



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501107-DR-26

Development	Demolition of lean-to extensions and construction of new extension with associated works.
Location	75, Patrick Street, Dun Laoghaire, Co. Dublin, A96PH55
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D26B/0035/WEB
Applicant(s)	Daniel Inacu & Catherine Mooney
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Mark & Alison Whelan
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	4
4.0	Planning History	5
5.0	Policy Context.....	6
6.0	EIA Screening.....	8
7.0	The Appeal	8
8.0	Assessment.....	9
9.0	AA Screening.....	14
10.0	Water Framework Directive	15
11.0	Recommendation	15
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	16
13.0	Conditions	16

Appendix 1 –EIA Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site is circa 350sqm and comprises an existing single storey dwelling which has garden areas to both the front and the rear. The dwelling has a hipped roof and is finished in a profiled concrete roof tile, the walls are finished in a painted roughcast render. To the rear of the site is an elongated rear annex which extends along the rear northern boundary. The eastern and southern rear boundaries of the site are defined by a random rubble stone wall approximately 2 metres in height. To the front of the dwelling is a paved area with a 1.8 metre height stone wall enclosing the site which includes a vehicular access.
- 1.2. The application site abuts Nos. 76 & 77 Patrick Street to the north of the site while No. 74 Patrick Street is located to the south. Nos. 74 & 77 are single storey dwellings while No. 76 contains a single storey office and garage/workshop with a flat roof. A laneway runs along the northern boundary of the application site and accesses No. 76 Patrick Street. The application site backs onto the rear garden areas of Nos. 28 & 29 Mulgrave Street which are two storey dwellings located to the east of the site.
- 1.3. The site is set within a mixed use area which comprises residential dwellings and some commercial premises.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development seeks permission for an extension and alterations to a dwelling which consists of a number of different elements including:
 - Demolition of existing single storey lean-to extensions to rear of house and the raising of the existing flat roof to rear of house;
 - Alterations to fenestration to the rear and side of the existing house;
 - Construction of a new single storey flat roof extension to the rear, with a one and a half height section over the dining area; and
 - All associated site works required to facilitate the development.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On the 11th March 2026 the Planning Authority issued a decision to grant planning permission subject to conditions.

3.1.1. Conditions

3. For the avoidance of doubt, this permission shall not be construed as approving any development shown on the plans, particulars and specifications, the nature and extent of which has not been adequately stated in the statutory public notices. The development hereby authorised relates to the development listed as per the statutory notices only. Reason: To comply with permission regulations.

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 development, notwithstanding its existing construction should have regard to the use of materials and climate change action;
- The development will extend along the northern boundary shared with No. 76;
- It is noted that the permitted dwelling (D21A/0941 & ABP-312530-22) at No. 76 was granted in a similar format;
- The height of the extension will be lower than the ridge height of the existing mono pitch;
- There will not be any undue overshadowing or overbearing impact at No. 76 or upon the development permitted under Ref's: D21A/0941 & ABP-312530-22;
- A lightwell area in the southeastern corner of No. 76 is noted, however, the extension is only marginally higher than the boundary wall at this location;
- The remaining private amenity to the rear is useable and equates to 53.5sqm;
- There are no changes proposed to the access & parking arrangements under this planning application;

- 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.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

3.4. Third Party Observations

The appellants own a dwelling immediately to the north of the appeal site (No. 76 Patrick Street) raised an observation during the processing of the planning application which is attached to the file. I consider that the issues raised are also mirrored and expanded upon in their submissions to the Coimisiún and are not replicated in this section.

4.0 Planning History

Site

None

Setting

D20A/0881 & ABP-309542-21 Permission was refused for the material change of use of the existing structure from part workshop/ part office to residential usage, with alterations/extension to include; flat roof single storey and two storey extensions along southern boundary, realignment of existing west facing elevation, replacement of existing roof structure to form flat, green roof, provision of two lightwells along east boundary , all associated site works, to provide a part one storey/ part two storey 2 bed dwelling of 100 sqm at 76, Patrick Street, Dun Laoghaire, Co Dublin.

