



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501333-CC-26

Development	Retention of existing 1.8m high timber boundary fence.
Location	44, Melbourn Road, Bishopstown, Cork, T12KC6X
Planning Authority	Cork City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2644536
Applicant(s)	Mohd Yaser Kayyal
Type of Application	Retention
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Retention
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Mohd Yaser Kayyal
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	17 th July 2026
Inspector	Michele Beirne

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
3.1. Decision	3
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	6
3.4. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History	6
5.0 Policy Context	8
6.0 EIA Screening	9
7.0 The Appeal	9
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	9
7.2. Planning Authority Response	11
7.3. Observations	11
8.0 Assessment	11
9.0 AA Screening	16
10.0 Water Framework Directive	17
11.0 Recommendation	18
12.0 Reasons and Considerations	18
Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	20

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located at No. 44 Melbourn Road, Bishopstown in Cork City. The site contains a two storey detached dwelling and is a corner site at the junction of Melbourn Road and Allendale Drive. The site adjoins 42 Melbourn Road to the south and is adjacent to an entrance to a residential estate to the north. The rear of the site adjoins No. 4 Allendale Drive in the estate. There is a 1.8m high timber fence and hedging located to the front (stepped back from the front building line), side and rear of the dwelling.
- 1.2. The site is c1.5km west of Cork University Hospital and within the Melbourn Road Estates Architectural Conservation Area. This is a mature residential area with a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings. The area was developed during the late 1960s and early 1970s and has an open plan character. Melbourn Road connects Curraheen Road to the south with Model Farm Road to the north.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1 The application seeks retention permission for the following:
 - Retention of existing 1.8m high timber boundary fence.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Cork City Council (CCC) issued notification of a decision to refuse permission on the 15th April 2026 for one reason.

- 3.1.1. The reason for refusal is as follows: *'Having regard to:*
 - (a) the location of the site within the Melbourn Road Estates Architectural Conservation Area (Ref: Map 16 of Volume 2 and Pgs. 68-69 of Volume 3 of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028),*
 - (b) the open plan character of this ACA which is identified within the 'Statement of Character' as being quite unique in the city,*

(c) planning policy contained within Paragraphs 8.32 – 8.36, Strategic Objective 7 and Objective 8.23 and 8.27 of Volume 1 of the Plan and the Architectural Heritage Protection, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht), 2011; and

(d) the prominent location of the fencing to be retained and the loss of the open plan character on this site, the retention of the development, would, if permitted, neither preserve nor enhance the special character of this A.C.A. but would result in a visually discordant feature which would have a negative impact on the spatial character of this streetscape and the overall character of the A.C.A.

The retention of the development would thereby seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity and the pattern and character of the streetscape, would set an undesirable precedent for similar type developments in the area. It would therefore be contrary to policies and objectives regarding development within ACAs as outlined within the Development Plan and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.'

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The SP report can be summarised as follows:

- Agree with recommendation to refuse permission.

The SEP report can be summarised as follows:

- The site is zoned objective ZO1 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhood and within a designated ACA.
- The sites planning history and a current enforcement case (E8243) is outlined.
- The planning history for No. 1 Allendale Drive includes a Section 5 declaration by ABP that the removal of a 4.5m high hedge and construction of a fence not exceeding 2m within and bounding the curtilage of the dwelling was development and not exempted development. Enforcement cases were closed without action and the structure remains in situ.

- The Melbourn Estate ACA is particularly defined by its lack of plot boundaries. This provides a spacious and open character unique in the city.
- The Development Plan states a main issue in the ACA is the erection of property boundaries, which negatively affects the overall character and original design.
- The existing fence has negatively impacted the open character of the ACA and fails to preserve the significance of this ACA.
- The estate has a particularly strong architectural and landscape character and has overwhelmingly retained its open plan character apart from No. 1 Allendale.
- The designation as an ACA under the 2022 Development Plan acknowledges its unique character and de-exempts certain works such as the fencing.
- This is a prominent corner site with extensive frontage to Melbourn Road and Allendale Drive. All lengths of the fencing are visible especially along Allendale Drive and to the rear. These sections in particular negatively impact on the character of the ACA and the setting of No. 4 Allendale Drive.
- The fence is out of character with the prevailing open plan nature of the ACA and is a visually discordant element on the streetscape.
- The Conservation Officer has recommended a refusal and this is supported as the fence is having a negative visual impact on the amenities of this ACA.
- Retention of the fencing cannot be supported, given the designation of the area as an ACA and Strategic Objective 7, Objectives 8.23 and 8.27.
- It is recommended permission be refused.
- The enforcement case timeline is noted. Enforcement action to remove the unauthorised structure is strongly recommended a.s.a.p. to prevent further erosion of the character or it being used as a precedent. It is noted the fence at No. 1 Allendale Drive is cited as a precedent.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Conservation report: Refusal recommended. The existing fence has negatively impacted the open character of the ACA and fails to preserve the

