



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501251-DN-26

Development	Change of use of existing retail unit at ground floor level to a gaming outlet and proposed link access to an existing gaming outlet at basement level previously granted permission Ref 309865-21 and all associated site works.
Location	185 Parnell Street, at the corner of Dominick Street Lower, Dublin 1
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council North
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1359/26
Applicant(s)	Royal Amusements Ltd
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Royal Amusements Ltd
Observer(s)	None

Date of Site Inspection

14/07/26

Inspector

Donal Farrelly

Contents

1.0 Introduction	4
2.0 Site Location and Description	4
3.0 Proposed Development	4
4.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
4.1. Decision	5
4.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
4.3. Prescribed Bodies	6
4.4. Third Party Observations to the Planning Authority	6
5.0 Planning History.....	6
6.0 Policy Context.....	7
7.0 EIA Screening.....	10
8.0 The Appeal	10
8.1. Grounds of Appeal	10
8.2. Planning Authority Response	11
8.3. Observations.....	11
9.0 Assessment	11
10.0 AA Screening.....	16
11.0 Water Framework Directive	17
12.0 Recommendation	17
13.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	18
Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	19

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. Planning permission was granted for the existing basement gaming/gambling outlet in 2021 under planning reference no. **2079/21**. Under Planning Reference no. **2781/20** permission was granted for a ground floor restaurant/takeaway in 2020. This is the current permitted use for the vacant ground floor retail unit subject to this appeal. The current application is for a change of use from the permitted restaurant use to a gaming/casino use and connect it internally through the fire stairs with the existing gaming use at the basement level.

2.0 Site Location and Description

- 2.1. The appeal site is located at the corner of no. 185 Parnell Street and Dominick Street Lower. Above the ground floor retail unit are four floors of residential units. Adjacent to the ground floor unit on Dominick Street is the fire exit for the Royal Amusements gaming business, and a vacant flats development. Adjacent to the premises on Parnell Street is a retail shop, access to the residential units over the ground floor unit (Stewart House), and the entrance to the Royal Amusements gaming business.
- 2.2. Dominick Street Luas stop is located adjacent to the appeal site. There are existing casino/gambling premises located on Parnell Street adjacent to the Luas stop and on O' Connell Street.

3.0 Proposed Development

- 3.1. The proposed development comprises a change of use of the vacant ground floor retail unit to a gaming outlet. The proposal also includes an internal link access from the ground floor level to the existing gaming outlet located at basement level. The proposed gaming outlet will be 109.78m². The existing basement gaming outlet is 237.6m². Access to the proposed gaming outlet will be by the existing external ground floor corner doorway and internally by the existing fire escape access already provided by the basement level unit.

4.0 Planning Authority Decision

4.1. Decision

- 4.1.1. Permission was refused by Decision Order dated 21/04/2026 for the following reason.

Having regard to the location of the site in the central shopping core of the City, on a Category 2 shopping street, the proposed lower-order use would be contrary to Policy 1. CCUV16 (Category 1 and Category 2 Street), Section 15.14.12 (Night Clubs/Licenced Premises/Casinos/Private Member Clubs) and Section 8.12 (Category 1 and 2 Streets) of Appendix 2 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028, where there is a strong policy presumption against such uses which would undermine the retail / complementary uses/functions of the street and which seeks to promote higher order retail and complimentary and active uses at street level on the principal shopping streets in the central shopping core. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, would set an undesirable precedent for similar such uses in the area and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

4.2. Planning Authority Reports

4.2.1. Planning Reports

- Report of Planner dated 10/04/2026 recommends a refusal of permission. This refusal was based on the following. The proposed gaming use would be contrary to the primary retail function and complementary uses of primary city centre streets.

4.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Transportation. No objection subject to condition.
- Drainage, Planning and Development Control. No objection.
- Archaeology. No response received.

4.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

Irish Water. No response received

National Transport Authority. No response received.

Transport Infrastructure Ireland. No objection subject to s49 Luas Line Levy.

Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage. No response received.

4.4. **Third Party Observations to the Planning Authority**

Objection received from Councillor Janet Horner (with a number of names in support of the objection added to the letter) regarding the proposed change of use and further gaming facilities would be counter productive to urban living on Parnell Street and Dominick Street.

Objection received from the Rotunda Hospital regarding a gaming facility in a residential and retail building, would attract anti social behaviour and would impact urban living.

5.0 **Planning History**

I consider the following planning history to be relevant.

Planning Reference 5103/22. The development consists of advertising appearing on doorway and surround at ground floor level and all associated site works. Retention permission refused on 13/12/22.

