



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501428-DR-26

Development	Demolition and replacement of side extension with associated works.
Location	72 Allen Park Road, Stillorgan, Co. Dublin, A94 Y025
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D26A/0175/WEB
Applicant(s)	Dane Collins
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Dane Collins
Observer(s)	Neil & Mags Buckley
Date of Site Inspection	17 August 2026
Inspector	Natalie de Róiste

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
6.0 EIA Screening.....	8
7.0 The Appeal	8
8.0 Assessment	10
9.0 AA Screening.....	15
10.0 Water Framework Directive	15
11.0 Recommendation	15
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	15
13.0 Conditions	16
Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	19

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The development site, 72 Allen Park Road, contains an existing semi-detached house on a triangular corner site of 0.2 hectares, paired to the north with 14 Melville Avenue. The house shares a pitched roof with its neighbour, and the pair presents a gable-fronted elevation to the corner of the road junction, with the first floor accommodation in the attic, and the main entrance to the house in the side elevation.
- 1.2. No 72 has a recent two-storey side extension and a dormer window to the roof pitch (granted under D21B/0410), as well as an older side extension/garage conversion towards the rear of the side elevation. It is set back from the road behind a large front and side garden, and has a vehicular entrance on Allen Park Road.
- 1.3. It is one of four pairs of houses of this type on Allen Park Road at the Merville Avenue end. Other houses on Allen Park Road are more conventional two-storey semi-detached houses, while Merville Road is characterised in the main by bungalows and dormer bungalows.
- 1.4. The junction is a T-junction, with Melville Avenue forming the major road. Both roads curve, with a more pronounced curve on Allen Park Road. There are large street trees to both roads, and well-planted front gardens to the appeal site and its immediate neighbours (70 Allen Park Road to the west, and 14 Merville Avenue to the north), with a number of ornamental trees, boundary hedging, and shrubs. This is a mature residential area, c. 900 metres' walk from Stillorgan village, and c. 9 km from Dublin city centre.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development as proposed comprises the following:
 - Construction of a single-storey side extension of 55 sqm, with a monopitch roof (c. 4.5 metres height), providing a new kitchen/living room;
 - Facilitated by the demolition of an existing flat-roofed side extension of 11.3 sqm;
 - Raising of the piers of the vehicular entrance to 1.35 metres;
 - All associated site works.

As part of the appeal, the applicant has submitted a revised design. This has a reduced footprint (50 sqm) due to a reduction in the depth of the extension by 650 mm. It has a reduced height of 4.1 metres, due to a lowered finished floor level by 300 mm, which reduces the maximum height of the roof by 414 mm.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission was refused for the following reason:

Having regard to the residential zoning of the site and to the residential character of the area, it is considered that the proposed development by reason of its design, excessive scale, footprint, inappropriate roof form and proximity to the subject site's boundaries would result in a visually dominant and obtrusive form of development and would adversely impact on the visual and residential amenity of the area.

As such, the proposed development would be contrary to Section 12.3.7. Additional Accommodation in Existing Built-up Areas and Section 12.3.7.1(iii) Extensions to the Side of Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 and is therefore considered to be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

One report, summarised as follows:

- Site context, planning history, third party submissions and technical reports noted. Proposal not compliant with Development Plan guidance on extensions at Section 12.3.7.1, concerns regarding size, building line, and proximity to boundaries. No concerns re: demolition or works to piers.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Planning – no objection subject to conditions, including compliance with SuDS measures.

- Transport Planning – no report on file.
- Environmental Enforcement/Waste Management – standard conditions recommended.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No reports on file.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Three on file, issues raised summarised as follows:

- Proposal is similar to recently refused house in side garden.
- Excessive scale, height, breaking of building line, visually obtrusive.
- Overdevelopment and misuse of front garden site
- Overlooking of neighbouring properties
- Overbearing, overshadowing, and impacts on daylight, in contravention of Policy Objective PHP20.

The third party submission from the neighbours at no 70 included photographs with indicative elevations of the extension inserted.