significance of this ACA, which is particularly defined by lack of plot boundaries. Retention would fail to accord with the Plan as works do not 'protect' or 'enhance' 'Cork's unique cultural heritage' (Strategic Objective 7) or respond 'respectfully to the historic environment' (Objective 8.23).

- Contributions report: No contribution applicable.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. Two third party submissions were made to the Planning Authority. They are summarised as follows:

- The development is out of keeping with the ACA. It is visually out of place, harms the look of the estate, devalues properties and is aesthetically unpleasing.
- The frontage is two public roads rather than a rear or side garden.
- The development exceeds exempted development limitation for fencing.
- It creates a road safety hazard, visibility is reduced at the corner.
- Residents have consistently opposed the development including signing a petition against planning permission with c61 signatures in December 2020.
- No. 1 Allendale was a dereliction of duty by the Council in not enforcing unauthorised development. It is requested this is not repeated.

4.0 Planning History

4.1.1. Site - 44 Melbourn Road

Planning History

- Planning Ref. 22/41160: Permission granted in 2022 for the retention and completion of a rear single storey extension.

Condition No. 6 is of note: *Notwithstanding the drawings hereby approved, the proposed wooden boundary fence was not assessed as part of this application. It does not form part of this approval as it was not described in the development description on the application form or on the public notice.*

- Planning Ref. 21/40673: Split decision in 2022 where a single storey side extension was refused and the retention of porch, retention and completion of single storey rear extension, garage conversion, elevation changes granted.

Condition 6 was as per Condition 6 of Planning Ref: 22/41160.

The side extension was refused for the following reason: *The proposed single storey side extension to the northern elevation of the existing house, by reason of its location, scale and design would be out of character with existing adjacent residential properties and would accordingly seriously injure the visual amenity of the area, have a negative impact on the character of the host property and that of the wider area, and set an undesirable precedent for similar extensions.*

Enforcement

- Planning Ref. E8243: Current enforcement case on fence.

4.1.2. No. 1 Allendale Drive - Other side of entrance to estate

Planning History

- Planning Ref. 25/44374: Permission granted in 2025 for 5 rooflights:

The planners report noted enforcement history and the assessment was made solely on the basis of the application.

- Planning Ref. 21/40242: Permission granted in 2021 to demolish a conservatory, an extension and alterations to elevations.

The planners report noted ongoing enforcement action on fence and assessment was made based on the application.

Section 5 Declaration

- ABP Ref. RL28.RL3603, Planning Ref. R447/17: Section 5 Declaration was made in 2018 that the removal of a 4.5 metre high hedge and the construction of a post and wooden panel fence not exceeding 2 metres high within and bounding the curtilage of a dwelling is development and is not exempted development.

Enforcement

- Planning Refs: E8257 and E7790 enforcement cases on fence closed.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028:

Zoning:

- 5.1.1. The area is zoned 'ZO1 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods', the zoning objective is to 'protect and provide for residential uses and amenities, local services and community, institutional, educational and civic uses'.

Built Heritage:

- 5.1.2. The site is within the Melbourn Road Estates Architectural Conservation Area. The ACA is outlined on Map 16 of Volume 2 Mapped Objectives and pages 68-69, Volume 3 Built Heritage Objectives of the Development Plan.

Summary of key policy:

- 5.1.3. Chapter 8 Heritage, Arts and Culture:

- Strategic Objective 7 Heritage, Arts & Culture
- Objective 8.23: Development in Architectural Conservation Areas
- Objective 8.27: Elements of Built Heritage

- 5.1.4. Chapter 11 Placemaking and Managing Development in particular:

- Section 11.202 Architectural Conservation Areas

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

- 5.2.1. Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines, 2011.