D21A/0941 & ABP-312530-22 Permission was granted on appeal for the material change of use of the existing structure from part workshop/ part office to residential usage, with alterations/extension to include; single storey extension along northern boundary, realignment of existing west facing elevation with projecting entrance, replacement of existing roof structure to form undulating green roof with projecting skylight, provision of two lightwells along east boundary and all associated site

works, to provide a single storey 2 bedroom dwelling of 94sqm at 76, Patrick Street, Dun Laoghaire, Co Dublin.

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 12.8.3.3 - Private Open Space

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.

Section 10.2.2.6 Policy Objective EI6 – Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Requires infiltration locally to soakaways designed to BRE Digest 365, with no overflow.

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

'Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities', Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, (2024)

Best Practice Guidelines for Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities 2007.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.4. The appeal site is not located on or within proximity to any designated Natura 2000 site. The subject site is situated c. 1.1km 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. 0.6km to the southwest 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 appellants (Mark and Alison Whelan) grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The proposal is contrary to Section 12.3.7.1 (ii) of the Development Plan;
- There is an extensive increase in the extent of the wall surfacing (15.8%) along the boundary between the appeal site and No. 76 Patrick Street;
- The existing rear annex extends 15.75m along the boundary with No. 76 with 11.52 metres of this being 4.57 metres above the ground level with No. 76, whereas the proposed extension is 17.89 metres at a uniform height which is only 0.267 metres less than the existing ridge height;
- No visual assessment or shadow study has been included;
- The existing rear annex casts significant shadows across No.76;
- The dwelling permitted at No. 76 (Ref's: D21A/0941 & ABP-312530-22) was designed to maintain the existing boundary wall height;

- The existing access arrangement to the front of the property does not have planning permission;
- The corner portion of the existing vehicular access to No. 75 passes over land which belongs to No. 76 and they have no permission to do so; and
- The wall to the front of No. 75 is 1897mm high and constitutes a danger if construction traffic is permitted to use the existing entrance.

7.2. **Applicant Response**

None

7.3. **Planning Authority Response**

The grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which, in the opinion of the Planning Authority, would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

8.0 **Assessment**

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

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Residential Amenity
- Other Matters

8.2 **Principle of Development**

8.2.1 The site is located on lands which are subject to 'Existing Residential (A)' under the Development Plan, the objective of which is "to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities." I also note that the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 (DLRCDP) is supportive of residential extensions. In this regard Section 12.3.7.1 Extensions to Dwellings supports applications to amend existing dwelling units to reconfigure and extend existing dwellings subject to specific safeguards. I consider

that the principle of a residential extension is acceptable subject to issues of design, neighbour amenity and other relevant factors.

8.3 Design

- 8.3.1 The existing dwelling is 5.41 metres in height and fronts onto Patrick Street. The dwelling contains an existing elongated rear annex which extends along the northern boundary of the site for a depth of 15.75 metres. The annex has a monopitch roof with a ridge height of 3.66 metres and an overall floorspace of approximately 67.61sqm. In addition, there is a second rear annex which comprises the existing kitchen area and a WC. This annex has a floor area of 17.90sqm and a height of 2.89 metres.
- 8.3.2 The proposal seeks to demolish the larger of the existing rear annexes and partially demolish and partially convert the smaller rear annex. The proposed development will include a new rear annex which has a depth of 17.89 metres, a ridge height of 3.48 metres and an overall floorspace of 99.2 sqm. The proposal includes a raised section of roof which sits over the dining room area and has a ridge height of 4.48 metres. I consider that the proposed extension is subordinate in height to the existing dwelling and would not alter the roofscape when viewed from along Patrick Street.
- 8.3.3 The extension includes a kitchen, living area and a bedroom, which brings the total number of bedrooms in the dwelling to three. Section 12.8.3.3 of the DRDCDP states that the private open space for a three bedroom dwelling is 60 sqm while Policy SPPR 2 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities', Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage states that a minimum of 40sqm for private amenity space is acceptable. Following the completion of the proposed development, the remaining useable rear amenity space for the dwelling is measured as being 69.23sq which I consider to be acceptable.
- 8.3.4 The extension has a flat roof and the external finishes are listed as being smooth render finish to match the existing dwelling. There are no windows on the northern and eastern elevations with the only window fenestration being on the southern elevation. There is generally no visibility of the rear annex from any public vantage point other than at the entrance to the access laneway to No. 76 Patrick Street which offers an oblique view of the northern elevation only.

