, I would have concerns that such a current precedent would have on the entire ACA at St. Marys Road, whereby carports could potentially dominate the streetscape of this ACA, were the proposal to be permitted.
- 8.13. Traffic/Pedestrian/Cyclist Safety
- 8.14. It is noted that the report on file from the Galway City Council Roads Department has no objection to the proposed development from a road's perspective.
- 8.15. There is a bend on the serving road to the south of the site and this is also within a context whereby three junction's confluence in close proximity; 1 St. Marys Road and Palmyra, 2. St. Marys Road and Sherwood Avenue and 3, St. Marys Road and Taylors Hill/The Crescent.
- 8.16. I am of the viewpoint that the subject site is on a heavily trafficked urban route and is in very close to the junction between Saint Mary's Road and Taylor's Hill Road. It is also diagonally opposite the junction between Saint Mary's Road and Palmyra

Avenue, which has a yellow box road mark. Scoil Fhursa primary school is also c.80 metres from the subject site and naturally there would be increased footfall on the public pedestrian pathway in such close proximity to the said school.

- 8.17. It is apparent that the proposal would create additional turning and reversing movements on this heavily trafficked route in proximity to additional road traffic junctions. Therefore, I consider that the proposal would interfere with public safety by reason of traffic hazard and would interfere with the free flow of traffic, including cycle traffic, by virtue of additional turning and manoeuvring at this location.
- 8.18. Furthermore, it is noted that the proposal would require that vehicular traffic would traverse a public footpath in order to access the site. I am of the viewpoint that this would also impact public safety as it would compromise pedestrian safety at this location. However, given the substantive reason for refusal, the board may decide not to pursue this issue.

## **9.0 AA Screening**

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.2. The subject site is located in an established urban area.
- 9.3. The proposed development comprises works to the front of a dwelling house consisting of the removal of front boundary and excavation of soil to provide a car port and bin storage area and all associated site works.
- 9.4. 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.
- 9.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Nature of works
  - Location in an established urban area
  - Lack of connections to nearest European sites



## 10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The subject site is located at No 34 St Marys Road, Galway, c 2.6 km from Galway Bay.
- 10.2. The proposed development comprises works to the front of a dwelling house consisting of the removal of front boundary and excavation of soil to provide a car port and bin storage area and all associated site works.
- 10.3. I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration.
- 10.4. 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.
- 10.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Nature of works
  - Location-distance from nearest water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections

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

## 11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend that permission be refused.

## 12.0 Reasons and Considerations

The site is located within a designated Architectural Conservation Area, indicated in the Galway City Development Plan 2023 – 2029, Section 8.3, Fig 8.11, where it is the policy, set out in Policy 8.2, points No.1 and 3, “To protect and enhance the character and special interest of designated Architectural Conservation Areas”, and, “Ensure that developments within an Architectural Conservation Area respect and enhances the character and special interest of the ACA”. If permitted, the development would have significant adverse impacts on the building and character of the ACA, which would contravene the above stated policies of the Galway City Development Plan 2023 – 2029 and would set undesirable precedent for similar 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.

---

Aisling Dineen  
Planning Inspector  
8<sup>th</sup> June 2026

## Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Case Reference</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | <b>PL-501061-GC-26</b>                                                                                                                                                 |
| <b>Proposed Development Summary</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | The removal of the existing front boundary wall, excavation/dig back of ground levels, and the construction of a new carport, together with all associated site works. |
| <b>Development Address</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 34 St Mary's Road, Galway, Co. Galway.                                                                                                                                 |
| <b>IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                        |
| <b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.                                                                                            |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> No, no further action required.                                                                                                               |
| <p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,</li> <li>- Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)</li> </ul> |                                                                                                                                                                        |
| <b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.<br><b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>                                                                                                                                                                       | <b>State the Class here</b>                                                                                                                                            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                        |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>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?</b> |                                                                           |
| <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.<br><b>No Screening required.</b>                                  |                                                                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.<br><b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b>                                                                                                                       | <b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b>                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.<br><b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b><br><b>OR</b><br><b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b>                                  | <b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b>                   |
| <b>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)?</b>                                                                                                               |                                                                           |
| <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                           |
| <b>No</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b> |

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_