Planning Reference no. 3563/22. The development will consist of the proposed erection of signage to the existing shopfront fascias on the ground floor elevation of a restaurant previously granted permission under Reg. Ref. 2781/20 and over/adjacent to the ground floor entrances to a gaming outlet (containing amusement-with-prize machines) at basement level previously granted permission by An Bord Pleanala under Reg. Ref. ABP 309865-2, and all associated site works and services. Permission granted on 28/06/22

Planning Reference no. 207921/ABP 309865-21. The development will consist of change of use of existing vacant retail unit at basement level to a gaming outlet

(containing amusement-with-prize machines) and all associated site works and services. Granted permission by ABP on 15/06/21.

Planning Reference no. 2781/20. The development will consist of change of use of existing vacant ground floor & basement level retail unit to restaurant/takeaway at ground floor level and to a gaming outlet (containing amusement-with-prize machines) at basement level, new external signage and all associated site works and services. Split Decision (permission granted, with refusal for gaming outlet at basement level) issued 03/11/20. Appeal to ABP under **ABP-308709-20** was invalidated. Final grant issued by the PA on 08/01/20.

6.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 (Development Plan) definition of Category 1 and Category 2 Shopping Streets: *Category 1 and Category 2 shopping streets relate to the premier shopping streets within the city centre retail core. In order to maintain and strengthen the retail character of the city centre retail core, which can be adversely affected by dead frontage and lower-order retail uses, the premier shopping streets in the city centre retail core are designated Category 1 and Category 2 shopping streets.*

The subject site is located on a Category 2 Street of the City Centre Retail Core. The purpose of the Category 2 designation is to provide for a mix of retail and other complementary uses which will increase shopper dwell time in the city.

I consider the following objectives and policies of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 to be most relevant to the appeal.

Chapter 7 - The City Centre, Urban Villages and Retail

Policy CCUV13 - Vacant Units. To promote the temporary use of vacant premises in order to reduce the level of vacancy on streets in the city's urban centres

Policy CCUV14 - Adult Shops, Betting Shops and Gaming Arcades. That there will be a presumption against adult shops, betting shops and gaming arcades in proximity to residential areas, places of public worship and schools and similarly,

there will be a presumption against an excessive concentration of such uses having regard to the existing presence of such retail outlets in an area.

Policy CCUV15 - Premier Shopping Area. To affirm and maintain the status of the city centre retail core as the premier shopping area in the State, affording a variety of shopping, cultural and leisure attractions. In line with the Retail Planning Guidelines, 2012, the city centre should be the main focus for higher order comparison retail in the city to protect its retailing role and primacy.

Policy CCUV16 – Category 1 and Category 2 Streets. To protect the primary retail function of Category 1 Streets in the city and to provide for a mix of retail and other complementary uses on Category 2 streets. To promote active uses at street level on the principal shopping streets in the city centre retail core having regard to the criteria for Category 1 and Category 2 streets (see Appendix 2 and Figure 7.2).

Policy CCUV17. Diversifying the City Centre. To ensure the resilience of Dublin City Centre to changing trends in retail demand, appropriate opportunities to further diversify the city centre as a place to live, work and socialise will be encouraged.

Policy CCUV35. Night Time Economy. To support and facilitate evening / night time economy uses that contribute to the vitality of the city centre and that support the creation of a safe, balanced and socially inclusive evening / night time economy.

Policy CCUV36. New Development To support uses that would result in the diversification of the evening and night time economy where there is little impact on the amenity of adjoining or adjacent residential uses through noise disturbance and where there are no negative cumulative impacts in terms of other night-time economy uses in the area.

Section 7.5.2 - Primacy of the City Centre and Retail Core Area. This references the premier shopping streets as Category 1 and Category 2, with the land use criteria set out in the DCC Retail Strategy in Appendix 2 of the DP.

Chapter 14 Land Uses

Section 14.7.5 – Zone Z5 City Centre

Land-Use Zoning Objective Z5: To consolidate and facilitate the development of the central area, and to identify, reinforce, strengthen and protect its civic design character and dignity

Z5-'Permissible Uses' include for 'Amusement/leisure complex'.

Z5-'Open for Consideration Uses' include for 'betting office'

Chapter 15 Development Standards

15.14.9 Betting Shops/Adult Store. It is an objective to prevent over concentration of these premises, and such uses will be controlled having regard to similar existing premises in the area, impact on amenities of the area, and to protect the viability of shopping areas.