4.0 Planning History

- ACP-323757-25 (DLR ref. D24A/0537/WEB) – permission refused for demolition of existing rear single-storey extension and construction of new two-storey house in side garden (car free) for the following reason:

Having regard to the residential zoning of the site, to the residential character of the area, to the design, scale and massing of the proposed development and to the policies and objectives set out in the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, it is considered that the proposed development would seriously injure the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings, would have a visually intrusive and incongruous appearance from the adjoining properties and the public road seriously injuring the visual amenity of the area and would be contrary to

Sections 12.3.7.5 Corner/Side Garden Sites and 12.3.7.7 Infill of the Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022 2028 . The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area

- D24A/0970/WEB – permission refused for demolition of existing side extension and construction of new two-storey house in side garden, widening of vehicular entrance and all associated works for the following reason:

It is considered that the proposed development constitutes overdevelopment of the site, and by reason of its layout and design in relationship to the surrounding properties, would be incongruous and obtrusive when viewed on the streetscape and would be visually overbearing and obtrusive when viewed from the adjoining public roadway to the side (southeast) and from adjacent properties. The proposed development is not considered to accord with Sections 12.3.7.5 Corner/Side Garden Sites and 12.3.7.7 Infill of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, and would seriously injure the adjoining residential/visual amenities and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

- D21B/0410 – Permission granted for the construction of a two-storey side extension and dormer window to side, and demolition of existing garage.

On neighbouring sites:

- 70 Allen Park Road (house to west)

ABP ref. PL06D.246441 (D15B/0398)

Permission granted for two-storey side extension following third party appeal.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Development Plan 2022-28

- 5.1.1. The zoning objective for the subject development site is “A”: To provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities.
- 5.1.2. Chapter 4: Neighbourhood – People, Homes and Place sets out policies and objectives on housing in Section 4.3: Homes.

Policy Objective PHP19: Existing Housing Stock - Adaptation

It is a Policy Objective to:

Conserve and improve existing housing stock through supporting improvements and adaption of homes consistent with NPO 34 of the NPF.

Densify existing built-up areas the County through small scale infill development having due regard to the amenities of existing established residential neighbourhoods.

5.1.3. Policy Objective PHP20: Protection of Existing Residential Amenity.

It is a Policy Objective to ensure the residential amenity of existing homes in the Built Up Area is protected where they are adjacent to proposed higher density and greater height infill developments.

5.1.4. Policy Objective PHP42: Building Design & Height

It is a Policy Objective to:

- *Encourage high quality design of all new development.*
- *Ensure new development complies with the Building Height Strategy for the County as set out in Appendix 5 (consistent with NPO 13 of the NPF)*

5.1.5. Chapter 12 gives detailed guidance on Development Management.

Section 12.3.7.1 Extensions to Dwellings provides guidance on various types of extensions (front, rear, side, and at roof level).

The following Section provides guidance with respect to porches, front extensions, side extensions, rear extensions, roof alterations, attic conversions and dormer extension.

(iii) Extensions to the Side:

Ground floor side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size, and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation) and impacts on adjoining residential amenity.

Section 12.4.8 Vehicular Entrances and Hardstanding Areas sets out specifications and guidance for alterations to the parking and access arrangements for houses.

5.4 Natural Heritage Designations

None of relevance.

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 (or Part V of the 1994 Roads).

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

One appeal was received, from the applicant against refusal. Issues raised are summarised below.

- The proposal is a single-storey extension, clearly ancillary to the house, well below the height of the existing dwelling, set back from the front elevation, and clearly visually subordinate. In a spirit of conciliation, amendments are proposed to reduce the effective height by 414 mm and the footprint from 56 sqm to 50 sqm, reducing the perceived scale and prominence of the extension.
- The proposal sits comfortably within the site, with a minimum of 3.3 metres from the closest boundary. It creates no overbearing or overlooking impacts on neighbours. There are a number of substantial extensions in the vicinity (including that on the shared boundary at no 72), and this surrounding context is relevant in assessing the proposal.
- Contrary to some third party assertions, the original application did not project beyond the established building line on Allen Park Road, aligning with the prevailing residential frontage. Nonetheless, a further setback of 650 mm is now proposed. The extension is clearly subordinate to the house, respects the building line on Allen Park Road and Merville Avenue, and is appropriate to this prominent corner position. The revised elevation to Allen Park Road ensures the extension reads as part of the occupied dwelling.

