



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501214-DL-26

Development	Demolition of existing derelict dwelling and construction of a new commercial storage shed.
Location	Lifford, Co. Donegal
Planning Authority	Donegal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2562056
Applicant(s)	Maxlite Ireland Ltd
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Martin & Jacqueline Herron
Observer(s)	Frank Herron
Date of Site Inspection	6 th July 2026
Inspector	Elaine Power

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	3
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	4
3.4. Third Party Observations	4
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	5
6.0 EIA Screening.....	6
7.0 The Appeal	7
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	7
7.2. Applicant Response	7
7.3. Planning Authority Response.....	7
7.4. Observations.....	8
7.5. Further Responses	8
8.0 Assessment.....	8
9.0 AA Screening.....	14
10.0 Water Framework Directive	14
11.0 Recommendation	15
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	15
13.0 Conditions	15
Appendix 1: EIA Pre-Screening	
Appendix 2: EIA Preliminary Examination	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located in Lifford town centre, Co. Donegal. The site has a stated area of 0.17ha and currently accommodates a derelict cottage which fronts directly onto O'Brien Row. The site is generally rectangular in shape and forms part of a larger L-shaped landholding within the applicant's ownership, which includes a commercial unit with frontage onto Main Street. Lifford town centre is urban in character with a variety of uses and architectural styles. O'Brien Row is a well-established laneway within the town and includes residential and commercial uses.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the demolition of an existing derelict dwelling (97.4sqm) and the construction of a single storey commercial storage shed (80sqm) with a pitched roof with a maximum height of c. 4.4m.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission was granted subject to six conditions.

- Condition 2 required archaeological monitoring to be undertaken during excavation works.
- Condition 3(a) limits the use of the structure to storage purposes only.
- Condition 4 limits noise levels generated by the proposed development.
- Condition 6 restricts lighting and signage associated with the proposed development.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. *Planning Reports*

The initial Planners Report dated 12th January 2026 considered the proposed development was acceptable in principle. However, some concerns were raised

regarding archaeology, access and flood risk. The report recommended that two items of further information be sought. These are summarised below.

1. (a) submit a traffic and transport statement in respect of the frequency and nature of deliveries.
(b) revised layout indicating loading and drainage details.
2. (a) submit a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).
(b) evidence of compliance with the Justification test.

The Planners Report dated 23rd March 2026 considered that the applicant had adequately addressed the items of further information and considered that proposed development would not be prejudicial to public health and would not endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. The report recommended that permission be granted subject to six conditions.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Roads and Transportation Planning: The initial report dated 15th December 2025 recommended that further information be sought regarding service / delivery arrangements to the proposed development.

Chief Fire Officer: Report dated 11th December 2025 raised no objection to the proposed development subject to the applicant obtaining a Fire Safety Certificate.

Donegal National Roads Office (NRO): Email dated 20th March 2026 states that the proposed development does not affect the progression of any current national road or greenway / active travel project managed by Donegal NRO.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

3.4. Third Party Observations

The Planning Authority received two third party submission which raised concerns regarding residential amenity, traffic and built heritage.

4.0 Relevant Planning History

Appeal Site

None

Surrounding Sites

18/50653: Permission was granted in 2018 for the demolition of an existing building (former amusement arcade) and the construction of a 3-storey building comprising 2 no. ground floor retail units and 3 no. 2-bed residential units fronting onto Main Street. This development has not been constructed. This site forms part of the larger landholding within the applicant's ownership.

22/51847: Retention permission was granted in 2023 for the completion of a 2-storey 3-bed residential unit with a ground floor garage and store to the rear of an existing dwelling on O'Brien Row.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 County Donegal Development Plan 2024 - 2030

Lifford is designated as a Service Town in the Settlement Strategy. Section 3.3.3 'Service Towns' notes that such service towns provide important local retail and employment functions.

The subject site is located within the settlement boundary of Lifford and zoned town centre, as defined on Map 21.52 of the Development Plan. Chapter 21 sets out the land use zoning objectives relating to Settlement Frameworks. The land use objective for 'town centre' is *to sustain and strengthen the core of towns as the centres for commercial, retail, cultural and community life*.

