



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501158-WD-26

Development	Retention of structural frame to side of existing house and permission for frame to be used for construction of carport.
Location	5 Tramore Heights, Tramore, Co. Waterford.
Planning Authority	Waterford City and County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2660043
Applicant	Eileen Owens
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant	Patrick Duggan
Observer	None
Date of Site Inspection	19 th June 2026
Inspector	Siobhan Carroll

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
3.1. Decision	3
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
3.3. Third Party Observations	4
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	5
6.0 EIA Screening.....	7
7.0 The Appeal	7
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	7
7.2. Applicant Response	9
7.3. Planning Authority Response.....	11
8.0 Assessment.....	12
8.1. Principle of development.....	12
8.2. Design.....	12
8.3. Impact on residential amenity	14
9.0 AA Screening.....	15
10.0 Water Framework Directive	16
11.0 Recommendation	17
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	17
13.0 Conditions	18
Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	19

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site no. 5 Tramore Heights, has a stated area of 0.056 hectares and is located in the suburbs of Tramore c.1.4km to the south-west of the town centre. Tramore Heights comprises a housing estate of detached single storey properties which was constructed in the early to mid-1970's. The site is located within the centre of housing estate on the southern side of an estate road which has access onto the R675 to the west.
- 1.2. The dwelling has a floor area of 136.68sq m. The gable fronted dwelling has a ridge height of 4.2m. The property is served by mature front and rear gardens and there is on-site car parking for two vehicles to the front and eastern side of the dwelling. There is a detached single storey garage to the south-eastern corner of the site.
- 1.3. The neighbouring dwellings to the east and west of the site no's 6 and 38 Tramore Heights are of a similar design to the subject property. No. 6 to the east of the appeal site has been extended to the western side of the dwelling. This single storey extension directly adjoins the boundary with no. 5.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the retention of a structural frame to the side of the existing house and permission for the frame to be used for the construction of a carport.
- 2.2. The proposed car port has an area of 25.82sq m.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Waterford City & County Council decided to grant retention permission and permission for the development by Order dated 20th of March 2026. The permission is subject to 6 no. conditions.

3.1.2. Conditions

- 3.1.3. Condition no. 1 – Development permitted shall be in accordance with plans and particulars submitted to the Planning Authority on 28th January 2026, except where altered or amended by conditions in this permission.
- 3.1.4. Condition no. 2 – Construction activity shall be limited to the hours of 08:00 to 19:00 Monday to Friday, 08:00 to 14:00 Saturday.
- 3.1.5. Condition no. 3 – All surface water runoff from roofs, driveways and paved areas shall be collected and disposed of within the curtilage of the site.
- 3.1.6. Condition no. 4 – Any interference with or damage to the road or footpath in the area caused during the construction of the development shall be made good at the expense of the developer to the confirmed written satisfaction of the District Engineer, Waterford City & County Council.
- 3.1.7. Condition no 5. – Any surplus construction material to be removed from the site shall be brought to an authorised facility.
- 3.1.8. Condition no. 6. – All measures shall be taken by the contractor to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble or other debris on adjoining roads during the course of the works.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning Reports
- 3.2.2. Planner's report dated: 20/3/2026 – It was concluded that the proposed car port structure is single storey in nature and is contained within the site and that it would be acceptable in that context.

3.3. Third Party Observations

- 3.3.1. The Planning Authority received two submissions/observations in relation to the application.
- 3.3.2. A submission was received from the appellant which details their objections to the proposal. The issues raised are similar to those set out in the appeal.

- 3.3.3. A submission was received from the applicant which sought to address concerns raised in the third party submission and sets out the background to the reasoning and requirement for the carport.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. None on the site.
- 4.2. Reg. Ref. 81315 – Permission was granted for a single storey extension to the side of no. 6 Tramore Heights.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 (As Varied)

