



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501102-DR-26

Development	Demolition of lean-to extensions and construction of new extensions with associated works.
Location	Kanta, 5 Silchester Crescent, Glenageary, Co. Dublin, A96D5K3
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D26A/0013/WEB
Applicant(s)	Blue Evans & Fiachra O'Shaughnessy
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party/Variation
Appellant(s)	Blue Evans & Fiachra O'Shaughnessy
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	6 th June 2026
Inspector	Barry Diamond

Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0	Planning History	7
5.0	Policy Context.....	8
6.0	EIA Screening.....	10
7.0	The Appeal	10
8.0	Assessment.....	11
9.0	AA Screening.....	14
10.0	Water Framework Directive	15
11.0	Recommendation	16
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	16

Appendix 1 –EIA Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site is circa 0.117ha and comprises an existing detached bungalow which is set back off Silchester Crescent. The property contains a garage which is not attached to the dwelling, however, the garage is attached to another garage which is associated with a nearby dwelling No. 4 Silchester Crescent.
- 1.2. The application site has a fairly extensive garden area on a relatively flat site. The boundaries are defined by a 1.8 metre high concrete block wall with landscaping set within the inner boundary which forms significant screening to the site. The application site is bounded by No. 4 Silchester Crescent to the southeast, No. 6 to the northwest and Nos. 36-40 to the southwest.
- 1.3. The application site is accessed along Silchester Crescent which is a residential cul-de-sac defined by detached and semi-detached dwellings of various styles.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises a number of different elements including:
 - The demolition of the existing single storey rear and side sunroom extensions and small attached shed/outbuilding, the demolition of associated single storey garage building;
 - The construction of a two-storey extension to the eastern, northern and western elevations of the existing dwelling, with single storey extensions to the western and southern elevations, fenestration changes to all elevations, with associated dormer windows (to the northern elevation) and rooflights, together with an increase in ridge height to facilitate first-floor;
 - The construction of a single storey ancillary, non-habitable garden room;
 - The widening of the existing front vehicular entrance from 2.74m to 3.45m; and
 - All associated site development works, associated drainage, landscaping, and ancillary works to facilitate the development.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On the 10th March 2026 the Planning Authority issued a decision to grant planning permission subject to conditions.

3.1.1. Conditions

2. Prior to commencement of development revised drawings shall be submitted with the planning authority for written agreement, showing the proposed roof extensions reduced as follows: (a) The gable apex of both the east and west ends of the proposed main roof extension for the upstairs bedrooms, reduced and changed from gable apex ends, into a half-hip roof ends, from just above the line of the first floor bedroom windows (and in-line to just above the proposed dormers structures on the north elevation) (and in-line with the eaves shown on the submitted Section AA drawing). (b) The roof of the proposed single-storey, south end living/ dining extension changed from a gable-apex end, into a hipped roof (similar to hipped roof of the single-storey, rear/south extension of no. 4 Silchester Crescent), and also to omit the south extension gable end chimney height where it rises above the south extension roof ridge level to reduce the chimney height.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and harmony, and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The decision of the planner reflects the decision to grant planning permission. It includes the following points:

- The proposed development does not create undue negative impacts in terms of energy use/performance;
- A condition can be attached requiring that demolished materials be reused on site where possible;
- The current proposal differs from the earlier refusal of permission as it is not a full demolition, with the core of the dwelling being retained to the north side end and front/east end of the house, the footprint of the previously refused proposal is somewhat different along with other design changes;
- The position of the detached garden room is positioned further north away from the south side boundary;

