



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL501166-DS-26

Development	Protected Structure: An extension containing gym, office and kitchen and new door openings from existing house on both levels, internal alterations to remove wall to provide new granny flat and associated site works
Location	51 Northumberland Road, Ballsbridge, Dublin 4
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	3382/25
Applicant(s)	Laura Chen
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission with conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Rozelle Ownes & Garrett Walsh
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	22nd July 2026
Inspector	Andrew Hersey

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1 The proposed development is located at 51 Northumberland Road comprises a four-storey semi-detached dwelling extending from lower ground floor to second floor level. The said dwelling is a protected structure.
- 1.2 Vehicular access to the site is currently provided via a gated undercroft laneway accessed from Pembroke Gardens, which extends to a substantial hardstanding area located to the rear of the property.
- 1.3 To the rear of the property is a substantial hardstanding area accessed via a shared undercroft laneway from Pembroke Gardens. This hardstanding serves the application property and adjoins the rear curtilages and parking areas associated with Nos. 44 and 45 Pembroke Gardens. The application site forms part of a wider shared rear environment where existing vehicular access and manoeuvring arrangements are of particular relevance to the issues raised in this appeal
- 1.4 The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, comprising a mix of traditional houses and converted residential properties. A number of neighbouring buildings are also in office use, while retaining their original residential appearance, reflecting the mixed residential and commercial character of the area.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1 The proposed development comprises of the extension, alteration and energy upgrade of the existing dwelling, a Protected Structure, together with associated external works. The principal elements of the proposal include:
 - Construction of a two-storey gable extension incorporating a gym at lower ground floor level and a home office and kitchen at upper ground floor level, together with new door openings connecting the extension to the existing dwelling.
 - Internal alterations at lower ground floor level to remove an internal wall, create a new lobby and bathroom, and provide a self-contained granny flat.
 - Internal alterations at first and second floor levels to provide additional en-suite bathrooms and a plant room, block up existing door openings, and amalgamate two existing second-floor bathrooms into a single bathroom.

- External works to the rear of the property including the construction of a new rear boundary wall and vehicular entrance, reinstatement and landscaping of the rear garden with new lawn, planting and gravel, and provision of rear parking.
- Energy efficiency upgrade works comprising the removal of the existing sand and cement render to the rear and gable elevations and its replacement with insulated lime render, installation of additional roof insulation, replacement of existing single-glazed windows with double-glazed units, and installation of a conservation-style rooflight

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1 Decision – Grant Permission subject to the following conditions. The following conditions are relevant to the appeal;

- 3.1.1 Condition 3 states that the use of granny flat be ancillary to the main residential use and shall not be used as a separate single residential unit for the purposes of renting/sale
- 3.1.2 Condition 5 relates to points of detail to be agreed with the Conservation Division of the Planning Authority
- 3.1.3 Condition 6 stipulates that the vehicular entrance will not have outward opening gates

3.2 Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1 There are two Case Planner's Reports on file. The first was prepared following receipt of the original planning application, while the second was prepared following the submission of Further Information. The original report identified a number of issues requiring Further Information, principally relating to the design of the proposed gable extension, conservation details, the proposed rear boundary treatment and gate, landscaping, and technical construction details. Following receipt of the Further Information response, the Planning Authority was satisfied that these matters had been satisfactorily addressed.

- 3.2.2 The reports also considered the issues raised in the third-party submission regarding the rear access and vehicle manoeuvring arrangements, having regard to the advice of the Transportation Planning Section and the Conservation Officer.
- 3.2.3 Collectively, the reports conclude that the proposed development would preserve the character and special interest of the Protected Structure and the surrounding conservation area and, subject to conditions, accords with the relevant provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022–2028 and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.3 Other Technical Reports

- Drainage (undated)– no objection subject to conditions
- Conservation Officer (10th March 2026) – recommends that the proposed development be granted subject to conditions including the reduction of the proposed rear gate to the garden to 3.0 metres
- Transportation Planning (5th April 2026) raises the following issues
 - The applicant has proven a right of way to their property
 - The 4.0 metre gate is considered acceptable
 - No objection subject to the following conditions:

