



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501314-DS-26

Development	RETENTION PERMISSION: For an electric vehicle charging arm installed in the front garden.
Location	9 Albany Road, Ranelagh, Dublin 6, D06 F9H6.
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	5040/26
Applicant(s)	Eugene Hillery.
Type of Application	Permission for Retention.
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission for Retention.
Type of Appeal	First Party.
Appellant(s)	Eugene Hillery.
Observer(s)	None on file.
Date of Site Inspection	6 th July, 2026.
Inspector	Aiden O'Neill.

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0	Planning History	7
5.0	Policy Context	7
6.0	EIA Screening	9
7.0	The Appeal	10
8.0	Assessment	12
9.0	AA Screening	15
10.0	Water Framework Directive	16
11.0	Recommendation	17
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	17
Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening		19

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The proposed development site is c. 0.0439ha and is located to the south of Albany Road, opposite the Church of the Holy Name, in Ranelagh, Dublin City. The site contains a semi-detached two-storey red bricked dwellinghouse set back from the public road with a well-maintained front garden bound by a wrought iron railing and gate. There is no off-street parking, with controlled parking available on the public road.

The EV Charging column, in black finish, to be retained is located in the front garden to the north-eastern boundary, behind the front railing.

1.2. 2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The proposed development consists of the retention of an electric vehicle charging arm installed at the northern boundary of the front garden of 9 Albany Road. The vehicle charging arm, stated to be an articulated arm, is c. 2.580m in height on the garden side (2.7m on the footpath side). When in operation, the charging arm would extend over the wrought iron front railing and public footpath to the on-street car parking space. The equipment retracts fully when not in use.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1.

Decision

Dublin City Council refused planning permission on 13th April, 2026 for 3no. reasons as follows:

1. The charging arm and associated cabling reduces the existing public footpath width and creates a potential trip hazard along the verge of the footpath. The development for retention is therefore contrary to SMT18 (The Pedestrian Environment) where it is policy of Dublin City Council to protect and maintain existing footpaths and endangers public safety by reason of traffic hazard or obstruction or road users or otherwise. The retention of the development therefore would set an undesirable precedent for similar type development and is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development for the area.

2. The Electric Vehicle charging arm that extends onto the public footpath on Albany Road is contrary to Volume 2, Appendix 5, Section 8.3 (Taking in Charge), where no private development shall overhang areas of public realm. No letter of consent has been issued by Dublin City Council Roads Section. The development for retention would therefore set an undesirable precedent for similar type development and is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
3. The development for retention relies on the public road to function and designation of public on-street car parking for the purposes of private car use which is contrary to DCC parking by-laws and in particular SMT 25 (On-Street Parking) which recognises the importance on-street car spaces in meeting the operational kerbside activities within the city and for Dublin City Council to control and manage on-street parking across the city to safeguard and enhance city living for people of all ages and abilities and for families. The development therefore sets an undesirable precedent for similar type development and is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development for the area.

3.1.1. Conditions

N/A.

3.2.

Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Deputy Planning Officer's report notes the following:

- The applicants are seeking retention permission for an electric vehicle charging arm installed in the front garden. The charging area is a ground mounted Electric Vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure (c. 2.58 in height).
- This is installed within the front garden of the subject site, in which an arm mechanism supports associated cabling, to run over the public footpath.
- This attaches to a parked (electric) private vehicle on the roadway.
- Under Section 14.7.1 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, the site is subject to zoning objective Z2 with a land use zoning objective 'to protect and / or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.'

- In terms of Section 14.7.2 and Policy BHA9, it is considered that the proposed column design is slender and the black finish is considered consistent with the character of the area. The structure does not appear to require the removal of architectural features typical of the area (wrought iron railing) and if required, can be removed without loss of the existing fabric.
- The file was referred to the Transportation Planning Division who recommended that permission is refused for the retention of the EV charging infrastructure. Based on the comments from the Transportation Planning Division it is recommended that retention permission is refused.

The Executive Planner's report is the basis for the Planning Authority's decision to refuse planning permission.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

The Report of the Drainage Division dated 6th March, 2026 states no objection subject to a condition.