The Architectural Protection Guidelines provide guidance on protecting structures or parts of structures and preserving the character of Architectural Conservation Areas.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.3.1. The closest European sites are Cork Harbour SPA (004030) located 6km east of the site and Great Island Channel SAC located 13km east of the site (001058). Lough Lee pNHA (000094) is located 2.7km northeast of the site, Lee Valley pNHA (000094) is located 1.5km north of the site and Douglas River Estuary pNHA (001046) is located 6km southeast of the site.

6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal was lodged on the decision to refuse permission. It is summarised as follows:

- The character of the site and its location within an ACA is acknowledged.
- The fence was erected in Autumn 2020, when the site was zoned 'Residential, Local Services and Institutional Uses' in the 2015-2021 Development Plan.
- The fence was erected when the site was not in an Architectural Conservation Area and no policies were applicable in relation to the architectural character.

- The fence was deemed to be exempted development as it complied with the 2m height limit defined by the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class 5, for fences to the side and rear of the dwelling.
- The property is on a corner site and the fence is within the property and is to the front (stepped back from the front building line), the side and a portion of the rear of the property.
- The fence line is fully located within the curtilage of the site. It is not adjoining the edge of the footpath, allowing a green buffer/verge between the public areas and the private amenity areas of the dwelling.
- The site still maintains an open-plan character for the full extent of the front of the dwelling.
- The rear/side private amenity area would be fully open to the public without a solid boundary.
- Ensuring homes have adequate private spaces for amenity is a key component of ensuring quality of life for residents under the Plans housing quality standards.
- The removal of the fence would preclude the residents from having a good standard of private amenity space and would be a threat to the security and the privacy of the property.
- The site is properly landscaped. A dense and mature hedge offers a buffer natural screening between the public space (footpath and public green verge) and the private areas, ensuring the provision of natural screening in the context of the open-style character of the estate.
- The appellant notes local precedents where corner site have solid boundaries enclosing their private open areas: 20 Melbourn Avenue, 1 Fremont Drive, 20 Beverly Drive, 1 Allendale Drive, 37 Melbourn Road, 12 Woburn Avenue.
- The appellant cites No. 1 Allendale Drive, located directly north of the site, as a significant example. It has a boundary treatment of timber fencing of similar type and height and has been in place since 2017.

- The development is necessary to provide safety, protection and privacy to the property.
- Having regard to precedents and that the site was not in an ACA when the fence was erected, development constitutes an acceptable form of development.
- The following are submitted to support the appeal and have been reviewed: A. Extract of the Map of Cork City Development Plan 2015-2021; B. Certificate of Exemption dated 2020 from DL Group Consulting Engineers.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

None.

7.3. Observations

None.

8.0 Assessment

Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, 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 are as follows:

- **Principle of development and exempted development**
- **Built heritage and visual impacts**
- **Residential amenity**

8.1. Principle of development and exempted development

- 8.1.1. The site is a corner site located at the junction of Melbourn Road and Allendale Drive. The application seeks retention permission of an existing 1.8m high timber boundary fence. The appellant states the fence was erected in Autumn

2020, when the site was zoned 'Residential, Local Services and Institutional Uses' and not part of an Architectural Conservation Area in the 2015-2021 Development Plan. They state the fence was deemed exempted development in 2020 and submitted a Certificate of Exemption from DL Group Consulting Engineers to support the appeal.

8.1.2. I note that under the current 2022-2028 Development Plan the site is zoned 'ZO1 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods' and the zoning objective is to 'protect and provide for residential uses and amenities, local services and community, institutional, educational and civic uses'. I also note that the site is within the Melbourn Road Estates Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) in the Development Plan. My assessment is based on the zoning and objectives of the current Development Plan and provided below.

8.1.3. With regard exempted development, I note that the planning history does not include a record of a Section 5 Declaration confirming whether or not the development required planning permission and the appellant has applied for retention of the timber fence. The 2011 Architectural Guidelines states permission can only be given if works would not materially affect the character of the area and the Development Plan includes objectives to protect and enhance built heritage in this context. I consider the proposal to be acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with the objectives and development management standards of the Development Plan. These are considered below in the assessment.

8.1.4. I also note the planning authority has a current enforcement case on the fence that is the subject of this appeal (Planning Ref: E8243). It is my view that unauthorised development and the enforcement process is a matter for the Planning Authority to address and outside the remit of the Commission.