3.4 Prescribed Bodies

No reports on file

3.5 Third Party Submissions

- 3.5.1 A submission was received from the occupiers of 45 Pembroke Gardens. While not objecting to the proposed development in principle, the submission raises concerns that the existing wayleave/right of way providing rear access to No. 51 Northumberland Road has not been identified on the submitted drawings. The submission also seeks clarification that the proposal will not prejudice existing parking and vehicle manoeuvring arrangements serving Nos. 44 and 45 Pembroke

Gardens, and requests that the Council ensure the existing access rights are properly reflected and protected

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1 Planning Reg. Ref. 4252/24 granted permission for the change of use of the structure from offices to a single residence and for minor internal alterations including renovating bathrooms and installing a new kitchen

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

- 5.1.1 The Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 is the statutory development plan in force in the area at present.
- 5.1.2 Within the plan the site is subject to zoning objective Z2 Residential Neighbourhoods which seeks to *protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas*.
- 5.1.3 Section 14.7.2 Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas) – Zone Z2 Residential conservation areas have extensive groupings of buildings and associated open spaces with an attractive quality of architectural design and scale. A Zone Z2 area may also be open space located within or surrounded by an Architectural Conservation Area and/or a group of protected structures. The overall quality of the area in design and layout terms is such that it requires special care in dealing with development proposals which affect structures in such areas, both protected and non-protected. The general objective for such areas is to protect them from unsuitable new developments or works that would have a negative impact on the amenity or architectural quality of the area.
- 5.1.4 Policy BHA2 Development of Protected Structure: That development will conserve and enhance protected structures and their curtilage and will:
- a) Ensure that any development proposals to protected structures, their curtilage and setting shall have regard to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines

for Planning Authorities (2011) published by the Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht.

- b) Protect structures included on the RPS from any works that would negatively impact their special character and appearance.
- c) Ensure that works are carried out in line with best conservation practice as advised by a suitably qualified person with expertise in architectural conservation.
- d) Ensure that any development, modification, alteration, or extension affecting a protected structure and/or its setting is sensitively sited and designed, and is appropriate in terms of the proposed scale, mass, height, density, layout and materials.
- e) Ensure that the form and structural integrity of the protected structure is retained in any redevelopment and ensure that new development does not adversely impact the curtilage or the special character of the protected structure.
- f) Respect the historic fabric and the special interest of the interior, including its plan form, hierarchy of spaces, structure and architectural detail, fixtures and fittings and materials.
- g) Ensure that new and adapted uses are compatible with the architectural character and special interest(s) of the protected structure.
- h) Protect and retain important elements of built heritage including historic gardens, stone walls, entrance gates and piers and any other associated curtilage features.
- i) Ensure historic landscapes, gardens and trees (in good condition) associated with protected structures are protected from inappropriate development.
- j) Have regard to ecological considerations for example, protection of species such as bats

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (Site Code 004024) which is located 1.8km metres to the east of the site and

- South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) which is located 1.8km to the east of the site

6.0 EIA Screening

6.1 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 & Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1 Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1 A third party appeal in the name of Rozelle Owens & Garrett Walsh was lodged on the 14th April 2026. The appeal in summary raises the following issues;

- The proposed two-storey side extension would adversely affect the character and setting of the Protected Structure by infilling the established gap between semi-detached dwellings, thereby eroding the historic streetscape of Northumberland Road.
- The proposal would establish an undesirable precedent for similar side extensions, resulting in the cumulative erosion of the architectural character of the street.
- The proposed rear boundary wall and electric gates would remove the existing turning area used by residents of Nos. 44 and 45 Pembroke Gardens, adversely affecting established access arrangements.
- The loss of turning space would require vehicles to reverse approximately 30 metres along a narrow laneway onto Pembroke Gardens, creating inconvenience and giving rise to road safety concerns.
- It is contended that the Planning Authority failed to adequately consider the implications of the proposed boundary wall and gates on existing vehicle manoeuvring arrangements before granting permission.