- The existing dwelling is relatively modest on a generous site;
- The bulk of the proposed extensions roofs can be reduced by condition which will help reduce overshadowing;
- The roof form is substantially enlarged;
- Given the position of the proposal relative to the side and rear gardens of adjacent properties, a condition requiring the eastern and western ends of the main roof to the upstairs bedroom be changed to a half hip;
- The roof of the single-storey, south end living/dining extension should be changed by condition to omit the chimney height where it rises above the ridge level and to change the southern facing gable to a hipped roof;
- The changes proposed through the use of conditions will help address third party concerns, reduce the visual impacts and potential impacts on the character;
- The small north facing 'eyelid' dormer serving an ensuite should be finished in obscure glazing to preserve residential amenity;
- The garden room is considered to be acceptable and a condition requiring that it should not be used for habitation or separately used for purposes ancillary to the main house should be attached to the grant of permission;
- The external finishes are considered acceptable;
- The proposed widening of the vehicular access is considered acceptable;
- The Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment has been assessed and the development is considered to be in accordance with Appendix 15 of the County Development Pla (CDP);
- The proposal does not lead to any significant concerns in relation to Appropriate Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Water Services Section: no objection subject to conditions.
- Transportation Planning Section: no objection subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

3.4. Third Party Observations

There were two representations received during the processing of the application by the Planning Authority the issues raised are as follows;

- The proposal is only marginally different from that refused under application Ref: D25A/0599/WEB;
- The proposal will give rise to overlooking contrary to Section 12.3.7 of the CDP;
- The proposal is 3.5 metres higher than the existing dwelling and will be overbearing and lead to overshadowing contrary to Section 12.3.7.4 of the CDP;
- The sunlight analysis does not appear to be accurate, does not show analysis before 9am and cannot be relied upon;
- The development does not respect the established pattern of development in the area contrary to Section 12.3.7 (i) of the CDP in relation to replacement dwellings;
- The extension to No. 3 Silchester Crescent is not comparable to the current proposal which has significant increases in the ridge height of the building;
- An engineering drawing is required to show that the extension walls can support a two storey dwelling;
- The existing walls will not be retained and the proposal is a new build and not an extension;
- The set back from the boundary with No. 6 is under 1.0 metre;
- The finishes do not match the existing finishes of Nos; 4 & 6 Silchester Crescent; and
- The scale of the development is not representative of the other dwellings in the area.

4.0 Planning History

Site

D25A/0599/WEB – Permission was refused on the 22 Sep 2025 for a proposed development consisting of A) The demolition of the existing single storey dwelling house, associated single storey garage building and garden wall inside the site. B) The construction of a part two storey, part single storey dwelling house with associated dormer windows to north elevation and rooflights to east and west elevations. C) The construction of a single storey ancillary, non-habitable garden room. D) The widening of the existing front vehicular entrance. E) The construction of a new courtyard garden wall. F) All associated site development works, associated drainage, landscaping, and ancillary works at Kanta, 5 Silchester Crescent, Glenageary, Dublin, A96D5K3 for the following reason:

1. Having regard to the nature of the proposed development, which includes the demolition of an existing dwelling house and construction of a replacement dwelling, the proposed development does not accord with Policy Objective CA6: 'Retrofit and Reuse of Buildings', which 'require the retrofitting and reuse of existing buildings, rather than their demolition and reconstruction where possible', nor would it accord with the provisions of Section 12.3.9 Demolition and Replacement Dwellings of the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, in that a strong justification has not been provided for the demolition of the existing dwelling on site, and it has not been demonstrated that the existing dwelling has fallen into such a state of disrepair so as to render it uninhabitable or structurally unsound. Therefore, to permit the development, as proposed, would set an undesirable precedent for other similar development. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the provisions of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, and to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area

Setting

D21A/0830 – Permission was granted in January 2022 for the alterations and additions to a single storey semi-detached dwelling comprising the demolition of an existing single storey semi-detached garage structure to the gable end, and the construction of a new dormer extension to the gable end of the original dwelling comprising a new utility room and kitchen/dining area to ground floor level, and 2no. dormer bedrooms at first floor level. The proposed works will also comprise the

extension of the existing ground floor accommodation to the rear, and the construction of new single storey bay window extension to the front elevation, together alterations to the existing window openings to the front & rear elevations and the provision of new velux rooflights to the front and rear of the existing main roof structure, together with all ancillary site works including connections to existing services. The proposed development will also comprise the partial blocking-up of the existing vehicular site entrance gate to the front boundary of the property, and the provision of a new pedestrian entrance gate in lieu of same. together with the formation a new and separate vehicular entrance gate from the public road at 3 Silchester Crescent, Glenageary, Co. Dublin (A96 V0R1).