8.2. Built heritage and visual impacts

8.2.1. The site is located at a prominent location at an entrance to a residential estate within the Melbourn Road Estates ACA. Volume 3 Built Heritage Objectives sets out specific built heritage objectives of the Development Plan and Section 1.133 outlines the statement of character for the Melbourn Road Estates ACA.

This states the area has a clearly identifiable modernist, suburban landscape characterised by the lack of boundary walls between and in front of the properties giving an open, spacious character, quite unique in the city. The houses are a mix of semi-detached and detached homes, surrounded by lawn laid out in a staggered pattern to allow an element of privacy between properties. The area is also defined by well-established mature trees planted on the corners of each property either singly or often in groups of threes for smaller species. Section 1.135 identifies that defining property boundaries through the use of fencing or hedging is an issue in the ACA and has a negative impact on the open plan character of the estate.

- 8.2.2. The appellant acknowledges the site's location and the character of the ACA. They state the development is necessary to provide safety, protection and privacy to the property. They also state the fence line is not adjoining the footpath, there is a green buffer/verge between public and private amenity areas and the front of the dwelling maintains an open plan character. A dense and mature hedge ensures natural screening of the site in the context of the estate's open style character. The appellant notes local precedents where corner sites have solid boundaries enclosing their private open areas. Having regard to precedents and that the site was not in an ACA when the fence was erected, the appellant states the fence constitutes an acceptable form of development.
- 8.2.3. The existing 1.8m high timber boundary fence is to the front (stepped back from the front building line), side and rear of the dwelling. The fence is also stepped back from the side and rear site boundaries. The longest length of the fence fronts the entrance to the estate and is c19m in length, with a grass verge c1m to c1.4m in width between the fence and footpath. The boundary fence to the rear between the site and No. 4 Allendale Drive is c11.6m in length, with a grass verge between the fence and site boundary c1m in width. The boundary fence to the front incorporates a side gate and is c8m in length.
- 8.2.4. I observed on my site inspection that this is a prominent corner site and that the front and side of the fence are evident from Melbourn Road. I also observed that the most prominent elements of the fence are along Allendale Drive and to the rear of the property. The timber fence is stepped in from the side and rear

boundaries, there is a high hedge behind the fence and some planting is growing in the northwest corner through the fence. I also observed that a significant portion of the estate maintains an open character. This includes properties directly to the rear of the site, No. 4 Allendale Drive and No. 38 Allendale Avenue, that have front or side private open space onto Allendale Drive.

- 8.2.5. I note the appellant states that the front of the dwelling maintains an open plan character. I observed that the front boundary is defined by hedging. I consider that defining the front boundary by hedging detracts from the open plan character of the ACA and is contrary to Strategic Objective 7 Heritage, Arts & Culture as it does not reinforce the areas unique open plan character. I note that the definition of boundaries by hedging and fencing is identified as an issue in the ACA as outlined in Section 8.2.1 above.
- 8.2.6. Having regard to the sites prominent location, the fact that the open character is an important aspect of the ACA and the overall pattern and character of the streetscape, it is my view that the sites characteristics fronting Allendale Drive and its relationship with adjacent property to the rear are as important as the front of the dwelling in contributing to the character of the ACA.
- 8.2.7. Having regard to the sites prominent location, the open character of the ACA and the overall pattern and character of the streetscape, the location, scale and design of the fence, I consider that the fence, in particular along Allendale Drive and between the site and No. 4 Allendale Drive, is visually obtrusive and fails to respect or complement the ACA as required under Objective 8.23 Development in Architectural Conservation Areas.
- 8.2.8. I note the appellant refers to examples to support their appeal. I have reviewed these examples and do not consider them to be comparable with the scale or characteristics of this proposal. I note the dwelling at No. 1 Allendale Drive, cited as a significant example and located on the other side of the entrance to Allendale Drive, has a different orientation, a much greater gap between the fence and footpath fronting Allendale Drive (between 9-10m) and a variety of planting between this fence and footpath. The fence subject to the appeal has in contrast a maximum of c1.4m between the fence and footpath and uniform

hedging behind the fence. I also note that a Section 5 Declaration was made by ABP in 2018 that the fence at No. 1 Allendale Drive is development and not exempted development (ABP Ref: RL28.RL3603, Planning Ref: R447/17). Permissions granted at No. 1 do not relate to the fence. The planners report states enforcement cases on the fence at this property were closed without action (Planning Refs: E8257, E7790). It is my view that it is not good practice to consider an example that has not been assessed against the Plan. I also consider that all cases are assessed and determined on their own merits having regard to the sensitivity of the receiving environment and the specifics of the proposed development.