- 5.1.1. The appeal site at 5 Tramore Heights, Tramore, Co. Waterford is located on lands zoned objective 'RS' Existing Residential. The objective is to provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity.
- 5.1.2. Volume 2 – Development Management Standards
- 5.1.3. Section 4.0 – Residential Miscellaneous
- 5.1.4. Section 4.7 – Off-street Parking in Residential Areas - Proposals for off street parking in existing front gardens in residential areas, therefore need to be balanced against loss of amenity (visual and physical) and communal spaces.
- 5.1.5. The removal of front garden walls, pillars, gates, piers, and railings will not generally be permitted where such removal will have a negative visual impact on the character of the streetscape, or reduce the level of communal parking to an unacceptable degree. In particular, these works will generally not be permitted in Architectural Conservation Areas, areas of architectural, historic character, within the curtilage of a protected structure and well-established housing estates
- 5.1.6. Development Management Objective - DM 10: Where permitted, drive-ins/ front garden parking provision should generally:
- Not have outward opening gates;
 - Have a vehicular entrance not wider than 3 metres, or 50% of the width of the front boundary, whichever is the lesser;

- Have an area of hard standing (parking space of 2.5 m x 5 m) and be constructed in accordance with SuDS and include measures to prevent drainage from the driveway entering onto the public footpath or road;
- Retain the balance as garden;
- In the case of established housing developments any replacement of front walls should match the existing material and design elements of neighbouring or adjacent properties within that particular housing development, such as piers, railing, stone/brick/render detailing etc.;
- Have gates, walls, pillars and railings made good, and;
- Permeable paving should be used in the interests of sustainable drainage.

5.1.7. Section 4.9 – House Extensions - The design and layout of extensions to houses should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties particularly as regards sunlight, daylight and privacy. The character, scale and form of the existing building and site should be respected.

5.1.8. Development Management Objective - DM 11: Extensions should:

- Respect and follow the pattern of the existing building as much as possible.
- Where contemporary designs are proposed, proposals should not detract from the visual amenities of the main dwelling or neighbouring properties.
- Extension works should not encroach, overhang or otherwise physically impinge third party properties.
- Proposals should be designed in such a way as to eliminate overshadowing or overlooking of adjoining property.
- Avoid additional surface water runoff arising from the site.

5.4 Natural Heritage Designations

5.1.9. Mid-Waterford Coast SPA (Site Code 004193) is situated 1.57km to the south of the appeal site.

5.1.10. Tramore Dunes and Backstrand SAC (Site Code 000671) is situated 2.27km to the east of the appeal site.

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations).

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

A third party appeal was submitted by Patrick Duggan on the 14th of April 2026. The issues raised are as follows;

- The appellant states that he has lived at his home at no. 6 Tramore Height for 39 years. The main objection refers to the right to light in one of the main living rooms of their house.
- It is contended that the assessment of the Planning Officer did not give sufficient weight to his rights in terms of long term established right to light.
- The appellant in their objection to the application submitted under Reg. Ref. 26/60043 stated that the retention permission for the unauthorised structure should be refused and that permission should be granted for a carport restricted in width and height. It was also suggested that the roof of the carport could be designed to slope from no. 5 in order that the constructed carport would not affect the light to their living/dining room.
- The appellant highlighted that the applicant did not have any discussions with him in advance of the existing structure being constructed.
- The appeal includes a number of photographs of the subject structure at no. 5 Tramore Heights viewed from the appellant's property no. 6. One of the photographs is stated as view of the kitchen, living/dining room window showing the afternoon shadow cast by the unroofed frame.
- It is submitted that the proposed development would impact the level of light to the windows to the western elevation particularly in the winter months when light levels are low.

- It is suggested that the design of the carport should be modified to address the appellant's concerns. Specifically, they suggest a reduced height of 2.5m a narrowing of the proposed width from 4.15m to 3.15m and to modify the roof design to slope away from the existing building.
- In relation to the assessment of the proposal as detailed in the report of the Planning Officer, it was concluded that the proposal would be consistent with development in the vicinity. The appellant does not agree with this conclusion.
- As originally designed, the houses in Tramore Heights had a carport attached over the main entrance this included no. 5 and no. 6. It is highlighted that this is retained in many of the houses within the estate.
- The appellant states that he replaced the carport at his property with an extension which was consistent with the original design. It is noted that the original carport was removed at no. 5 many years ago by a previous owner.
- In later development in the estate the carports were replaced by a garage to the side and set behind the entrance door. Some garages within the estate have been modified and converted to provide additional habitable rooms. It is considered that those extensions were well designed and did not affect the light to neighbouring houses.
- The appellant states that while the report of the Planning Officer referred to the proposed height of the carport as 2.8m, the height of the frame at the closest point to their property is 2.9m without the roof added.
- Reference is made in the report of the Planning Officer to the requirement for a wider carport to accommodate modern type cars. The appellant considers that a carport with a width of 4.15m is not justified. The original carport had a width of 2.5m. The example of the original carport at no. 2 Tramore Heights is cited as being of sufficient width to accommodate modern cars.
- The proposed carport is similar in design and height to the one constructed in recent years at no. 15 Tramore Heights. It is stated that the wide design carport at no. 15 was constructed to accommodate the needs of the occupier of the property specifically for wheelchair access.