Relevant Policies include:

Policy CS-P-1 That within the boundaries of settlements identified Settlement Framework boundaries, applications for development will be assessed in the light of all relevant material planning considerations including any identified land use zonings, availability of infrastructure, relevant policies of the Development Plan/Local Area Plan as applicable, other regional and national guidance/policy and relevant environmental designations

Policy SF-P-1: Within flood risk areas identified within settlement frameworks, only the following developments will be considered:

Areas of established development, including those parts of the Ballintra, Kilcar, Pettigo, Burtonport, Dunfanaghy and Glenties, and Rathmullan Regeneration Opportunities, Minor development only (e.g. small extensions to houses, and most changes of use of existing buildings and or extensions and additions to existing commercial and industrial enterprises, unless they obstruct important flow paths, introduce a significant additional number of people into flood risk areas or entail the storage of hazardous substance); and Such applications shall be accompanied by a commensurate assessment of the risks of flooding to demonstrate that they would not have adverse impacts or impede access to a watercourse, floodplain or flood protection and management facilities. Such proposals shall follow best practice in the management of health and safety for users and residents of the proposal.

New (currently undeveloped) areas. Water compatible uses only as per Section 5.28 of the 'Planning System and Flood Risk Guidelines' (DEHLG and OPW, Nov. 2009).

Objective CS-O-7(b): To support economic growth throughout the County through:

To continue to support 'County Growth Drivers and 'Service Towns' as critical drivers of growth outside of Letterkenny.

With regard to flood risk, policies F-P-1 and F-P-2 and Objective F-O-1 are all considered relevant.

5.4 Natural Heritage Designations

The appeal site is not located within or immediately adjacent to a designed area. The River Finn SAC is located c. 100m south and east of the appeal site.

6.0 EIA Screening

6.1. I refer the Commission to Appendix 1 and 2 of this report.

6.2. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment. Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.

The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The relevant planning grounds of the third-party appeal are summarised below.

- The appeal site is a heritage site. There is a historical plaque 3m from the appeal site. The garda station is a listed building and there are old walls and buildings on the lane. The cottage should be restored.
- The proposed development, including metal finish, is not suitable for the laneway.
- The laneway has no capacity on the laneway for any additional traffic.
- Traffic on the laneway causes vibrations for adjacent properties.
- The site is not suitable for a vehicular access / egress as it is located on a corner with no sightlines.
- Concerns that the proposed development would negatively impact on the residential amenity of the appellants property.

7.2. Applicant Response

None

7.3. Planning Authority Response

The response from the Planning Authority notes the content of the third-party appeal and refers the Commission to the Planners Report.

The proposed development is a less vulnerable development compared to the highly vulnerable use currently in situ. The shed is low in terms of ridge height with no fenestration / openings facing the third-party residential dwelling to the north. Considering the separation distances and absence of any openings, no issues arise in relation to loss of privacy, overlooking or residential amenity. Conditions have been

attached in order to alleviate any residential amenity concerns. No further comments on the appeal.

7.4. **Observations**

A detailed observation from Frank Herron was received. The main planning concern related to a potential traffic hazard and requests that access to the shed from the laneway be omitted.

7.5. **Further Responses**

None

8.0 **Assessment**

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

- Principle of Development.
- Design Approach.
- Built Heritage.
- Transport.
- Flood Risk.
- Archaeology.

8.2. In the interest of clarity this assessment relates to the development submitted by way of further information.

8.3. ***Principle of Development***

8.3.1. The proposed works include the demolition of an existing derelict dwelling and the construction of a single storey commercial shed. The appeal site forms part of a larger landholding within the applicant's ownership and is bound to the west and partially to the south by the applicant's premises 'Maxlite' which is a lighting and interiors

commercial unit fronting onto Main Street. In response to the request for further information the applicant states that the appeal site was purchased for the purpose of constructing the proposed storage shed which would be associated with the existing business.

- 8.3.2. The subject site is located within the settlement boundary of Lifford and zoned town centre, as defined on Map 21.52 of the Development Plan. Chapter 21 sets out the land use zoning objectives relating to Settlement Frameworks. The land use objective for 'town centre' is *to sustain and strengthen the core of towns as the centres for commercial, retail, cultural and community life*. Lifford is a designated 'Service Town' in the Settlement Strategy. Section 3.3.3 'Service Towns' of the Development Plan notes that such service towns provide important local retail and employment functions. Policy CS-0-7(b) of the Development Plan aims to support economic growth throughout the County through inter alia to continue to support 'County Growth Drivers' and 'Service Towns' as critical drivers of growth outside of Letterkenny.
- 8.3.3. Having regard to the existing use on site and the sites town centre zoning and location within the settlement boundary of Lifford I have no objection in principle to the proposed development and consider that the proposed development is in accordance with Policy CS-0-7(b) of the Development Plan.