- In the alternative, the appellant requests that the rear boundary wall and gates be omitted or relocated to retain sufficient turning space for neighbouring properties

7.3. Planning Authority Response

7.3.1 A response was received from Dublin City Council on the 28th April 2026 and raises the following issues;

- requests that the commission uphold the decision
- that a S48 development contribution be imposed

7.4. First Party Response to Appeal

7.4.1 The first party submitted a response to the appeal on the 24th April 2026 and which raises the following issues:

- That the side extension is required to meet the needs of modern family living.
- That the rear parking area is not considered an appropriate long-term use of the property, which is being restored as a dwelling.
- That the appellants have alternative on-street parking available through the residential parking permit scheme.
- That the applicant owns the rear land and is under no obligation to provide additional turning space for neighbouring properties.
- That sufficient space remains for parking and manoeuvring, and the appeal should be dismissed with the grant of permission upheld

8.0 Assessment

8.1. I have examined the application details and all other documentation on file and I have inspected the site and have had regard to relevant local development plan policies and guidance.

8.1.2 I am satisfied the substantive issues arising from the grounds of this third party appeal relate to the following matters;

- Impact of the Proposed Side Extension on the Protected Structure
- Impact of the Proposed Development on Existing Access and Vehicle Manoeuvring Arrangements

8.2 Impact of the Proposed Side Extension on the Protected Structure

8.2.1 The principal heritage issue raised in the appeal concerns the proposed two-storey side extension and its potential impact on the character and setting of the Protected Structure and the established streetscape of Northumberland Road. The appellant contends that the extension would infill the characteristic gap between pairs of semi-detached dwellings, thereby eroding an important element of the historic building pattern and setting an undesirable precedent for similar development.

8.2.2 Section 14.7.2 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022–2028 recognises that objective Z2 Residential Conservation Areas require special care in assessing development proposals to ensure that new development does not adversely affect the architectural quality or amenity of the area. Furthermore, Policy BHA2 seeks to ensure that any extension or alteration to a Protected Structure is sensitively sited and designed, is appropriate in terms of scale, massing, height, layout and materials, retains the special character and structural integrity of the Protected Structure, and has regard to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011).

8.2.3 I also note that the Planning Authority's Conservation Officer examined the proposal in detail and raised no objection to the principle of the proposed development. The Conservation Officer concluded that the proposed extension and associated works could be accommodated without adversely affecting the special interest of the Protected Structure, subject to a series of detailed conditions relating to conservation methodology, materials, architectural detailing and the reduction of the proposed entrance gate to 3.0 metres. In my opinion, these recommendations are appropriate and necessary to ensure that the works are undertaken in accordance with best conservation practice and that the architectural integrity of the Protected Structure is preserved.

- 8.2.4 The planning authority considered these matters during its assessment of the application, including following the submission of Further Information, and concluded that the proposed extension would preserve the character of both the Protected Structure and the surrounding conservation area. Having examined the submitted drawings and supporting conservation documentation, I am satisfied that the extension has been designed as a subservient addition to the existing dwelling. The proposal remains visually secondary to the original building, respects its architectural composition and detailing, and retains a meaningful degree of separation from the adjoining property. While the existing side space is reduced, the proposal does not materially alter the established rhythm of development or undermine the distinctive character of the streetscape.
- 8.2.5 Having regard to the design of the proposed extension, the submitted conservation documentation, the conclusions of the Planning Authority's Conservation Officer and the conditions recommended to safeguard the historic fabric of the building, I am satisfied that the proposed extension would not adversely affect the special architectural interest, character or setting of the Protected Structure or the architectural quality of the surrounding Z2 Residential Conservation Area.
- 8.2.6 The proposed development includes the provision of a granny flat at lower ground floor level. Having regard to its layout and relationship with the main dwelling, I am satisfied that the accommodation is acceptable only where it remains ancillary to the principal residence and does not function as an independent dwelling.
- 8.2.7 I therefore consider the Planning Authority's condition restricting the separate sale, letting or occupation of the granny flat, together with the prohibition on subdivision of the curtilage, to be reasonable and necessary in the interests of residential amenity and to prevent the creation of an additional residential unit

8.3 Impact of the Proposed Development on Existing Access and Vehicle Manoeuvring Arrangements

- 8.3.1 The principal issue raised by the appellant concerns the effect of the proposed rear boundary wall and sliding gate on the longstanding vehicular access, parking and manoeuvring arrangements serving Nos. 44 and 45 Pembroke Gardens. The

appellants submit that they have historically utilised part of the rear hardstanding area within the application site, in conjunction with an existing vehicular wayleave, to access, park and manoeuvre their vehicles. They contend that the proposed boundary wall and gates would remove the existing turning area, requiring vehicles to reverse along the shared laneway before entering Pembroke Gardens, thereby giving rise to road safety concerns.

