



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501431-KE-26

Development	Alteration of layout to church (Protected Structure NS19-006)
Location	Presbyterian Church, North Main Street, Naas
Planning Authority	Kildare County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2660250
Applicant(s)	Mark Proctor
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Split Decision
Type of Appeal	First Party Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Mark Proctor
Observer(s)	Uisce Éireann
Date of Site Inspection	19/08/26
Inspector	Donal Farrelly

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	6
3.4. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History	6
5.0 Policy Context	6
6.0 Natural Heritage Designations	10
7.0 EIA Screening	10
8.0 The Appeal	10
8.1. Grounds of Appeal	10
8.2. Planning Authority Response	11
8.3. Observations	11
8.4. Further Responses	11
9.0 Assessment	12
10.0 AA Screening	16
11.0 Water Framework Directive	16
12.0 Recommendation	17
13.0 Reasons and Considerations	17
14.0 Conditions	17
Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	20

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site comprises a Presbyterian Church which is located at North Main Street, Naas, Co. Kildare, W91 C5RP. It is a protected structure (identified as reference no. NS19-006 in the Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029) (Development Plan). The appeal site is also located within the Naas Architectural Conservation Area.
- 1.2. The appeal site is located centrally within Naas Town Centre at the intersection of Church Lane and the R445 main street. The building faces south and fronts onto Church Lane. Parking is available to the front of the building. Opposite the site on the R445 is the Naas Public Library.
- 1.3. The appeal site is located within a mixed use area with surrounding land uses comprising predominantly commercial and residential. Northeast of the appeal site is St David's Church and St. David's Castle which are also identified as protected structures in the Development Plan as reference no's. NS19-001 and NS19-002. There are numerous other protected structures located within the vicinity of the appeal site.
- 1.4. The interior of the church comprises a raised pulpit in the eastern section of the building 2.036m in depth, 15 no. pews arranged on both sides of the central church aisle, and a children's room in the western section of the building. Access to the church is by way of doors located in the southeast and southwest corners of the building. A door in the northeast corner of the church provides access to a rear kitchen/lobby area.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. A number of internal alternations are proposed to the protected structure. These include the following.
 - Removal of the majority of the existing pews to be replaced with chairs.
 - Modification of pew no. 1 to form a screen for audio equipment.
 - Reposition pew no's. 2 and 3 to flank the northern and southern walls of the church.

- Carpet tiles to replace the existing central isle carpet and also to carpet the area over the existing timber floor where the pews will be removed from.
- The existing pulpit extends 2.036m from the church wall. The proposal seeks to move the existing pulpit back against the eastern wall of the church and reduce the overall depth of the pulpit to 725mm. The relocated pulpit will contain a bench seat over storage. The pulpit will be 1.709m in height. Wall panelling will extend to an overall width of 4.596m between the two no. doors located on the eastern wall of the church.
- Replace the floorboards from where pulpit is removed with the timber from the pulpit.
- Provision of new grill covers for existing vents.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

A split decision notice was issued with the recommendation set out below:

It is recommended that permission be Refused for the proposed removal of the existing original pulpit and the associated floor repairs including the installation of carpet tiles for the following reason:

1. Having regard to the installation of carpet tiles, which would erode the architectural quality of the space, and the pulpit being an integral element of the church interior, original to the building, and contributing significantly to its architectural and liturgical character, its removal would not be reversible, and the additional space requirement put forward does not constitute exceptional circumstances under Objective AH O22. The works would therefore result in an unwarranted loss of historic fabric and would materially diminish the character of the Protected Structure and therefore in the absence of exceptional circumstances as per AH O22 of the Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029 a refusal of permission is required.

3.1.1. It is recommended that permission be Granted for:

- *The removal of six rows of pews (pews 3–8 and 10–15),*

- *The alteration and reuse of Pews 1 and 2 as an audio desk,*
- *The relocation of 2 no. pews along the perimeter walls, as it retains historic fabric within the building.*

3.1.2. Conditions

- Condition no. 3 requires that pew no. 9 be retained.
- Condition no. 4 requires that pews to be removed are numbered and stored appropriately.
- Conditions 5 and 6 requires the appropriate documentation and archiving of pre and post construction works.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

Report of Planner dated 29/04/2026 recommends a split decision.

A refusal is recommended regarding the installation of the carpet tiles, and the removal of the pulpit and associated floor repairs.