8.4. ***Design Approach***

- 8.4.1. The proposed storage shed is rectangular in shape with a stated gross floor area of 80sqm. It has a pitched roof with a maximum height of c. 4.4m. The shed includes double doors on the southern elevation of the structure. Light to the structure is provided by 4 no. roof lights on the southern elevation of the pitched roof. The shed would be finished in a metal cladding.
- 8.4.2. The third parties raised concerns that the proposed development which includes a metal finish is not suitable for the laneway. Having regard to the commercial nature of the proposed shed, the variety of architectural styles within Lifford and on O'Brien Row, I am satisfied that the proposed design would not adversely affect the urban character of the area.
- 8.4.3. The observer also requested that access to the proposed development from O'Brien Row be omitted. It is noted that by way of further information the roller shutter doors on the eastern elevation of the shed, which fronted onto O'Brien Row were omitted. I

have no objection to the provision of a pedestrian access only to the commercial use from the laneway.

- 8.4.4. No details of the proposed boundary treatments have been provided, in particular the boundary treatment with O'Brien Row. However, I am satisfied that this could be addressed by way of condition.
- 8.4.5. Concerns that the proposed development would negatively impact on the residential amenity of the appellants property with particular regard to overlooking of the appellants privacy amenity space. The proposed shed is located a minimum of c. 2m from its southern boundary with two existing commercial premises fronting onto Main Street, a minimum of c. 0.1m from its boundary with the appellants property to the north, c. 0.7m from its western boundary and c. 0.5m from its eastern boundary with O'Brien Row. The proximity to the appellants property is noted, however, having regard to the limited height of the proposed shed, the urban location, the existing structure on site and as the shed does not have any windows on its elevations, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not negatively impact on any existing residential amenity, with regard to overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing impact.

8.5. ***Built Heritage***

- 8.5.1. The third party raised concerns that the appeal site is a heritage site and considers that the existing cottage should be restored. The appeal also notes that there is a historical plaque 3m from the appeal site, that the garda station is a listed building and there are old walls and buildings on the lane.
- 8.5.2. The existing structure has a stated area of 97.4sqm. The windows are boarded up. There are a number of roof tiles missing and gutters and downpipes are missing. The site is overgrown with vegetation growing from sections of the roof and side elevation of the cottage. The existing cottage is not a protected structure and is not listed on the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH) and the site is not located within an Architectural Conservation Area. The derelict cottage does not contain any features of architectural merit and is in a state of disrepair. Having regard to the structural and functional challenge of the existing structure on site, I have no objection to its demolition and replacement with a commercial storage shed.

8.5.3. There are a number of protected structures within Lifford, including the Lifford Garda Station (RPS no. 40800810) which is located c. 50m east of the appeal site. However, having regard to the backland location of the site, and the relatively minor nature and scale of the proposed development I am satisfied that the proposed development would not negatively impact on the character or setting of any protected structure.

8.6. ***Transport***

8.6.1. Concerns are raised by the third parties that the proposed development would result in a traffic hazard. The proposed storage shed has frontage onto O'Brien Row. O'Brien Row is a C-shaped, two-way laneway that connects Main Street to Foynes View. The lane is irregular in width, with a maximum width of c. 4m, with no footpath or public lighting. The laneway provides vehicular access to 3 no. residential units, the rear of commercial premises and the rear of Lifford Garda Station. It is acknowledged that due to the alignment of O'Brien Row and the number of high boundary walls along the laneway that there are limited sightlines available.

8.6.2. The proposed commercial storage shed is associated with an existing lighting and interiors commercial premises that fronts onto Main Street. The proposed development, as submitted by way of further information, includes a pedestrian only access from O'Brien Row. The applicant has stated that all deliveries to the storage shed would be via the shop entrance on Main Street. It is estimated that deliveries would be a maximum of one van per day. Main Street is a two-way street in the town centre with unrestricted car parking. There is also unrestricted car parking on the surrounding street network. I am satisfied that the surrounding road network has capacity to accommodate the likely volume of servicing / deliveries related to the proposed development.