8.3.2 Having examined the submitted drawings and the appeal documentation, I am satisfied that the proposed rear boundary wall would alter the existing vehicle manoeuvring arrangements within the rear hardstanding area. I also note that the application is accompanied by a site location map which delineates, in yellow, the applicant's right of way over the shared rear laneway providing access to the application site. While the extent of any legal entitlement to use the applicant's lands for parking or turning is a civil matter outside the remit of the planning process, the implications of the proposed boundary treatment for vehicle manoeuvring and traffic safety are material planning considerations which require assessment.

8.3.3 I note that the Planning Authority's Transportation Planning Section accepted the applicant's right of way over the shared rear laneway and raised no objection to the proposed development, subject to conditions. However, I also note that neither the planning application nor the Further Information response included a swept path analysis or vehicle tracking assessment demonstrating that satisfactory vehicle manoeuvring can be maintained following construction of the proposed rear boundary wall and gates. Equally, while the appellant contends that the proposal would require neighbouring vehicles to reverse along the shared laneway, no independent traffic assessment has been submitted to substantiate the extent of any resulting traffic safety risk. Accordingly, while the available information does not indicate that the proposal would give rise to unacceptable traffic safety impacts, it is insufficient to enable a definitive conclusion to be reached regarding the adequacy of the revised vehicle manoeuvring arrangements.

8.3.4 Notwithstanding the existence of the applicant's established right of way, I do not consider that the outstanding issue regarding the detailed vehicle manoeuvring arrangements warrants the refusal of permission. While the legal rights of the respective parties are matters outside the planning process, it is appropriate for the

Commission to ensure that the detailed design of the proposed boundary wall, entrance gate and access arrangements facilitates satisfactory vehicle manoeuvring in the interests of traffic safety. In my opinion, this matter can be satisfactorily addressed by condition requiring the submission of a swept path analysis together with revised details of the rear boundary treatment, including the position and width of the proposed entrance gate and, where necessary, the alignment or set-back of the boundary wall, to demonstrate that satisfactory vehicle manoeuvring can be achieved without prejudicing traffic safety or the reasonable operation of the shared rear access. Subject to compliance with such a condition, I am satisfied that the proposed development would accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.2 The subject site is located
- 1.8km to the west of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (Site Code 004024)
 - 1.8km to the west of the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210)
- 9.3 The proposed development comprises of the construction of an extension, external walls, gates and landscaping. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.4 Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, and its location in a suburban area, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site
- 9.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The relatively small scale nature of the works proposed
 - The lack thereof of any hydrological connection from the proposed development to the Natura 2000 site.

- Having regard to the screening report/determination carried out by the Planning Authority

- 9.6 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.
- 9.7 Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The proposed development is located 1.8km to the west of Dublin Bay.
- 10.2 The proposed development consists of an extension, external walls, gates and landscaping..
- 10.3 No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.4 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.
- 10.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The minor scope of the works and nature of the development
 - The distance to the nearest water body, Dublin Bay and the lack of hydrological connections to the same.
- 10.6 I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1 I recommend that permission for the development be granted