The Report of the Transportation Planning Division dated 24th March, 2026 states that:

- This Division has serious concerns with the provision of private EV charging which relies on the public road outside the control and ownership of the applicant.
- In order for the proposed EV charging to function, the applicant would require a clear space between EV charging structure and sufficient space to park a car and clearance for the charging cable.
- These aspects are beyond the control and ownership of the applicant.
- It is noted that the applicant has not requested or received a letter of consent from the Transportation & Public Realm Department of Dublin City Council, responsible for the maintenance and control of the public road (from back of footpath to back of footpath).
- Notwithstanding, Dublin City Council Roads Section cannot issue consent for the erection of any permanent private structure that traverses the public road (either above or below ground level).

- Accordingly, the proposed development is contrary to Section 8.3 'Taking in charge' where it states that no part of a development shall overhang footpaths, roads and areas of public realm.
- Permission therefore should be refused on this basis.
- Furthermore, based on the information submitted, the functioning of the charging arm would require the informal reservation or designation of an on-street parking space for the benefit of a private dwelling.
- Such a requirement would be contrary to parking DCC bylaws but also SMT25 (On-Street Parking) which recognises the importance on-street spaces have in meeting the operational kerbside activities within the city and for Dublin City Council to control and manage on-street parking across the city to safeguard and enhance city living for people of all ages and abilities and for families. On this basis, permission should be refused.
- With regard to pedestrian safety, the existing footpath in front of the site is c. 1.9 metres. A clearance of height of 2.4m would be required for all parts of the charging area. The area where the charging cable comes down and connects to the car is illustrated on the drawing (DWG. Ref: 2026.02.P.102 'Image of Charging Arm').
- It is noted that this area is not linear and would depend on the position and location of the charging port on the car and is not controlled to prevent the cable encroaching further into the footpath.
- There is a serious concern that the structure and cabling when charging would cause a safety hazard for pedestrians, and in particular those with accessibility issues, where the cable drops and crosses the footpath, contrary to Policy SMT18 (The Pedestrian Environment) which seeks to continue to maintain and improve the pedestrian environment and protection of the public footpath.
- On this basis, permission should be refused.
- With regard to Policy SMT29 (Expansion of the EV Charging Network), it recognises that DCC will support charging on public land and private development. However, the proposed development relies on the provision of on-

street parking within the public road. Dublin Regional EV Parking Strategy, June 2022 (EV Strategy) notes that the EV charging requirements for users without off-street parking will be provided by neighbourhood charging led by the Council and forms a key focus of the EV Strategy.

Prescribed Bodies

None on file.

Third Party Observations

3.3.

None on file.

3.4.

4.0 Planning History

4.1 There is no recent planning history.

4.2 There is a live enforcement file, ref. E0755/24, in relation to the car charger installed at front, open since 24th July 2024.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1.

Development Plan

The provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 refer.

The proposed development site is zoned objective Z2; Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas) with a stated objective 'to protect and / or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas, where the following policies apply:

CHC1: To seek the preservation of the built heritage of the city that makes a positive contribution to the character, appearance and quality of local streetscapes and the sustainable development of the city.

CHC4: To protect the special interest and character of all Dublin's Conservation Areas.

CHC8: To facilitate off-street parking for residential owners/occupiers where appropriate site conditions exist, while protecting the special interest and character of protected structures and Conservation Areas.

Policy objective BHA9 of the Plan seeks to protect the special interest and character of all Dublin's Conservation Areas – identified under Z8 and Z2 zoning objectives and

denoted by red line conservation hatching on the zoning maps. Development within or affecting a Conservation Area must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible.

Section 8.5.1 of the Plan notes that Dublin City Council acknowledges the importance of transitioning to low carbon mobility solutions to mitigate against climate change and will continue to address this through an integrated set of policies and objectives. It is noted that the decarbonisation of vehicles is required and a regional strategy for electric vehicle (EV) charging will be implemented over the lifetime of the plan.

Objective CA04 seeks to support and implement the forthcoming Regional Strategy for Electric Vehicle (EV) charging over the lifetime of the plan in order to facilitate the transition to low carbon vehicles required to achieve 2030 national targets.

Objective SMT2 seeks to support the decarbonising of motorised transport and facilitate the rollout of alternative low emission fuel infrastructure, prioritising electric vehicle (EV) infrastructure.