8.6.3. The concerns of the third parties are noted. However, having regard to the information provided which indicates that the proposed development would not generate any additional vehicular movement on the laneway and to the commercial nature and small scale of the development, the previous residential use on the site, the established use of this laneway as a two-way vehicular route within the town centre and the limited number of properties located on O'Brien Row, I am satisfied that the proposed

development would not endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard. It is also noted that the Planning Authority raised no concerns regarding a traffic hazard.

- 8.6.4. The third parties also raised concerns that traffic on the laneway causes vibrations within their property. Having regard to the nature and scale of the development with no vehicular access, I am satisfied that it is unlikely to generate any additional vehicular movements on the laneway and, therefore, any associated vibrations. It is noted that other properties on the laneway also generate vehicular movements. Having regard to the relatively limited number of properties located on the access road, I am satisfied that the existing vehicular movements are unlikely to cause structural damage to any existing property.

8.7. **Flood Risk**

- 8.7.1. The site is located c. 100m north and east of the River Finn. Donegal's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and the OPW's Flood Maps (CFRAM) indicate that the appeal site is located in an area vulnerable to fluvial flooding (Flood Zone A).
- 8.7.2. With regard to applications for minor developments in areas of flood risk Section 5.28 of the Flood Risk Guidelines (2009) states that applications for minor development are unlikely to raise significant flooding issues, unless they obstruct important flow paths, introduce a significant additional number of people into flood risk areas or entail the storage of hazardous substances. Since such applications concern existing buildings, the sequential approach cannot be used to locate them in lower-risk areas, and the Justification Test will not apply.
- 8.7.3. Policy SF-P-1 of the Development Plan is reflective of the provisions of the Flood Risk Guidelines and states that within flood risk areas identified within settlement frameworks, only areas of established development will be considered for minor development only (e.g. small extensions to houses, and most changes of use of existing buildings and or extensions and additions to existing commercial and industrial enterprises, unless they obstruct important flow paths, introduce a significant additional number of people into flood risk areas or entail the storage of hazardous substance).
- 8.7.4. Having regard to the location of the appeal site within Lifford town centre, the existing derelict house on the site and the nature and minor scale of the commercial shed I am

satisfied that the proposed development is would not obstruct an important flow path, introduce a significant additional number of people and does not entail the storage of hazardous substances. Therefore, the proposed development does not raise significant flooding issues, and the Justification Test does not apply in this instance.

8.7.5. Policy SF-P-1 of the Development Plan and the Flood Risk Guidelines also states that applications for minor development shall be accompanied by a commensurate assessment of the risks of flooding to demonstrate that they would not have adverse impacts or impede access to a watercourse, floodplain or flood protection and management facilities. These proposals should follow best practice in the management of health and safety for users and residents of the proposal. In response to the request for further information the applicant notes that the proposed use is classified in the Flood Risk Guidelines as a less vulnerable use, the appeal site is within the town centre of Lifford, adjacent to existing commercial uses and that a new storm drainage system would be provided within the site including permeable areas and water butts.

8.7.6. Having regard to the available information I am satisfied that the proposed development would not increase the risk of fluvial flooding within the appeal site or elsewhere and is in accordance with Policy SF-P-1 of the Development Plan and the provisions of the Flood Risk Guidelines. I am also satisfied that the site is not at risk of flooding from all other sources including tidal, surface water, groundwater or infrastructure failure. It is also noted that the third parties raised no concerns in this regard.

8.8. ***Archaeology***

8.8.1. Lifford is a designated historic town (DG071-008) and the appeal site is located within a Zone of Archaeological Potential. Policy AYH-P-1(b) of the Development Plan seeks to conserve and protect Zones of Archaeological Protection in urban areas including Lifford. Condition 2 of the Planning Authority's grant of permission required archaeological monitoring to be carried out during the excavation works. If permission is being contemplated it is considered appropriate that a similar condition be attached.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the appeal in light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.
- 9.2. The proposed development is located within the town centre of Lifford, Co. Donegal. The River Finn SAC (002301) is located c. 100m south and east of the appeal site.
- 9.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the proposed development I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment as it could not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The location of the development in a serviced urban area.
 - The nature and extent of the proposed development.
 - The distance to the nearest European Site.
 - The lack of a direct hydrological or ecological pathway to a European Site.
- 9.4. I conclude, 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.
- 9.5. 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. 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.
- 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. In addition, the proposed development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the protection, maintenance, and improvement of water body status, as required under the Directive.