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The relevant Development Plan is the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028. The site is zoned 'A' with the objective to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities. Residential development, including alterations to existing dwellings, is permitted in principle under this zoning.

Chapter 3 Climate Action

Section 3.4 Achieving Sustainable Planning Outcomes

Section 3.4.1.3 Policy Objective CA7: Construction Materials.

Chapter 4 Neighbourhood – People, Homes and Place

Section 4.3.1.2 Policy Objective PHP19 – Existing Housing Stock – Adaptation

Section 4.3.1.3 Policy Objective PHP20 – Protection of Existing Residential Amenity

Chapter 12 (Development Management)

Section 12.3.7.1 Extensions to Dwellings

- (i) Front extensions, at both ground and first level will be considered acceptable in principle subject to scale, design, and impact on visual and residential amenities. A break in the front building line will be acceptable, over two floors to the front elevation, subject to scale and design however a significant break in the building line should be resisted unless the design can demonstrate to the Planning Authority that the proposal will not impact on the visual or residential amenities of directly adjoining dwellings. Excessive scale should be avoided.

- (ii) Ground floor rear extensions will be considered in terms of their length, height, proximity to mutual boundaries and quantum of usable rear private open space remaining.
- (iii) Ground floor side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size, and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation) and impacts on adjoining residential amenity.
- (iii) First floor side extensions built over existing structures and matching existing dwelling design and height will generally be acceptable. However, in certain cases a set-back of an extension's front façade and its roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities, integrate into the streetscape, and avoid a 'terracing' effect. External finishes shall normally be in harmony with existing.
- Roof alterations/expansions to main roof profiles - changing the hip-end roof of a semi-detached house to a gable/ 'A' frame end or 'half-hip' for example – will be assessed against a number of criteria including:
 - Careful consideration and special regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.
 - Existing roof variations on the streetscape.
 - Distance/contrast/visibility of proposed roof end.
 - Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures, and prominence

Section 12.4.8.1 – General Specifications

Section 12.4.8.3 – Driveways/Hardstanding Areas.

Section 12.8.7 – Private Amenity Standards – Quality Standards.

Section 12.8.7.1 – Separation Distances. Section 12.8.7.2 – Boundaries.

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

Best Practice Guidelines for Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities 2007.

5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

The appeal site is not located on or within proximity to any designated Natura 2000 site. The subject site is situated c. 2.6km to the west of the Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (site code SAC 003000) and the Dalkey Islands SPA (site code SPA 004172). It is also c. 2km to the southeast of the South Dublin Bay SAC (site code SAC

000210), the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (site code SPA 004024), and the South Dublin Bay pNHA (site code pNHA 000210) and is situated c. 0.8km to the south of the Dalkey Coastal Zone and Killiney Hill pNHA (site code pNHA 001206).

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

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal are submitted from the applicant in relation to the requirements of Condition No.2. The issues raised are summarised below:

- The reasons for imposing Condition 02 'in the interests of visual amenity and harmony', is not reflective of either the existing or emerging character;
- There are no hipped or half hipped roof forms visible from the public realm along Silchester Crescent;
- Recent residential development in the area at No. 3 Silchester Crescent (D21A/0830) involved a very similar proposal to the one previously refused on the application site;
- Silchester Crescent displays a varied architectural character that has evolved over time;
- The proposal aligns with Policy Objective CA6 which promotes the retrofit and reuse of existing buildings;
- A number of appeals have been allowed by the Coimisiún for the removal of conditions which included roof amendments where key considerations were met;
- The southern façade which is required to have a half hip is some 30 metres from the rear elevations of neighbouring properties;

- There is only minor levels of overshadowing to the driveway serving No. 6 rather than any established private amenity areas; and
- While the revisions would result in a reduction in the scale and bulk of the proposal, the reduction is not warranted as the development is located on a generous site with substantial separation distances from neighbouring properties.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

While the new forms of development along Silchester Crescent has not predominantly included hipped or half hipped roofs, there is a dominant character of hipped roofs in the area which includes dwellings along Silchester Park, Nos 1 & 2 Silchester Crescent and hipped roof elements at No. 4 and the application site. The application site is somewhat removed from newer developments on Silchester Crescent. The proposed roof changes are to ameliorate any potential visual and character impacts with regard to roof height and bulk increases.