- In conclusion, the appellant requests that the Commission overturn the decision of Waterford City and County Council on the basis that they did not sufficiently balance the right to add a carport at no. 5 with their long-established right to light and effect of overshadowing in their living/dining room from the proposed carport.

7.2. Applicant Response

A response to the third party appeal was submitted by James Reynolds Building Engineers & Project Managers, Architectural Technology & Planning Consultants on behalf of the applicant Ms Eileen Owens. The issues raised are as follows;

- The issues raised in the appeal refer to the style, shape and size of the carport and right to light.
- In relation to the style, shape and size of the carport it is highlighted that the size and finish is same as one constructed at no. 15 Tramore Heights.
- It is highlighted that if the applicant did not have an existing garage, then the proposed carport would have been exempt under the provisions of Class 3 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 (as amended).
- Regarding the right to light, the internal layout of the appellant's property no. 6 was ascertained from planning documents from Waterford City and County Council of the permission for a single storey extension to the property granted under Reg. Ref 81351. The living room and dining rooms are located to the front and front left of the property. The window serving the kitchen faces west to the side boundary adjoining the appeal site.
- The photograph submitted with the appeal noted that the unroofed carport casts a shadow in the afternoon. The photograph does not have a date or time stamp to provide context.
- The photographs provided with the appeal response figures 2.2.2 to 2.2.4 show that the shadow arrives on the appellant's window cills at 5.40pm. The window is fully in shadow by 7.00pm where the existing roof/ridgeline of no. 5 cast an evening shadow.

- As indicated on figures 2.2.4 to 2.2.7 the ridgeline of the original house is close behind the proposed carport which creates its own shadow which has been in place since the original house was constructed.
- Regarding the matter of right to light it is defined by the Society of Chartered Surveyors in their professional standards as “a right to light is a right to only a ‘reasonable amount of light’ and whilst a person’s light might be significantly reduced there is no infringement on their right.”
- It is submitted that the carport does not materially affect the level of light in the neighbouring house and that there is a minor effect for a short period during the day.
- It is stated that the applicant is willing to reduce the overall height of the carport by 150mm outside of their entrance door and slope the roof towards the shared boundary. By reducing it by a further 50mm it would allow rainwater to flow from the roof. This would reduce the carport’s height by 200mm adjacent to the neighbouring boundary.
- The shadow cast by the roof would be similar to the shadow cast by the original roofline.
- It is highlighted that the extension constructed to the western side of no. 6 Tramore Heights, close to the shared boundary already influences the distribution of light between the two properties. It is highlighted that existing features including the roof structure of no. 6 itself and nearby vegetation also contribute to shadowing.
- It is submitted that the carport does not give rise to any significant or unacceptable impact on light, outlook or amenity.
- It is stated in the appeal that the modest carport that formed part of the original house design was sufficient, and reference is made to some houses that still retain this structure. There are 71 no. houses in Tramore Heights, and 57 no. of the dwellings no longer have the original carport. It is submitted that the design was unsuitable and impractical. It is noted that two of the remaining 14 no. original carports have been altered to create additional width to allow for safe parking of vehicles. The majority of the remaining 12 no.

carports are not used by the residents as there is insufficient space between the structural posts and the gable wall of the house to safely park a car and allow space for the driver and their passengers to exit the car without damaging the car doors.

- It is stated that the proposed carport has the same height and width as the one constructed at No. 15 Tramore Heights.
- It is noted that there are many extensions in Tramore Heights of various design and size. It is submitted that the proposed carport is in keeping with the general pattern of development within the estate. It is highlighted that many of the original carports have been converted for habitable use.
- In conclusion, it is submitted that the concerns raised by the appellant in relation to the style, scale and design of the carport are not substantiated.
- It is submitted that the proposed development does not give rise to any material loss of residential amenity including light or outlook. It is submitted that the scale and design of the carport are appropriate and proportionate and that the development is consistent with the prevailing character and pattern of development within Tramore Heights.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

- The details submitted for the grounds of appeal are noted by the Planning Authority.
- The Planning Authority notes that the substantive issues raised in the third party appeal were also raised in the submission made during the submission period.
- The Planning Authority considers that the substantive issues raised in the third party appeal were assessed in detail as part of the assessment of the third party submission made during the assessment of the application. The planner's report submitted to An Coimisiún Pleanála as part of the documentation associated with this planning application addresses the issues within the report. The details included in the appeal regarding the planner's report are also noted.