- 8.2.9. Having regard to the above, I consider the development gives rise to adverse visual impacts and has a detrimental impact on the open character of the ACA. I note the planning authority came to a similar conclusion and that the Councils conservation report states 'the existing fence has negatively impacted the open character of the ACA and fails to preserve the significance of this ACA, which is particularly defined by lack of plot boundaries'. I consider that the fence constitutes an unacceptable form of development and is contrary to Strategic Objective 7 Heritage, Arts & Culture as it does not reinforce the areas unique character, Objective 8.23 Development in Architectural Conservation Areas as it does not respond respectfully to the historic environment and Objective 8.27 Elements of Built Heritage as it does not contribute to the protection of important elements of the built heritage and their settings. The development if permitted would set an undesirable precedent for similar type developments. I recommend that retention of the 1.8m high timber boundary fence be refused.

8.3. Residential amenity

- 8.3.1. The appellant states the fence was erected to provide a secure and private open area for the dwelling and that ensuring homes have adequate private spaces for amenity is a key component of quality of life for residents under the Development Plans housing quality standards.

- 8.3.2. I observed on my site inspection that there appears to be a varied orientation and placement of dwellings within the estate that does not follow the traditional uniform front facing layout, this variation provides an element of privacy between properties. Privacy is also achieved through the placement of trees on the corners of properties either singly or in groups. Fencing of a different style to the timber fence subject to the application is evident directly to the rear of dwellings. I note that the layout plan submitted suggests a boundary extended directly behind the original dwelling to the rear boundary with No. 4 Allendale Drive and that the dwelling has been extended to the rear of the site (Planning Ref: 22/41160).
- 8.3.3. It is my view that the ACA designation does not preclude development but that any development must be sensitive to and enhance the character of the area. This accords with Section 11.202 Architectural Conservation Areas of the Plan which seeks positive enhancement of an areas unique qualities and the 2011 Architectural Guidelines which encourage high standards of new development that respect the character of an ACA.
- 8.3.4. I note the appellant wishes to provide a secure and private space for the dwelling. I do not consider this to outweigh effects on visual amenity or on the character of the ACA and I consider it contrary to Objective 8.23 Development in Architectural Conservation Areas as the timber boundary fence does not respond respectfully to or enhance the open character of the ACA. Having regard to the built heritage and visual impacts outlined in Section 8.2, it is my opinion that retention of the fence is not the solution to enhancing private open space for the dwelling, as it seriously injures the visual amenities of property in the vicinity and has a detrimental impact on the open character of the ACA.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1 I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.2 The subject site is located 6km west of Cork Harbour SPA (004030) and 13km west of Great Island Channel SAC (001058).
- 9.3 No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

9.4 Having considered the nature, scale and location of the proposed development, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature of the development proposal.
- The location of the development in a serviced area.
- The distance to the Natura 2000 network and the absence of pathways to any European Site.

9.5 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.

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

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

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 12.1. The development for retention of a 1.8m high timber boundary fence in a prominent location in the Melbourn Road Estates Architectural Conservation Area, by reason of its location, scale and design, fails to respect or complement the open character of the Architectural Conservation Area. As such, to grant permission for retention of the development would seriously injure the visual amenities of property in the vicinity and the pattern and character of the streetscape and would adversely affect and detract from the Melbourn Road Estates Architectural Conservation Area. This would be in contravention with Strategic Objective 7 Heritage, Arts & Culture, Objective 8.23 Development in Architectural Conservation Areas and Objective 8.27 Elements of Built Heritage of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 and the Architectural Heritage Protection, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht), 2011. The development if permitted would set an undesirable precedent for similar type development. The development is therefore considered to 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.”

Michele Beirne
Planning Inspector

19th August 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501333-CC-26
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of existing 1.8m high timber boundary fence
Development Address	44, Melbourn Road, Bishopstown, Cork, T12KC6X
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.
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	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes ☐	Screening Determination required
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____