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, and subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, I am satisfied that the proposal complies with the relevant provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022–2028, would preserve the special interest of the Protected Structure, would not adversely affect residential amenity or traffic safety, and would accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 20th day of February 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.	Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit to the Planning Authority, for written agreement, a swept path analysis prepared by a suitably qualified professional together with revised details of the proposed rear boundary wall, entrance gate and vehicular entrance, including any necessary modification to the position, width or set-back of these elements, demonstrating that satisfactory vehicular manoeuvring can be achieved for existing users of the shared rear access and that the proposed development will not adversely affect traffic safety. The width of the entrance gate shall not exceed 3.0 metres. Any

	agreed amendments shall be implemented in full as part of the permitted development. Reason: In the interests of traffic safety and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
3.	The Developer shall comply with the following requirements of the Conservation Division of the Planning Authority: a) A conservation expert with proven and appropriate expertise shall be employed to design, manage, monitor and implement the works and to ensure adequate protection of the retained and historic fabric during the works. In this regard, all permitted works shall be designed to cause minimum interference to the retained fabric and the curtilage of the Protected Structures. b) The Developer shall submit the following to the Conservation Division of the Planning Authority, for their written agreement: i. Detailed drawings to show the junction between the proposed extension and the neighbouring property. ii. Structural engineer's drawings for boundary wall underpinning, which shall be kept to the minimum necessary in order to protect the historic fabric and legibility of the Protected Structure and historic walls. iii. Services drawings to show all proposed service routes, reusing existing runs where possible, and illustrating any new penetrations through historic fabric. iv. Drawings of proposed fire safety interventions to attic and floors with conservation-led method statement for the works. v. Justification for the replacement of cementitious render, a method statement for render removal, and a method statement for re-rendering with a mortar specification. Insulating render shall only be specified/applied if its installation would not result in thermal bridging. The applicant shall provide site-based samples for render removal and re-rendering. vi. Samples of proposed outlet ventilation grille for use in the rear elevation only. Outlets shall not be placed on the front elevation. vii. A windows survey to show the condition of windows and to identify if glazing is historic or replacement. The loss of historic glass is not supported. Where historic glazing is present, it shall be retained in situ. The applicant shall provide product details of proposed slim-profiled glazing which shall not contain visible spacers, glass micro pillars, fritted glass, visible vacuum seals, nor plant-on glazing bars, and it shall be traditionally putty faced with a glazing-compatible putty. viii. Method statement for repairs to the roof with drawings for the rationalisation of rainwater goods. Any new rainwater goods shall be historically accurate cast-iron. No outlets shall be placed on the front elevation.

	ix. Method statements for the repair of historic fabric including plasterwork, joinery and floors. c) All works to the structure shall be carried out in accordance with best conservation practice and the <i>Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011)</i> and Advice Series issued by the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage. Any repair works shall retain the maximum amount of surviving historic fabric in situ. Items to be removed for repair off site shall be recorded prior to removal, catalogued and numbered to allow for authentic re-instatement. d) All existing original features, in the vicinity of the works shall be protected during the course of the refurbishment works. e) All repair of original fabric shall be scheduled and carried out by appropriately experienced conservators of historic fabric. f) The architectural detailing and materials in the new work shall be executed to the highest standards so as to complement the setting of the protected structure and the historic area. Reason: In order to protect the original fabric, character and integrity of the Protected Structure and to ensure that the proposed works are carried out in accordance with best conservation practice
4	The granny flat hereby permitted shall not be sold, let or otherwise conveyed as an independent living unit and shall revert to use as part of the main dwelling on the cessation of such use. The existing garden and curtilage of the overall residential property on this site shall not be subdivided. Reason: In the interest of residential amenity and to control the density of residential units
5.	Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 07.00 to 18.00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 08.00 to 14.00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority. Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity
6	The site development works and construction works shall be carried out in such a manner as to ensure that the adjoining street(s) are kept clear of debris, soil and other material and, if the need arises for cleaning works to be carried

	out on the adjoining public roads, the said cleaning works shall be carried out at the developer's expense. Reason: To ensure that the adjoining roadways are kept in a clean and safe condition during construction works in the interests of orderly development
7.	Surface water drainage arrangements shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such services and works. Reason: In the interest of public health.
8	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 Bord 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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

Andrew Hersey

Planning Inspector

24th July 2026

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL501166-DS-26
Proposed Development Summary	Works and extension to domestic protected structure
Development Address	51 Northumberland Road, Ballsbridge, Dublin 4
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 Q2.
	☐ 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 <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.	State the Class here
☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 2</u>, 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	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
☐ 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)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold

Inspector: _____

Date: _____