8.3.5 I am of the opinion that the design and layout of the extension will not detract from the visual amenity or character of the area and is acceptable in accordance with the policies for rear extensions in the DLRCDP.

8.4 **Residential Amenity**

8.4.1 The proposed extension has been designed with only ground floor accommodation no windows are proposed on the northern and eastern gables. While there are windows on the southern elevation, these are low level and look onto a 1.8 metre high wall which separates the application site from No. 74 Patrick Street. I am of the view that there will be no overlooking onto the neighbouring properties from the proposed development.

8.4.2 The appeal site backs onto Nos. 28 & 29 Mulgrave Street which are two storey residential properties with single storey rear returns. The proposed extension abuts the shared boundary with these properties, has a stated ridge height of 3.48 and is 15.2 metres from the nearest point of the rear returns of Nos. 28 & 29 Mulgrave Street. Given the low elevational height of the proposed extension and the separation distance I do not consider that there would be any impact of dominance or overbearing onto the properties on Mulgrave Street.

8.4.3 The appeal site adjoins 74 Patrick Street to the south. The highest part of the proposed extension facing the rear garden area of No. 74 reaches 4.48 metres, it sits 3.2 metres away from the shared boundary, which is a 1.8 metre high rubble stone wall. Given the separation distance, the low elevation of the extension and the screening provided by the intervening wall, I do not consider that the proposal would unacceptably dominate No. 74 Patrick Street.

8.4.4 The third party appellant owns a property at No. 76 Patrick Street which lies to the north of the site and is accessed by a short laneway which runs along part of the northern application site boundary. At present this property (No. 76) contains a single storey office and garage/workshop with a flat roof. Planning permission also exists at No. 76 for a single storey dwelling (Ref: D21A/0941 & ABP-312530-22), however, development of the dwelling has not yet commenced.

8.4.5 The approved dwelling (Ref: D21A/0941 & ABP-312530-22), extends for 7.85 metres along the appeal site boundary and has a low angled pitched roof which is 3.1 metres in height where it abuts the appeal site boundary. The approved dwelling does not contain any skylights in the roof along the shared boundary, however, there

are areas of amenity space within the curtilage of the approved dwelling which run contiguous with the shared boundary of the appeal site.

- 8.4.6 The third party states that the existing rear annex on the application site casts significant shadows across No. 76 Patrick Street and no visual assessment or shadow study has been submitted despite the proposed annex increasing the wall surfacing by 15.8% compared to the existing annex. Section 12.3.7.1 of the DLRCDP states that overshadowing caused by first floor rear extensions will be a concern, however, no such stipulation exists for ground floor extensions. Nevertheless, I accept that overshadowing can still arise from single storey extensions dependent upon factors such as height and the proximity to shared boundaries.
- 8.4.7 The existing rear annex extends for approximately 15.75 metres along the boundary with No. 76 and for 11.52 metres of the annex it has a ridge height of 3.66 metres. While the proposed extension is 17.89 metres in length, it has a continuous ridge height of 3.48 metres along the common boundary with No. 76. This amounts to a height reduction of 0.18 metres across a 11.52 metre section of the common boundary.
- 8.4.8 The third party property at No. 76 lies to the north of the application site and is subject to existing overshadowing, a condition that will persist in the future. However, the proposed extension will marginally reduce overshadowing along a 11.52 metre section of the boundary, where its ridge height is lower than the existing rear annex. Conversely, it is accepted that the ridge height of the proposed annex will exceed current levels at two specific sections.
- 8.4.9 There is a small pocket of amenity space to the rear of the previously approved dwelling at No. 76 which measures 3.92sqm and contains two windows. At present the site is bounded by the boundary wall of the appeal site, which is circa 3 metres in height and by the boundary wall of No. 28 Mulgrave Street. Given the existing rear annex and shared boundary wall with the appeal site and the shared boundary with No. 28 Mulgrave Street, I am of the opinion that the level of overshadowing within this area of amenity space is unlikely to be significantly greater than would be experienced in the absence of the appeal proposal.