7.3. Observations

None

8.0 Assessment

- 8.1. This is a first party appeal against a condition of a grant of permission. Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) allows the Coimisiún (so long as it is satisfied that the application does not require an assessment as if it had been made to it in the first instance) to give the relevant planning authority direction regarding the attachment, amendment or removal of the condition. I am satisfied that the development (demolition of extensions and garage, construction of new extensions and garden room with associated works) is otherwise in accordance with the Development Plan and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, and I am satisfied that the appeal only relates to Condition 02 and does not raise any further issues. I am satisfied that the appeal may be dealt with under Section 139 of the Act, and I am going to limit my consideration to the appropriateness of the condition in question.

8.2. Condition No.2

Condition 02 states:

- 8.3 'Prior to commencement of development revised drawings shall be submitted with the planning authority for written agreement, showing the proposed roof extensions reduced as follows: (a) The gable apex of both the east and west ends of the proposed main roof extension for the upstairs bedrooms, reduced and changed from gable apex ends, into a half-hip roof ends, from just above the line of the first floor bedroom windows (and in-line to just above the proposed dormers structures on the north elevation) (and in-line with the eaves shown on the submitted Section AA drawing). (b) The roof of the proposed single-storey, south end living/ dining extension changed from a gable-apex end, into a hipped roof (similar to hipped roof of the single-storey, rear/south extension of no. 4 Silchester Crescent), and also to omit the south extension gable end chimney height where it rises above the south extension roof ridge level to reduce the chimney height.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and harmony, and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.'

- 8.4 The proposed development includes extensive extensions and alterations to an existing single storey dwelling which includes increasing the floorspace from 134.3 sqm to 360.3 sqm and increasing the ridge height from 5.52 metres to 8.61 metres. The resulting dwelling as extended is a one and a half storey dwelling with a linear footprint forming the main part of the dwelling with a single storey annex projecting from the southern elevation. The dwelling as proposed has gabled roofs at each end of the dwelling, along with a gabled roof to the single storey annex which also includes an external chimney.
- 8.5 Condition 02 effectively requires the applicant to submit to the Planning Authority amended drawings showing all three of the gable ends to the dwelling to be finished with a half-hipped roof as opposed to the gable roofs which is opposed by the applicant. The Planning Authority state that the condition is necessary as the application site is within an established character area which includes both Silchester Park and Silchester Crescent and the area is defined by hipped roofs.
- 8.6 I accept that Silchester Park is predominantly defined by semi-detached dwellings with hipped roofs, however, while the application site backs onto Silchester Park it is not visible from it and does not read with it when viewed from any of the surrounding

public vantage points. I consider that Silchester Crescent, where the application site is located and accesses onto, sets the appropriate context for establishing the design character in which the application sits.

- 8.7 Silchester Crescent is a cul-de-sac located off Silchester Park and has a much more varied style of dwelling types, which includes; detached and semi-detached dwellings, traditional and contemporary dwellings, dwellings with flat roofs, gabled roofs and hipped roofs along with a variety of external building finishes. In my opinion Silchester Crescent has an evolving character probably best described in terms of its variety of style, building forms and finishes with recent planning approvals allowing dwellings of contemporary design to be constructed at Nos, 3, 8, 9, 10 & 11.
- 8.8 I note that of the eleven dwellings located along Silchester Crescent, the Planning Authority identify that Nos. 1 & 2 Silchester Crescent have a hipped roof, while they identify hipped roof elements on the dwelling at No. 4 and the application site.
- 8.9 Given that there is only a limited number of hipped roofs along Silchester Crescent I do not consider that there is any established character of hipped roofs. I also note that there are no half-hips evident and the Planning Authority have not provided a rationale why the introduction of a half-hip would be applicable.
- 8.10 I am of the view that hipped roofs do not form a distinct design characteristic in the character area in which the application site is located and the Planning Authority's rationale is not sustained.
- 8.11 While not included in the reason for applying the condition on the decision notice, I note that the Planning Authority also state in their appeal submission that the roof changes are also to ameliorate any potential visual and character impacts with regards to roof height and bulk increases.
- 8.10 As previously stated above Silchester Crescent has a variety of dwelling styles which includes single storey, one and a half storey and two storey dwellings. The proposed roof height of the dwelling as extended is 8.61 metres with an overall footprint of 360.3 sqm and is set back off Silchester Crescent by 9.29 metres. In addition, the dwelling as extended has a separation distance of over 21 metres to the nearest dwelling with the nearby dwellings all set within sizeable curtilages. I am of the view that the gabled roofs as originally proposed would not add to the height or the bulk of the dwelling to any significant degree that would adversely impact the visual setting,