- Further to concerns regarding private amenity space expressed in the planner's report, it can be confirmed that 85 sqm of usable private amenity space will be retained to the rear, with c. 71 sqm to the side – this in addition to the front garden. The removal of the existing single-storey extension improves the useability of the rear garden area. The private amenity space is generous and well in excess of requirements.
- The proposal complies in full with Section 12.3.7 and 12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan, being single-storey, subordinate to the existing dwelling, maintaining appropriate separation distances from the boundaries, respecting the building lines, and creating no material overlooking or overshadowing.
- The Commission is requested to overturn the decision of the council and grant permission for this modest single-storey extension.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

Response received dated 9 June. The Planning Authority did not consider that the grounds of appeal raised any new matter which would justify a change of their attitude, and referred the Board to their previous report.

7.3. Observations

One received, from neighbours at 70 Allen Park Road. Issues raised are summarised as follows:

- The proposed revisions are not significantly different to the refused proposal, and the proposal remains unacceptable on this high profile corner site.
- The proposed extension raises many of the same concerns the previous applications on the site did, with a similar footprint, height, proximity to the boundary, breach of the building line, and visual impact as the previously proposed house in the side garden.
- This has been misrepresented as a modest domestic extension, when its location on a prominent corner makes it obtrusive and visually unacceptable. The existing openness provided by the side garden is an important part of the character of the streetscape. Comparisons to the extension at no 70 (which

does not break the building line or impact negatively on visual amenity) are misleading.

- The proposal does not comply with any aspect of the guidance set out in Section 12.3.7, regarding scale, design, proximity to boundaries, or relationship with the site context.
- The development would impact negatively on the outlook from 70 Allen Park Road, introduce overlooking, and reduce the residential amenity currently enjoyed.
- The drawings do not adequately demonstrate the impacts of the development or the nature of the corner site. A site visit is imperative.
- Constant unsubstantiated assertions have been made regarding daylight and sunlight, with no assessments submitted.
- A grant of permission, particularly following previous refusals, would set a poor precedent for future development, and undermine the consistency of the process. The Commission is respectfully requested to uphold the refusal.

7.4. Further Responses

None received.

8.0 Assessment

- 8.1.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal and 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:

8.2. Visual impact

- 8.3. The Local Authority note in their report their concerns regarding the prominence of the site, the breach of the established building line, the design of the building, including its monopitch roof, largely blank elevation to the street, floor to ceiling

windows to the southwest elevation, and the large footprint. The appellant considers these concerns to be overstated, and has also proposed a number of minor amendments to reduce the scale of the extension.

- 8.4. I note the Local Authority considered *Section 12.3.7.5 Corner/Side Garden Sites* to be of relevance, given the planning history on the site; given that this section specifically refers to subdivision of a site to provide an additional dwelling, it is not the appropriate section against which to assess the proposal, in my view. *Section 12.3.7.1 (iii) Extensions to the Side* sets out the parameters for assessment of side extensions. A number of third parties referred to similarities to the previous applications refused on the site. The previous refusals were for a three-bedroom two-storey house of 140 sqm (subsequently reduced to 120 sqm). This, a proposal for an extension of 55 sqm is a materially different application, and can be assessed on its merits.
- 8.5. Regarding the streetscape and the building line, the building line on Merville Avenue is relatively regular apart from at the junction, where the two pairs of gable-fronted houses are arranged at an angle to the junction, and set further back than a continuation of the building line would require. This has the effect of creating visual interest in the streetscape; rather than a view of a side elevation, views along the street are of the main elevation of each house pair. The pair of 109 Allen Park Road/10 Merville Avenue closes the vista when viewed from the northwest on Merville Avenue, due to the curve in the road. There are no long views on the approach from the southeast, due to the road curvature, and localised views of 72 Allen Park Road/14 Merville Avenue are further restricted by mature planting and high boundary treatments.
- 8.6. Regarding the building line on Allen Park Road, it is very regular along the straight, with a slightly greater setback at the turn in the road as it approaches the junction. The houses along the straight have a setback of c. 6 metres from the footpath, while no 72 is set c. 8-12 metres back from the footpath. The pair 105-107 is sited in such a way to provide visual interest to the long view towards the junction, while the house at no 72 Allen Park Road is largely hidden behind no 70 Allen Park Road in long views, due to the curve of the road, and the greater setback from the road.