- 8.4.10 It should be noted that the area of amenity space referred to above at No. 76 currently forms an area of roofscape for the existing building on the site which would not be impacted by the proposed extension.
- 8.4.11 Situated between the rear building line of the appeal dwelling and the main section of the existing rear annex is a storage building, which extends 3.8 metres along the shared boundary with No. 76 and has a ridge height of 2.51 metres. This section of the existing annex partially abuts the existing access lane and the front yard of No. 76. In addition, it would also abut the front amenity space of the previously approved dwelling on that same neighbouring plot.
- 8.4.12 The proposal seeks the demolition of this section of the rear return to accommodate the new extension, which will have a ridge height of 3.48 metres. While this section will have a higher ridge height, this increase is mitigated by the lowering of the ridge height on the main body of the proposed annex, where it sits forward of the front building line of the previously approved dwelling at No. 76 and the existing buildings. Considered in the round, the proposed extension will not have a significantly greater impact on the approved neighbouring dwelling than the existing annex in terms of overshadowing or dominance.
- 8.4.13 I note that the Planning Authority did not raise any objection on overshadowing or overbearing impact. Having regard to the foregoing I do not consider that significant impacts on residential amenity are likely and further I do not consider that a detailed shadow analysis is required to reach such a conclusion.
- 8.4.14 Overall, I consider that the proposed extension will not have any significant impacts in terms of overshadowing/loss of light, dominance or overlooking.

8.5 Other Matters

- 8.5.1 I note that land ownership issues were raised by the third party in relation to an access point to the front of the appeal site and the presence of a front boundary wall which it is claimed are not permitted. Ownership issues are not matters which can be adjudicated by the Coimisiún. I refer to Section 5.13 of the Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2007) which states that the planning system is not designed as a mechanism for resolving disputes about title to land or premises or rights over land with Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) stating that 'a person shall not be entitled solely by reason of a permission under this section to carry out any development'.

8.5.2 I note that the access and front boundary wall are not matters which form part of the description of development. The Planning Authority attached a condition to the grant of permission which stipulates that the permission only authorises the development listed on the statutory notice which does not include the access or the front boundary wall. I concur that a similar condition should be attached to the grant of planning permission in the interests of clarity for all parties.

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 75 Patrick Street, Dun Laoghaire, Co. Dublin, A96PH55, no relevant designated sites are close by.

9.2 The proposed development comprises the demolition of lean-to extensions and the construction of a new extension 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;
- Distance from nearest European site and lack of connections; and
- The screening decision of the Planning Authority.

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 75 Patrick Street, Dun Laoghaire, Co. Dublin which is 657 metres east of the nearest water body.

10.2 The proposed development comprises the demolition of lean-to extensions and the construction of a new rear extension 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

That planning permission be granted for the reasons and considerations set out below and subject to the conditions set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the design, appearance of both the existing structure on the site and the proposed rear annex, it is considered that, subject to compliance with conditions below, the development proposed would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area or residential amenities of property in the vicinity and would not adversely impact on the character of the area. The proposed development, therefore, would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged and received by the Planning Authority on the 23rd day of January 2026, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars. Reason: In the interest of clarity.
2	The existing dwelling and extension shall be used as a single dwelling unit apart from such use as may be exempted development for the purposes of the Planning and Development Regulations Reason: In the interests of clarity and to ensure the proper and sustainable development of the area.
3	For the avoidance of doubt, this permission shall not be construed as approving any development shown on the plans, particulars and specifications, the nature and extent of which has not been adequately stated in the statutory public notices. The development hereby authorised relates to the development listed as per the statutory notices only. Reason: To comply with permission regulations.
4	The rear extension shall be finished in painted render to harmonise with the render finish of the existing dwelling.

	Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.
5	Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements, in writing where necessary, of the planning authority for such works and services. Reason: In the interests of public health.
6	a) All necessary measures shall be taken by the applicant to prevent any spillage or deposition of clay, dust, rubble or other debris, whether arising from vehicle wheels or otherwise, on the adjoining and/or adjacent public road and footpath network during the course of the construction works. b) Any damage to roads, footpaths or other public property caused by the development shall be made good to the satisfaction of the District Engineer. Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and proper control of development.
7	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. 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.

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-501107-DR-26
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of lean-to extensions and the construction of a new extension with associated works.
Development Address	75, Patrick Street, Dun Laoghaire, Co. Dublin, A96PH55
	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.