Objective SMT18 seeks to continue to maintain and improve the pedestrian environment and strengthen permeability by promoting the development of a network of pedestrian routes including laneway connections which link residential areas with recreational, educational and employment destinations to create a pedestrian environment that is safe, accessible to all in accordance with best accessibility practice.

Objective SMT25 seeks to manage on-street car parking to serve the needs of the city alongside the needs of residents, visitors, businesses, kerbside activity and accessible parking requirements, and to facilitate the re-organisation and loss of spaces to serve sustainable development targets such as in relation to, sustainable transport provision, greening initiatives, sustainable urban drainage, access to new developments, or public realm improvements.

Objective SMT29 seeks to support the expansion of the EV charging network by increasing the provision of designated charging facilities for Electric Vehicles on public land and private developments in partnership with the ESB and other relevant stakeholders; and to support the Dublin Regional EV Parking Strategy.

Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

- 5.2. The Draft National EV Charging Infrastructure Strategy 2026 supports the Climate Action Plan target of 30% of the private car fleet being electric by 2030, ensuring that the provision of public charging infrastructure remains ahead of growing demand. It is noted that while home charging remains the primary method of charging for most EV users, public charging demand will continue to grow.

Regional Policy Objective RPO 7.42 of the Eastern and Midland Regional Assembly Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy 2019 states that local authorities shall include proposals in statutory land use plans to facilitate and encourage an increase in electric vehicle use, including measures for more recharging facilities and prioritisation of parking for EVs in central locations.

The Dublin Local Authority Electric Vehicle Charging Strategy 2022-2030 establishes a coordinated approach to deploying EV charging infrastructure in order to support and accelerate the decarbonisation of the transport system. The Dublin City Council implementation plan will include the identification of Council and community facilities that may allow scope for facilitating the siting of EV charge points.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

The proposed development site is c. 1.45km to the south-east of the Grand Canal pNHA (Site Code: 002104); 3.13km to the west of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024), the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210) and the South Dublin Bay pNHA (Site Code: 000210).

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 and 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

Grounds of Appeal

The First Party appeal sets out the following grounds:

7.1.

- The Planning Authority's first reason for refusal is fundamentally incorrect in fact and disproportionate in planning terms.
- The charging arm does not reduce the width of the public footpath and does not create a traffic hazard.
- The articulated arm was specifically installed to avoid the very danger identified by the Council, namely loose charging cables lying on the footpath surface. The cable is suspended above pedestrians' level and clear of the walking route at all times during use. The footpath remains fully unobstructed and accessible for pedestrians, wheelchair users, buggies, and persons with disabilities.
- No evidence has been represented by the Planning Authority demonstrating any actual obstruction, danger, accident or interference with pedestrian movement arising from the development. The refusal is therefore speculative in nature and unsupported by objective assessment.
- The development must also be considered in the context of national policy under the Climate Action Plan, the Government's electric vehicle strategy, and Ireland's obligations under the Climate Action Plan and Low Carbon Development Act, 2015, as amended, which requires the Planning Authority and An Coimisiún to carry out their functions in a manner consistent with climate objectives, insofar as practicable.
- Like many residences in older urban areas, the property had no driveway or off-street parking and there is presently no alternative means of safely charging the vehicle. The refusal effectively excludes residents of established urban neighbourhoods from participating in national climate policy objectives solely because they do not possess private driveways, with obvious detrimental climate effects.
- Importantly, no practical alternative has been identified or made available.