- 8.7. Having undertaken a site visit, I can confirm that the site is visible only in localised views, on close approach. I consider the impacts on the established streetscape as viewed from Merville Avenue would be negligible; the extension would not be visible in long views on the street. It would be seen from the junction to the south, with two-storey housing and screen planting as a backdrop, and with mature landscaping in the foreground. While the other corner has a more open character visually, this corner (no 72 Allen Park Road and 14 Merville Avenue) has a greater sense of enclosure due to the mature planting, the high boundaries, and the location of the street trees. The proposed extension is set well back from the building line on Merville Avenue.
- 8.8. The visual impacts on Allen Park Road would be somewhat greater. The extension (as revised) would be located within 2.7 metres of the boundary, breaking the established building line. However, due to the curve in the road, the extension would not be visible in long views and impacts would be localised to the area immediately around the site. The mature landscaping on and adjacent to the site would mitigate the visual impacts. I note a cluster of ornamental trees and shrubs would be removed to facilitate the works, while the site plans show the boundary planting and the large tree to the front garden retained. A condition should be attached regarding tree protection (including the protection of street trees) in the event of a grant. I note the crown of the mature trees (and the presumed root protection area) is larger than that shown in the site plan.
- 8.9. Regarding the design of the extension, there is a variety of house types in the area, which have in turn been modified, altered, and customised. In my view, neither the monopitch roof nor the fenestration would be out of character, given the heterogenous pattern of development in the immediate vicinity. Regarding the scale of the extension, I consider the revisions to reduce the overall volume effective.
- 8.10. I note the imagery contained in the appellant's original third party submission to the council did not accurately show screening vegetation to the boundary, and showed the extension in elevation rather than in perspective, overstating its impacts.
- 8.11. On the whole, I consider the extension to be acceptable in terms of design and visual amenity.

8.12. Impact on neighbouring residential amenity

- 8.12.1. I note the concerns from the observer at no. 70 Allen Park Road regarding impacts on their residential amenity (privacy, daylight and sunlight, and visual dominance and loss of openness). The planning authority also expressed concerns regarding privacy to 70 Allen Park Road due to the provision of floor to ceiling windows to the south-west elevation.
- 8.12.2. I note that impacts on front gardens are generally less significant than similar impacts on rear gardens, as front gardens usually do not serve as sitting out areas or children's play areas, and they do not have the same expectation of privacy. However, in properties such as these with larger sunnier gardens to the front than to the rear, which lend them to more regular use, impacts on the amenity of front gardens can be significant.
- 8.12.3. Regarding privacy, there are large French doors to the west elevation of the proposed extension, facing the neighbouring property. However, there is a solid fence to the boundary, and significant screening planting on the applicant's side, which is shown to be retained on the proposed plans. There is no risk of overlooking from the new extension to the house or garden at no 70.
- 8.12.4. Regarding daylight and sunlight, there is a setback of at least 3.3 metres from the neighbouring property at no 70, and a maximum ridge height of c. 4.1 metres (revised down from c. 4.5 metres). It is of a lower height, and has a greater setback from the shared boundary, than the side extension to no 70. There may be some additional overshadowing of the front garden to no 70 in summer mornings, but given the existing solid boundary, any additional overshadowing will be negligible, and transient, clearing early in the day as the sun moves south.
- 8.12.5. Regarding impacts to daylight, I note the openings to the side elevation to the extension at no 70 are located c. 1 metre from the boundary. Windows in such a location are naturally vulnerable to even modest developments on the neighbouring property. However, given the single-storey height of the proposed extension, and its distance from those openings, I have no concerns regarding perceptible impacts on daylight.