the character and appearance of the area nor would it adversely impact upon the amenity of any of the adjoining properties.

- 8.11 The Planning Authority also requested that the chimney on the single storey annex on the southern elevation of the proposed extension is to be reduced below the ridge line. The chimney does not extend above the ridge line of the dwelling as extended/alterd, it is located over 26.9 metres from the nearest rear building line of any adjoining property and its position on the southern elevation of the dwelling means that it is largely obscured from public view along Silchester Crescent. I do not consider that there is any justification for lowering the height of the chimney.
- 8.12 The officer's report identifies overshadowing as a basis for the requested design changes to the roof. An Overshadowing Assessment was provided as part of the submissions to support the planning application which was submitted to the Planning Authority. This provides an analysis of the seasonal and daily shadow paths for both the existing and proposed structures.
- 8.13 The proposed development achieves separation distances in excess of 10 metres to three out of four of the site's boundaries. While the fourth boundary (southwestern) has only a separation distance of 4.91 metres, the nearest building to the southwest is 26 metres from the proposed dwelling. Having taken into account the submitted Overshadowing Assessment and the separation distances to boundaries and the neighbouring dwelling, I do not consider that requiring the roof of the proposed dwelling to be amended to a half hip would mitigate overshadowing to any significant degree.
- 8.14 I consider that the reasons for imposing condition 02 have not been justified and the condition should be deleted.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1 I have considered the development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located at Kanta, 5 Silchester Crescent, Glenageary, Co. Dublin, A96D5K3 no relevant designated sites are close by.
- 9.2 The proposed development comprises the demolition of existing lean-to extensions and garage, along with the construction of new extensions and garden room with

associated works. 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 there is no conceivable risk to any European Site.

9.3 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Small scale and nature of the development; and
- Distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.

9.4 I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1 The subject site is located at Kanta, 5 Silchester Crescent, Glenageary, Co. Dublin, A96D5K3 which is 1.03km metres south of the nearest water body.

10.2 The proposed development comprises the demolition of existing lean-to extensions and garage, along with the construction of new extensions and garden room with associated works. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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. 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. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of works e.g. small scale and nature of the development; and
- Distance from nearest water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections.

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

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. Having regard to the nature of the condition which is the subject of the appeal, it is considered that the determination of the relevant application as if it had been made to the Coimisiún in the first instance would not be warranted and it is recommended that based on the reasons and considerations set out below, that the Planning Authority are directed under subsection (1) of section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, to remove condition number 2 in its entirety for the reasons and considerations hereunder.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the design of the proposed development, it is considered that the modifications to the proposed development, as required by the Planning Authority in its imposition of condition number 2, are not warranted, and that the proposed development, would be in accordance with the provisions of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 and would be acceptable in terms of the visual amenities of the area given the current and evolving character, would not set an unacceptable precedent in the area and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Barry Diamond
Planning Inspector

23rd June 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501102-DR-26
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of extensions and garage, construction of new extensions and garden room with associated works.
Development Address	Kanta, 5 Silchester Crescent, Glenageary, Co. Dublin, A96D5K3
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. ☐ No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
☒ 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.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

This page is intentionally blank.