- The Planning Authority further considers that the development which was granted permission by the Planning Authority was so granted following a detailed and robust assessment.
- The Planning Authority remains favourably disposed to the development, subject to appropriate conditions being attached to any grant of permission, and strongly urges An Coimisiún Pleanála to uphold its decision to grant permission for this development.

8.0 **Assessment**

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

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Impact on residential amenity

8.1. **Principle of development**

- 8.1.1. The site is located on lands zoned objective 'RS', Existing Residential. It lies within an existing residential housing estate, and there is an existing dwelling on the site. As such, the principle of a carport which entails an extension to a residential development is acceptable in principle.

8.2. **Design**

- 8.2.1. Section 4.9 of Volume 2 of the Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-2028 (As Varied) refers to House Extensions. It advises that the design and layout of extensions to houses should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties

particularly as regards sunlight, daylight and privacy. The character, scale and form of the existing building and site should be respected.

- 8.2.2. In relation to the design of the proposed carport, it has a height of 2.8m, 4.15m in width and 5.88m in depth with a stated area of 25.82sq m. The appeal refers to the height of the height of the frame at the closest point to their property being 2.9m without the roof added. I note this point and note that the ground level of no. 5 the subject site is 100.00 while the ground level of the appellant's property is circa 500mm below this level.
- 8.2.3. In relation to the appearance of the proposed carport, I note that the existing dwelling is served by a front garden, as a result of the dwelling has a setback of c.9m from the front boundary of the site. The proposed carport would be located to the eastern side of the dwelling and 3.2m back from the front elevation of the dwelling. It would have a setback of c12m from the front boundary of the site.
- 8.2.4. It is contended in the appeal that the proposed carport is excessive in scale and not in keeping with the design of other extensions to property within Tramore Heights. It is set out in the appeal that a carport with a width of 4.15m is not justified. It is highlighted in the appeal that the original carport had a width of 2.5m. The example of the original carport at no. 2 Tramore Heights is cited as being of sufficient width to accommodate modern cars.
- 8.2.5. In response to the matter the first party stated that of the 71 no. houses in Tramore Heights that 57 no. of the properties have removed the original carport on the basis that it was unsuitable and impractical. It is further highlighted that two of the remaining 14 no. original carports have been altered to create additional width to allow for safe parking of vehicles. Therefore, the first party submit that the size of carport proposed is necessary to allow space for the driver and their passengers to exit the car without damaging the car doors. Having regard to the fact that the Tramore Heights housing estate was constructed in the early to mid-1970's, I would accept the argument provided by the first party that the original carports are not of sufficient size to accommodate modern vehicles many of which are considerably larger than the vehicles from the 1970's. Therefore, I would consider it appropriate that a wider carport be provided on that basis.

- 8.2.6. In relation to the matter of the design of the proposed carport, I consider that the structure itself would be relative slimline in design. It has an adequate setback both from the public domain and also the front elevation of the dwelling on the site. I note the point made in the appeal response that there are a variety of extensions to the dwellings within Tramore Heights. They include extensions to the side of properties and conversion of the original carports for habitable use.
- 8.2.7. Accordingly, I consider that site size is substantial enough to accommodate this structure, and I am not of the view that the overall scale of the single storey structure is detrimental to the appearance of the dwelling house itself, nor of the wider estate as a whole.