15.14.12 - Night Clubs/Licenced Premises/Casinos/ Private Member Clubs. DCC recognises the importance of the 24 hour city concept but a balance is needed between entertainment uses and high quality retail functions, protect amenities of the area including noise pollution, and minimise impact and street presence of casinos and members clubs.

'In cases where new uses, including uses such as casinos and private members' clubs, or extensions to the existing use are proposed, the onus is on the applicant to demonstrate that such proposed development will not be detrimental to the residential, environmental quality or the established character and function of the area'

Appendix 2: Retail Strategy. This sets out the planning policy context and strategic guidance for retail development in Dublin City, and criteria for assessment of planning applications.

Section 8.12 - Category 1 and 2 Streets. *'Dublin City Council will seek to prohibit adult shops, betting shops and **gaming arcades** on Category 1 and 2 principle shopping streets in Dublin. Figure 7.2 in Chapter 7 identifies the Category 1 and 2 Streets. Policy CCUV16 also refers.'*

Appendix 17: Advertising and Signage provides guidance on the provision of various types of signage within various locations in the city. **The appellant is not proposing any signage in their submission.**

Shopfront Design Guide, DCC, 2001. This provides guidelines regarding the design of shopfronts for contemporary design and the protection of original shopfronts.

5.4 Natural Heritage Designations

South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024) is located circa 2.5km to the northwest of the appeal site.

Proposed Natural Heritage Areas

North Dublin Bay (000206) is located 1.2km to the northeast of the appeal site.

7.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development does not come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA, that is, it does not comprise construction works, demolition or intervention in the natural surroundings. [Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report].

8.0 The Appeal

8.1. Grounds of Appeal

The first party appeal was received from a consultant acting on behalf of the appellant. The submission includes photographs and is summarised as follows.

- The PA opposes the extension of an authorised amusement use into a vacant permitted restaurant use.
- The wider considerations of the Development Plan have not been applied in the assessment. The proposal would not affect the amenities of the area.
- ABP overturned the previous refusal under PL29N/309865 in that the provision of an amusement use would not undermine the primary retail function of the Category 2 retail street. The Planner did not explain the basis for preferring shopping policies over the land use zoning.
- The Z5 zoning objective encourages a range of non retail uses including those that operate outside the traditional shopping hours.
- There have been previous letting difficulties of the premises and the appellant suggests that it will not be used for any retail purpose in the future. Permission granted under 2781/20 for a restaurant also constitutes a loss of retail space. The current proposal therefore does not result in a loss of retail space or introduction of an activity not already present in the building.

- The terms of the appellants lease does not allow for subletting and finding a partner for the permitted restaurant has not been possible due to commercial and economic constraints.
- Amusement centres can co-locate with residential properties. An example is provided by the appellant under planning reference no. PL29N.309865 which is for the basement unit located under the appeal unit approved by ABP in 2021.
- The current refusal does not raise concerns with respect to overlooking, overshadowing, or visual amenity.
- The proposal would accord with adopted planning policy for the area.
- The DP has conflicting land use and shopping policies, and the planners report does not address these competing provisions. The planners report does not state which retail offering could be accommodated in the premises in place of the proposal.
- The development is not extensive and floorspace is limited. This is in contrast to PL29S.246925 which was for a larger unit. I note that this application was refused by ABP.

8.2. **Planning Authority Response**

None

8.3. **Observations**

None

9.0 **Assessment**

Having examined the planning application details and all other documentation on file, including the submission received in relation to the appeal, the report 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 issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of development and planning history
- Impact on residential amenity
- Impact on streetscape

Principle of development and planning history

- 9.1. I have reviewed the proposed ground floor plan drawing submitted to the PA and note that the proposed ground floor includes 'amusement-with-prize machines'. The existing floor plan outlines a similar use at the basement level. I observed the existing basement use during my site visit and consider it to be gaming machines associated with gambling.
- 9.2. I consider that the proposed development is associated with a casino/gambling use which utilises prize machines and I do not consider it a premises associated with an amusement/leisure complex. Section 8.12 of the Development Plan prohibits such casino/gambling uses on Category 2 Streets. Policy CCUV14 also prohibits an overconcentration of casino uses in an area and section 15.14.12 seeks to protect the existing character of the area.
- 9.3. I consider there to be an overconcentration of casino/gambling uses in the area with various premises located on O' Connell Street and adjacent to the Parnell Street Luas Stop. I consider Policy CCUV14 and Section 8.12 of the Development Plan to be appropriate in this instance due to the overconcentration of uses in the area and on a Category 2 street, and the potential to create dead frontage on a street in an area which is subject to regeneration and which I consider to also be contrary to s15.14.12 of the Development Plan.
- 9.4. I note the reason for refusal and the submissions received regarding the use of the ground floor premises for a gaming outlet. I note under **planning reference no. 2079/21** that permission was granted for the basement gaming outlet in 2021. Under **Planning Reference no. 2781/20** permission was granted for a ground floor restaurant/takeaway in 2020. This is the current permitted use for the vacant retail unit subject to this appeal.
- 9.5. The appellant outlines in their appeal submission that the proposed change of use of the ground floor to a gaming outlet constitutes an extension of the permitted basement gaming outlet use. They propose to use the existing internal fire escape to