- In practical terms, the refusal substantially impairs the ability to utilise an electric vehicle at this urban residential property. Such an outcome is contrary to the principles of sustainable development, national climate policy, and the proper planning of existing urban communities.
- While the second and third grounds for refusal contend that the development would set an undesirable precedent, it is relevant that several other EV charging arms have been installed within an 80m radius.
- The absence of a clear consistent policy framework for such infrastructure creates significant uncertainty for urban residents attempting to comply with national transport in the second ground, is negligible, in particular when weighted against climate objectives.
- If Dublin City Council considers such arrangements unacceptable in principle, it is unclear what practical alternative is available to residents of traditional urban streets who have no access to private driveways or dedicated charging infrastructure.
- The third ground for refusal appears to be based on a contention that the designation is contrary to Dublin City Council SMT 25. First, there is nothing in the terms of SMT 25 which states or suggests that a charging arm of this type is undesirable. The contention appears to be that to grant permission would unduly promote the use of on street parking by private cars. This contention disregards the fact that a car owner who does not benefit from off-street parking will invariably look for park his or her in the vicinity of their home, which is reflected by the car parking permit system.
- A policy which makes it more difficult for car owners to engage in EV charging doesn't reduce on street parking but instead promotes to use of cars which run on fossil fuels, contrary to climate policy.
- The proposal is modest, reversible, safety-conscious, and causes no material injury to the public realm or pedestrian environment. The refusal therefore represents a disproportionate response to a development that directly supports national sustainability and transport objectives.

- Accordingly. An Coimisiún Pleanála is requested to overturn the decision of Dublin City Council and grant retention permission for the development.
- A photograph of the extended charging point is included with an appeal, illustrating a pedestrian walking under the outstretched charging arm.

Applicant Response in the case of a 3rd Party Appeal

- N/A.

Planning Authority Response

7.2.

- None on file.

7.3.

Observations

7.4.

- None on file.

Further Responses

7.5.

- N/A

8.0 Assessment

8.1.

Having examined all the application and appeal documentation on file, and having regard to relevant policy, I consider that main issues which require consideration in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal.

8.2.

The main appeal issues are, therefore, as follows:

8.3.

- Compliance with the Plan.

Compliance with the Plan

8.3.1 The proposed development consists of the retention of an electric vehicle charging arm installed in the front garden of 9 Albany Road, Ranelagh, Dublin 6.

8.3.2 Permission has been refused by Dublin City Council on transportation grounds, including the reliance on the public road outside the control of the applicant; an unacceptable overhang of a private development on a public road; the requirement for an informal reservation of an off-street car parking space; and the creation of a safety hazard for pedestrians. The provisions of the Dublin Regional EV Strategy for users without off-street car parking also apply.

- 8.3.3 As noted by the applicant, the proposed development is aligned with national, regional and local policies for decarbonising the transport sector.
- 8.3.4 As also noted by the Deputy Planning Officer, the proposed development is acceptable in principle on lands zoned Z2, and that having regard to policy objective BHA9 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, the proposed development, by reason of its design and materiality, is consistent with the character of the area. Having regard to the nature and extent of the electric vehicle charging arm, including its height, design and black finish, I would agree with the Deputy Planning Officer that the proposed development is acceptable in principle on lands zoned Z2.
- 8.3.5 In response to the 3no. reasons for refusal, the applicant makes the case that the charging arm is articulated, that there will be no loose cables, and that the footpath remains fully unobstructed and accessible. A photograph of the extended charging point is included with an appeal, illustrating a pedestrian walking under the outstretched charging arm without issue. In addition, it is stated that there is currently no alternative means of safely charging the vehicle.
- 8.3.6 While the case made by the applicant is acknowledged, this does not address the fundamental issue of alignment with the Dublin Local Authority Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging Strategy 2022-2030. This is the framework which the applicant states is absent. In the context of objective STM29 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, the Dublin City Council implementation plan of the EV Charging Strategy includes the identification of Council and community facilities that may allow scope for facilitating the siting of EV charge points. The report of the Council's Transportation Division states that the EV charging requirements for users without off-street parking will be provided by neighbourhood charging led by the Council.
- 8.3.7 While it is not clear if any such facilities have yet been identified or provided that would benefit the applicant, what is clear is that this is the preferred approach to EV charging provision in the City, including for those residences which do not have off-street parking.
- 8.3.8 The electric vehicle charging arm to be retained is not aligned with the preferred approach to EV charging provision for residences which do not have off-street parking.
- 8.3.9 In this context, the proposed development to be retained is therefore contrary to policy objective SMT29 in relation to the expansion of the EV charging network in Dublin City.