A grant of permission is recommended regarding the following. The removal of six rows of pews (pews 3–8 and 10–15), the alteration and reuse of Pews 1 and 2 as an audio desk, and the relocation of 2 no. pews along the perimeter walls. Pew no.9 shall be retained.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Naas Area Engineer. No objection subject to conditions.
- Environment section. No objection subject to conditions.
- Water Services. No objection subject to conditions.
- Heritage and Nature section. Split decision recommended.

A refusal is recommended for the following reasons. The removal of the pulpit and floor repairs, and the installation of carpet tiles is not acceptable as it will result in the loss of historic fabric of a protected structure, does not constitute exceptional circumstances, and is therefore contrary to Objective AH O22 of the Development Plan.

A grant of permission recommended regarding the following. The removal of pews 3-8 and 10-15 is acceptable. The reuse of pews 1 and 2 is acceptable. Pew no. 9 to be retained. The relocation of 2 no. pews along the perimeter walls is acceptable. all pews removed shall be numbered and stored. Appropriate archived documentation to reflect works shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the planning authority.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Irish Water. No response received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None

4.0 Planning History

No planning history on file.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

The appeal site is located within the 'A: Town Centre (M2)' zoning as per the Naas Local Area Plan 2021-2027. The Naas Town Plan (Town Plan) forms part of the overall Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029 (Development Plan). I consider the following policies and objectives of the Development Plan and Town Plan to be relevant.

Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029

Chapter 11 Built and Cultural Heritage

AH P6. Protect, conserve and manage the archaeological and architectural heritage of the county and to encourage sensitive sustainable development in order to ensure its survival, protection and maintenance for future generations.

AH O20. Conserve and protect buildings, structures and sites contained on the Record of Protected Structures of special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical interest.

AHO22. Refuse planning permission for the demolition of any protected structure unless the Council is satisfied that exceptional circumstances exist. The demolition of a protected structure with the retention of its façade will likewise not generally be permitted.

AH O23. Require an Architectural Heritage Assessment Report, as described in Appendix B of the Architectural Heritage Protection, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011), to accompany all applications with potential for visual or physical impacts on a Protected Structure, its curtilage, demesne and setting.

AH O33. Promote best practice and the use of skilled specialist practitioners in the conservation of, and any works to, protected structures.

AH O36. Actively encourage uses that are compatible with the character of protected structures

AH O39. Promote the maintenance and appropriate re-use of buildings of architectural, cultural, historic and aesthetic merit which make a positive contribution to the character, appearance and quality of the streetscape or landscape and the sustainable development of the county. Any works associated with the re-use of such buildings should be carried out in accordance with best conservation practice.

AHO41. Promote the retention of original or early building fabric including timber sash windows, stonework, brickwork, joinery, render and slate. Likewise, the Council will encourage the re-instatement of historically correct traditional features.

AHO43. Ensure that national guidelines and the principles of conservation best practice are followed in assessing the significance of a Protected Structure.

AH O65. Ensure that any development, modifications, alterations, or extensions within an ACA are sited and designed appropriately and are not detrimental to the character of the structure or to its setting or the general character of the ACA and are in keeping with any Architectural Conservation Area Statement of Character Guidance Documents prepared for the relevant ACA.

Naas Town Plan 2021-2027

Policy BH1-Protected Structures. It is the policy of the Council to preserve and enhance the buildings identified on the Record of Protected Structures and to carefully consider any proposals for development that would affect the special value of such structures, including their historic curtilage, both directly and indirectly.

Policy BH2-Architectural Conservation Area. It is the policy of the Council to protect the character of the Architectural Conservation Area and to carefully consider any proposals for development that would affect the special value of the ACA, while having regard to the guidance contained in the ACA Statement of Character which provides information to support property owners located within the ACA.

Naas ACA Statement of Character 2019 provides guidance to development with the ACA.

5.2 National/Regional Plans/Policies

National Planning Framework (First Revision)

National Policy Objective 90. Enhance, integrate and protect the special physical, environmental, economic and cultural value of built heritage assets, including streetscapes, vernacular dwellings and other historic buildings and monuments, through appropriate and sensitive investment and conservation.

Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy 2019-2031

RPO 9.30. *Support the sensitive reuse of protected structures.*

5.3 National Guidance

Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2011.

Chapter 5 Places of Worship

5.2.1. Respecting liturgical requirements includes recognising that churches may wish to adapt places of public worship in the light of contemporary revisions of their worship and mission. Thus church authorities may, in their places of public worship, require flexibility in the provision and arrangement of seating, in the openness of space, for example, for a baptismal font area; for the enlargement of an existing sanctuary or chancel or for the relocation of the altar-table and lectern. A church

authority may also seek flexibility in the associated use of buildings and spaces within the curtilage, such as for access to another space or building for processions, children's liturgy and Sunday school.