connect the basement and ground floor levels. The appellant states that they have been unsuccessful in finding a restaurant partner due to the economic and financial costs associated with this business model. They further outline that they expect the unit to remain vacant as a result of this.

- 9.6. The PA planners report outlines that the site is zoned Z5 as per the DP. The report refers to 'Amusement/leisure complex' as a permitted use under the Z5 zoning objective. Under section 4.0 of the planners report it notes that the proposed gaming use is more associated with a casino/gambling.
- 9.7. I note under Article 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) (Regulations) the following; *"amusement arcade" means premises used for the playing of gaming machines, video games or other amusement machines.*
- 9.8. I refer to the Planning Inspector's report under planning reference no. ABP-309865-21. The Planning Inspector outlined that they consider the principle of development acceptable with respect to the location of the basement gaming use within the Z5 zoning objective. I acknowledge however that this appeal was assessed by the Planning Inspector under the previous Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022. 'Amusement/leisure complex' was outlined as a permissible use under the Z5 zoning objective of the Development Plan 2016-2022. I also note that the 2016-2022 Development Plan includes restrictions regarding the development of ground floor gaming uses to avoid predominance of such uses on Category 2 streets.
- 9.9. I have reviewed the definition of 'amusement arcade' under Article 5 of the 2001 Regulations and I conclude that this definition is associated with amusement arcade style machines and not gambling machines. I am satisfied that there is a clear distinction between gambling and non-gambling gaming machines. Further to this I have also considered the permitted uses of the Z5 zoning objective. This includes 'Amusement/leisure complex' which is defined under s1.0 Land Use Definitions of Appendix 15 the DP as a building used for the playing of gaming machines, video games or other amusement machines as defined in Article 5 of the Regulations. I am of the opinion that this does not include gaming machines associated with gambling or a casino style premises.
- 9.10. Having regard to the zoning of the site and definition of 'amusement arcade' under Article 5 of the Regulations I consider that the casino/gambling use is not a permitted

use within the said zoning designation. I consider that the principle of development is subject to an assessment of its impact on the residential amenity of the area and impact on the streetscape having regard to the fact that the unit is located on a Category 2 shopping street.

9.11. Further to the above I do not consider there to be a conflict in the DP regarding the zoning objective and the DP policies, as I do not consider that the proposed development to be a permissible use under the Z5 zoning objective.

9.12. **Impact on residential amenity**

9.13. I note that the appellant argues that the proposed development can collocate beside existing residential development and would contribute to activities that operate outside the traditional shopping hours.

9.14. I note the submissions received by the PA regarding impact on residential amenity in an area with existing and proposed residential development. I note the PI report under **ABP reference no. 309865-21** which previously outlined that they were satisfied that there would be no impact on the residential units above the basement gaming use as Parnell Street is a mixed use area and not exclusively a residential area. This was assessed by the Planning Inspector under the previous Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022.

9.15. I note that s15.14.12 of the DP outlines that the onus is on the applicant to remonstrate that the extension of existing gaming activities will not impact on residential amenities of the area. The appellant has referred to the development as being located within a mixed use area.

9.16. I am of the opinion that the proposed use on the ground floor would not change the fact that this is a mixed use area and the gaming activities are classified as a permitted use under the Z5 zoning objective of the CDP subject to satisfying the appropriate policies of the DP. I do not consider that the proposed use would result in an impact on residential amenity due to the mixed use nature of the area. I am satisfied that appropriate planning conditions including hours of operation would protect residential amenity in the event of a grant of permission.