8.3. Impact on residential amenity

- 8.3.1. The grounds of appeal primarily refer to the matter of overshadowing. Development Management Objective - DM 11 as set out in Volume 2 of the Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-2028 (As Varied) refers Extensions. It sets out that extension works should not encroach, overhang or otherwise physically impinge third party properties and should be designed in such a way as to eliminate overshadowing or overlooking of adjoining property.
- 8.3.2. It is contended in the appeal that the proposed carport would give rise to overshadowing of the windows to western side of no. 6 Tramore Heights. It is stated in the appeal that these windows serve the kitchen, living/dining rooms.
- 8.3.3. The appeal includes a number of photographs of the structure at no. 5 Tramore Heights for which retention is sought. One of the photographs is stated as view of the kitchen, living/dining room windows showing the afternoon shadow cast by the unroofed frame. It is contended that the proposed development would impact the level of light to the windows to the western elevation particularly in the winter months when light levels are low.
- 8.3.4. In response to the matter the first party stated that the photograph submitted with the appeal with the note that the unroofed carport casts a shadow in the afternoon does not have a date or time stamp to provide context. The appeal response document includes 4 no. photographs of the two windows to the western side of the appellant's property. It is stated in the first party response that the shadow arrives on the

appellant's window cills at 5.40pm and that the windows are fully in shadow by 7.00pm where the existing roof/ridgeline of no. 5 cast an evening shadow. These photographs include the date and time that they were taken at which was on the 23rd of April 2026 at 17:39, 17:50, 18:42 and 18:56.

- 8.3.5. It is highlighted in the appeal response that the ridgeline of the original house is close behind the proposed carport which creates its own shadow which has been in place since the original house was constructed. The first party submitted that the carport does not materially affect the level of light in the neighbouring house and that there is a minor effect for a short period during the day.
- 8.3.6. I note the details provided by the first party, specifically the submitted photographs. While there would be some shadowing in the late evening, the extent of shadowing generated by the proposed carport would be very limited and I note that existing shadowing is generated by the ridgeline of the original house and the roof structure of no. 6 itself and vegetation within that that site. Accordingly, I would conclude that the proposed development would not result in an undue level of new overshadowing of the appellant's property.
- 8.3.7. It is stated in the appeal response that the applicant is willing to reduce the overall height of the carport by 150mm outside of their entrance door and slope the roof towards the shared boundary. By reducing it by a further 50mm it would allow rainwater to flow from the roof. This would reduce the carport's height by 200mm adjacent to the neighbouring boundary. I note this proposal would marginally reduce the height of the proposed carport. Should the Commission decide to grant permission for the proposal and consider it appropriate to revise the design of the carport as detailed above then a condition could be attached specifying that. I note that the Planning Authority did not require such a revision to the design and I would concur that the design as proposed would be acceptable as set out this assessment.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development considering the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

- 9.2. Mid-Waterford Coast SPA (Site Code 004193) is situated 1.57km to the south of the appeal site. Tramore Dunes and Backstrand SAC (Site Code 000671) is situated 2.27km to the east of the appeal site.
- 9.3. The proposed development comprises the retention of structural frame to side of existing house and permission for frame to be used for construction of carport.
- 9.4. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.5. No streams/watercourses are identified on site.
- 9.6. 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. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The small scale and nature of the development.
 - The distance to the nearest European sites, and the absence of any hydrological or other pathways
- 9.7. Considering the screening report of Waterford City and County Council.
- 9.8. I conclude based on 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.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive, together with relevant guidance published by the Environmental Protection Agency (Ireland), including applicable codes of practice for the protection of water quality.
- 10.2. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, it is concluded that the proposal will not result in any risk of deterioration in the status of any water body, including surface waters (rivers and lakes), groundwater, transitional waters, or coastal waters. This applies to both qualitative and quantitative status, and in respect of temporary and permanent effects.
- 10.3. The proposed development has been designed in accordance with EPA codes of practice and best practice guidance, ensuring that appropriate measures are

incorporated to prevent pollution, control runoff, and protect both surface water and groundwater receptors.

- 10.4. Furthermore, the development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the maintenance or attainment of Good Ecological Status/Potential and Good Chemical Status, as required under the Directive.
- 10.5. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend that retention permission and permission is granted for the proposal.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 12.1. Having regard to the provisions of the Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 (As Varied) and the scale, form and design of the structure proposed for retention, and the proposed car port, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not adversely impact the residential amenity of neighbouring property or the character and visual amenity of the existing building and surrounding streetscape. The proposal would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be retained, carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

3. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 and 1900 from Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 and 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

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

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

Siobhan Carroll
Planning Inspector

17th of July 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP 501158-WD-26
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of structural frame to side of existing house and permission for frame to be used for construction of carport.
Development Address	5 Tramore Heights, Tramore, Co. Waterford.
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?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☐ No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, 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:** _____