10.4. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

11.0 Recommendation

It is recommended that permission be granted subject to conditions.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the site's town centre zoning objective and location within the settlement boundary of Lifford, which is designated as a Service Town, the existing derelict dwelling on the site, the provisions of Policy CS-0-7(b) of the County Donegal Development Plan 2024 – 2030 which supports economic growth, the existing pattern of development in the area and to the nature and scale of the proposed development it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area or of any adjacent property, would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience and built heritage. The proposed development would, therefore, 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 with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 10th day of March 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 proposed structure hereby permitted shall be solely used for commercial storage purposes in conjunction with the applicants existing commercial

premises and shall not be sold, sub-let or leased for any other industrial or commercial uses.

Reason: To restrict the use of the development and in the interest of clarity.

3. Prior to commencement of development the applicant shall submitted for the written agreement of the Planning Authority details of all proposed boundary treatments.

Reason: To ensure a high standard of development and in the interest of residential and visual amenity.

4. Prior to commencement of development the applicant shall submitted a lighting plan for the written agreement of the Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.

5. During the operational phase of the proposed development noise levels as measured at the nearest noise sensitive receptor shall not exceed (a) 55 dB(A) rated sound level between the hours of 0700 to 2300, and (b) 45 dB(A) at all other times. Procedures for the purpose of determining compliance with this limit shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: To protect the residential amenities of property in the vicinity of the site.

6. The developer shall engage a suitably qualified archaeologist to monitor all excavation works. If, during the course of site works any archaeological material is discovered, the County Archaeologist / Planning Authority shall be notified immediately. The applicant/developer is further advised that in this event that under the National Monuments Act, the National Monuments Service, Dept. of Housing, Heritage and Local Government and the National Museum of Ireland require notification.

Reason: In the interest of preserving or preserving by record archaeological material likely to be damaged or destroyed in the course of development

7. No advertisement or advertisement structure, the exhibition or erection of which would otherwise constitute exempted development under the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended), shall be displayed or erected on

the acoustic fence, or within the curtilage of the site, without a prior grant of planning permission.

Reason: To allow further assessment of the impact of the permitted advertisement on the amenities of the area and in the interest of visual amenity.

8. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 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

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

Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management.

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.

Elaine Power
Senior Planning Inspector

29th July 2026

Appendix 1: EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501214-DL-26
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of existing derelict dwelling and construction of a new commercial storage shed.
Development Address	Lifford, Co. Donegal.
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)	Part 2, Schedule 5, Class 10 Infrastructure Projects – (b) (iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere. The site area is c. 0.17 ha gross, which is significantly below the 10ha threshold for urban development in other parts of a built-up area that's not a business district.
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 ☐	
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 2: EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-501214-DL-26
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of existing derelict dwelling and construction of a new commercial storage shed.
Development Address	Lifford, Co. Donegal.
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	The proposed development comprises the demolition of an existing derelict structure and the construction of a single storey commercial storage shed (80sqm). The nature and scale of the development is similar to the character of the surrounding area and the established pattern of development. The nature of the demolition works is minor. The proposed development does not include any significant excavation works. Having regard to the nature and minor scale of the proposed development I am satisfied that it would not give rise to significant use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution, nuisance, or a risk of accidents. There are no Seveso / COMAH sites in the vicinity of this location
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves,	The proposed development is located on an underutilised brownfield site in the town centre of Lifford. This site is not located on, in or adjacent to any ecologically sensitive site and does not have the potential to impact any such sites. There are no protected structures on the site, and the site is not listed as being of historic or cultural importance. There are no protected landscapes in the wider area. The site is located within a Zone of Archaeological Potential. A condition is recommended that ground works be subject to appropriate archaeological monitoring.

European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	The site is located in an area vulnerable to fluvial flooding (Flood Zone A). However, given the nature and scale of the proposed development and the implementation of proposed SUDS measures it would not increase the risk of fluvial flooding within the appeal site or elsewhere It does not host any species of conservation interest. This site is not located on, in or adjacent to any ecologically sensitive site and does not have the potential to impact any such sites. Having regard to the urban location of the site and the nature and scale of the development, I am satisfied that there is no potential to significantly affect environmental sensitivities in the area, including archaeology.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	Having regard to the characteristics and urban location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.

There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