9.17. **Impact on streetscape**

- 9.18. I acknowledge that the permitted use for the unit is restricted to a restaurant/hot food takeaway as per the extant permission **2781/20**. I also note that the appeal site is located on a Category 2 shopping street. S8.12 of the DP states ‘Dublin City Council will seek to prohibit adult shops, betting shops and gaming arcades on Category 1 and 2 principle shopping streets in Dublin’. This restriction is also emphasised in the PA planners report.
- 9.19. I also note s15.14.12 (Night Clubs/Licenced Premises/Casinos/ Private Member Clubs) of the DP. This outlines that the onus is on the applicant to demonstrate that the proposed use or extension to an existing use will not be detrimental to the environmental quality and character of the area, residential amenity, and impact on the existing streetscape. Policy CCUV16 also emphasises the importance of maintaining an active street frontage on Category 2 streets. The planners report also raised concerns regarding hours of operation, dead frontage, and proximity to residential units on top of the ground floor unit.
- 9.20. The Planning Inspector noted under **ABP reference no. 309865-21** that there would not be an over concentration of gaming facilities on Parnell Street as a result of the basement development. This was assessed under the 2016-2022 Development Plan. I am of the opinion that the proposed development would intensify the existing gaming use and I would consider this to represent an over concentration of gaming facilities in the area having regard to the existing facilities on both Parnell Street and O’ Connell Street. I am of the opinion therefore that the proposed development which is an extension of the permitted basement gaming use would contravene Policy CCUV14 of the DP in this regard.
- 9.21. The appellant argues that the vacant unit is permitted for a restaurant use and therefore is no longer available for retail use, and that the gaming use represents an expansion of the permitted basement level facility. I note the appellant argues that the DP policies are not consistent with the Z5 zoning objective. I am of the view that the Z5 zoning objective outlines permitted uses, and I do not consider the proposed development to be a permitted use. The policies of the DP with respect to Category 2 retail streets and the provision of gaming facilities are subject to a number of restrictions which are relevant to the proposed development including impacts on the streetscape.

- 9.22. I note the gaming outlet was approved by **ABP reference no. 309865-21** on the basis that it would not impact on the streetscape as it is confined to the basement level. I also note that the PI's report outlined that if the gaming use was located at ground floor level that it could result in dead frontage and the use may not contribute to the enhancement of the vitality and vibrancy at street level.
- 9.23. I am of the opinion that the proposed use would impact on the streetscape on this Category 2 retail street by creating dead frontage and a use that would not contribute to the vibrancy envisioned for a Category 2 street of the city centre. I consider that s8.12 of Appendix 2 of the Development Plan is relevant in this regard. I acknowledge the rationale provided by the appellant in that the unit is vacant and that there are viability issues regarding establishing a restaurant use. However, the DP is clear regarding the policies for Category 2 retail streets and I consider that the appellant has not satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposed change of use will not have an adverse impact on the streetscape and I do not consider it to be in accordance with s15.14.12 and Policy CCUV16 of the DP.
- 9.24. I do not consider that the change of use to a restaurant means that the unit is no longer considered a retail unit in terms of satisfying the policy requirements for a Category 2 shopping street. A restaurant does not create dead frontage and ensures an active streetscape. This use would therefore complement the policies and objectives of a Category 2 street.
- 9.25. Having regard to the above I recommend to the Commission that the application be refused as I do not consider that a casino/gambling use is open for consideration for Category 2 streets and I do not consider the use appropriate as it will create dead frontage in an area undergoing regeneration.

10.0 **AA Screening**

- 10.1. I have considered the project in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located at the corner of no. 185 Parnell Street and Dominick Street approximately 2.5km southeast of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024).

The permission is for a change of use of the existing ground floor vacant retail unit to a gaming use.

No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered that no significant construction works are required, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

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.

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

11.0 Water Framework Directive

- 11.1. 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.

Having considered that no significant construction works are required, 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.

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

12.0 Recommendation

- 12.1. I recommend to the Commission that permission be refused for the reasons and considerations set out below.

13.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the location of the site in the central shopping core of the City, on a Category 2 shopping street, the proposed lower-order casino/ gambling use would be contrary to Policy CCUV16 (Category 1 and Category 2 Street), Section 15.14.12 (Night Clubs/Licensed Premises/Casinos/Private Member Clubs) and Section 8.12 (Category 1 and 2 Streets) of Appendix 2 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028, where there is a strong policy presumption against such uses which would undermine the retail / complementary uses/functions of the street and which seeks to promote higher order retail and complimentary and active uses at street level on the principal shopping streets in the central shopping core, and to avoid the creation of dead frontage. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, would set an undesirable precedent for similar such uses in the area and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

Donal Farrelly
Planning Inspector

11/08/26

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501251-DN-26
Proposed Development Summary	Change of use of the existing vacant retail unit at ground floor level to a gaming outlet. A proposed internal link access to the existing gaming outlet at basement level is also proposed.
Development Address	185 Parnell Street, at the corner of Dominick Street Lower, Dublin 1
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.	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 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 ☐	
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____