- 8.12.6. Regarding visual dominance and loss of openness, I note that no 70 is orientated with the main windows of its habitable rooms facing to front and rear (north and south). The proposed extension, located to the east, may be visible at a very oblique angle from the first floor front window of no 70's extension. The new extension will have minimal visual impacts on the front garden area of no 70, due the distance of the extension from the boundary, the single-storey height, and the orientation of the properties. As noted above, the imagery contained in the appellant's original third party submission showed the extension in elevation rather than in perspective, which fails to account for the location of the extension and overestimates its impact.
- 8.12.7. On the whole, there will be minimal to no impacts on no 70 Allen Park Road, which will continue to enjoy good residential amenity.

8.13. **Other issues**

- 8.14. Regarding private open space, I note the concerns of the local authority. The house as built has a small rear garden, and limited visual privacy to the front and side garden. The location of the proposed extension, and the demolition of the existing extension, would improve the effective area of the garden enjoying visual privacy, and would provide for adequate private open space.
- 8.15. I note the conditions recommended in the Environmental Enforcement Report. Given the limited size and scale of the development, I do not consider a Construction Management Plan or a Public Liaison Plan appropriate or necessary, subject to appropriate advisory conditions.
- 8.16. Regarding the proposal to raise the height of the gate piers to 1.3.5 metres, this is a relatively minor development. The road serves local traffic and has a speed limit of 30 km, and I observed little traffic on the date of my site visit.
- 8.17. I note the drawings show a large square area of hardstanding for car parking/turning. *Section 12.4.8.3 Driveways/Hardstanding Areas* sets out that a minimum of one third of front garden areas should be maintained in grass or similarly landscaped, and hardstanding should be constructed in accordance with SuDS. This can be addressed with the standard drainage condition.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. 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. I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on any European site. The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European site(s). No further assessment is required for the project. No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.

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 a grant of permission.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the height, scale, and footprint of the side extension as submitted to An Coimisiún Pleanála, and having regard to the location and orientation of the existing house and the proposed extension relative to the existing building lines, it is

considered that the proposed development, subject to the conditions set out below, would not have adverse impacts on the visual or residential amenity of the area, and would comply with Development Plan policy and guidance on side extensions, including Section 12.3.7.1(iii).

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by An Coimisiún Pleanála on the 26th day of May 2026 except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

REASON: In the interest of clarity.

2. The existing dwelling and the proposed extension shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit and the extension shall not be used, sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.

Reason: To restrict the use of the extension in the interest of residential amenity

3. The external finishes of the proposed extension (including roof tiles/slates) shall harmonise with those of the existing dwelling in respect of colour and texture.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

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

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

5. Prior to commencement of development, tree protection measures shall be put in place to protect the adjacent street trees, and the large mature tree in the front garden, as shown on *drawing no 261010.03.001 Site Plans Existing and Proposed*. They shall be protected by stout fences not less than 1.5 metres in height. This protective fencing shall enclose an area covered by the crown spread of the branches, or at minimum radius of two metres from the trunk of the tree or centre of the shrub, and to a distance of two metres on each side of the hedge for its full length, and shall be maintained until the development has been completed. (d) No construction equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought onto the site for the purpose of the development until all the trees which are to be retained have been protected by this fencing. No work shall be carried out within the area enclosed by the fencing and, in particular, there shall be no parking of vehicles, placing of site huts, storage compounds or topsoil heaps, storage of oil, chemicals or other substances, and no lighting of fires, over the root spread of any tree to be retained.

Reason: In the interest of tree protection.

6. Any cutting of trees, hedgerows and vegetation shall only be undertaken outside of the bird breeding season. The bird breeding season takes place between March 1st and August 31st.

Reason: To minimise risks to breeding birds.

7. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 7.00 and 19.00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 08.00 and 14.00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.

8. No mud or debris from the site shall be carried onto or deposited on the public road by the developer during the construction phase.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the area and in the interests of road safety.

9. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

REASON: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

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

Natalie de Róiste
Planning Inspector

21 August 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501428-DR-26
Proposed Development Summary	House extension
Development Address	72 Allen Park Road, Stillorgan, Co. Dublin.
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	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 (Complete Form 3) [Delete if not relevant]
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3) [Delete if not relevant]

Inspector: _____ Date: _____