- 8.3.10 The applicant has clarified that the charging arm to be retained is articulated and that there are no loose cables. Therefore, it is considered that the potential for a trip hazard is unlikely. However, it is considered that the electric vehicle charging arm does obstruct the footpath by way of a height restriction where currently there is no height restriction and that this would have the potential to endanger public safety.
- 8.3.11 The applicant makes the case that similar EV charging arrangements are now commonplace, including at Beechwood Avenue Upper in the vicinity of Albany Road. However, the facilities located at Beechwood Avenue Upper, which are similar to that provided at 9 Albany Road, do not appear to have planning permission.
- 8.3.12 In this context, the proposed development to be retained is contrary to policy objective SMT18 in relation to the pedestrian environment.
- 8.3.13 The Planning Authority's second reason for refusal states that the proposed charging arm to be retained constitutes private development that overhangs the public realm which is contrary to Volume 2, Appendix 5, Section 8.3 (Taking in Charge). While it is noted that the applicant also does not have the consent of the Planning Authority to extend the arm over the public road outside the applicant's control, it is not considered that the Taking in Charge provisions apply in this instance, as no Taking in Charge of the charging arm is proposed. The second reason for refusal should be set aside on this basis.
- 8.3.14 The applicant also makes the case that the third reason for refusal appears to be based on a contention that to grant permission would unduly promote the use of on street parking by private cars, whereas on street parking is moderated by the car parking permit system. In this regard, I agree with the applicant, and do not consider that the proposed development to be retained will affect the provision of on-street car parking, nor is it contrary to objective SMT25 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022. The third reason for refusal should be set aside on this basis.
- 8.3.15 I recommend that the Commission upheld the decision of the Planning Authority to refuse permission.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the retention permission for an electric vehicle charging arm installed in the front garden at 9 Albany Road, Ranelagh, Dublin 6, D06 F9H6.in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.2 The proposed development site is c. 3.13km to the west of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024), and the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210).
- 9.3 The proposed development consists of retention permission for an electric vehicle charging arm installed in the front garden at 9 Albany Road, Ranelagh, Dublin 6, D06 F9H6..
- 9.4 No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.5 In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024), and the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210) in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- The modest scale of the works and the nature of the development
- Location - distance from nearest European site and lack of connections

- 9.6 Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.
- 9.7 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.
- 9.8 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 site is located in the established suburban area of Ranelagh, South Dublin City. The nearest relevant water body is the Dodder_040, code IE_EA_09D010620, c. 0.803km to the south-east, the status of which is 'At Risk'.
- 10.2 The proposed development consists of retention permission for an electric vehicle charging arm installed in the front garden at 9 Albany Road, Ranelagh, Dublin 6, D06 F9H6.
- 10.3 No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal. I have assessed the proposed development of retention permission for an electric vehicle charging arm installed in the front garden at 9 Albany Road, Ranelagh, Dublin 6, D06 F9H6., 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.
- 10.4 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The nature and scale of the development proposed.
 - Distance from the nearest relevant water body, and the lack of hydrological connections.
- 10.5 Conclusion

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

I recommend that permission for the proposed development is refused for the following reasons and considerations.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

11.1.

1. Objective SMT29 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022 seeks to support the expansion of the EV charging network by increasing the provision of designated charging facilities for Electric Vehicles on public land and private developments in partnership with the ESB and other relevant stakeholders; and to support the Dublin Regional EV Parking Strategy. This policy is considered to be reasonable. The electric vehicle charging arm to be retained is not aligned with the preferred approach to EV charging provision for residences which do not have off-street parking. The retention of the development therefore would set an undesirable precedent for similar type development and is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development for the area.
2. The electric vehicle charging arm to be retained obstructs the public footpath by way of a height restriction where currently there is no height restriction and that this would have the potential to endanger public safety. The development for retention is therefore contrary to objective SMT18 (The Pedestrian Environment) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 where it is policy of Dublin City Council to protect and maintain existing footpaths and endangers public safety by reason of traffic hazard or obstruction or road users or otherwise. The retention of the development therefore would set an undesirable precedent for similar type development and is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development for 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.

Aiden O'Neill
Planning Inspector

13th July, 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501314-DS-26
Proposed Development Summary	RETENTION PERMISSION: For an electric vehicle charging arm installed in the front garden.
Development Address	9 Albany Road, Ranelagh, Dublin 6, D06 F9H6.
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 ☒	

Inspector: _____

Date: 13th July, 2026