5.2.4. Many factors should be considered by a planning authority before issuing a declaration as to the type of works it considers would or would not materially affect the character of a protected structure that is regularly used as a place of public worship. The basic considerations are the effects, if any, of proposed works on the special interest of the structure, including its interior, and whether proposed alterations are necessitated by the liturgical requirements of worship. Planning authorities should consider whether any substantial structural changes or alterations to the existing plan-form are required for the proposed alterations, for example, the subdivision of important existing spaces, as well as any consequential effects in other parts of the building. Any proposed removal or alteration/destruction of important fixtures and fittings, for example galleries, box pews or fixed seating will require careful consideration

5.2.6. In addition, it [PA] should consider whether the proposed works are directed at accommodating other compatible activities within the building or in its curtilage. This may help to ensure its continued viability in community use, primarily as a place of public worship.

National Built Heritage Service National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH)

Naas Presbyterian Church. Reg No 11814054. Rating- Regional

Appraisal

Naas Presbyterian Church is an attractive small-scale building that is an important feature in the townscape of Naas, forming the junction of Main Street North and Main Street South, fronted by the former Market Square to south, and flanking Church Lane leading to the south-east. The construction of the church in limestone, granite and vitrified red and yellow brick creates a polychromatic effect, fashionable at the time of construction, which serves to emphasise the presence of the building on the streetscape. The church is of considerable social and historic interest, attesting to the Presbyterian community in the locality. Well-maintained, the church retains an early aspect with original features in situ, including iron fenestration with lattice

glazing, timber sash fenestration to the vestry projection, and a slate roof. The preservation of an early external aspect suggests that the interior may also retains original or early features and fittings of interest. Forming a boundary to the building to south-west a section of decorative railings, together with a gate, are a fine example of early surviving cast-iron work.

6.0 Natural Heritage Designations

Red Bog, Kildare SAC (000397) is located circa 8.5km to the southeast of the appeal site.

Mouds Bog SAC (002331) is located circa 8.5 km to the southwest of the appeal site.

Proposed Natural Heritage Areas

Grand Canal (002104) is located circa 190m to the west of the appeal site.

7.0 EIA Screening

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

8.0 The Appeal

8.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party planning appeal letter has been submitted by the appellant. This is summarised as follows.

- The refusal of permission to modify the pulpit is problematic.
- All elements of the split decision need to be reviewed together as the aspects granted are unworkable in isolation.
- The church is not just a place for worship but is also used for non-ceremonial activities to a variety of age groups. A flexible workspace is therefore required.

- If the pulpit cannot be moved back against the wall then there are limitations on seating configuration and numbers, as chairs occupy more space than pews. This would result in some of the congregation being seated behind the preacher. Being able to move the pulpit would avoid these issues.
- Removing the majority of the pews and retaining the pulpit in place will not overcome space challenges.
- The current pulpit is a hindrance to current activities, is too large, is uneven, is unused, and uses more space than is required. The proposal is to move the front elevation of the pulpit back against the wall behind.
- Retaining pew no.9 in its current location will look peculiar and draw negative comments.
- The central isle is a more recent configuration. It is important the floor is covered with carpet tiles if the chairs replace the pews for the following reasons. The wooden floor is unsightly, the floor needs to be safe and comfortable to sit on, the floor is not the original and is from the 1990s, the carpet will protect the floor from further damage, a new carpet will replace the old central isle carpet, the central carpet will become a trip hazard if pews are removed.

8.2. **Planning Authority Response**

None

8.3. **Observations**

None

8.4. **Further Responses**

None

9.0 **Assessment**

9.1. I have examined the application details (including reason for refusal) and all other documentation on file including the submissions received in relation to the appeal and the report of the local authority. I have also inspected the site, and I have had 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:

- Split decision
- Principle of development and works to a protected structure
- Pew no. 9
- Pulpit and carpet tiles

Split decision

9.2. The first party appellant is appealing the split decision issued by the Planning Authority. The refusal element of the decision notice is outlined as being contrary to Objective AH022 of the Development Plan regarding the demolition of a protected structure which includes the installation of carpet tiles and the removal and relocation of the pulpit.

9.3. The grant of permission element of the decision outlines that pew no. 9 shall be retained in its current location. I note the concerns of the appellant, and I am of the opinion that the entire decision needs to be reviewed as the permitted elements are not fully implementable without the ability to move the pulpit.

Principle of development and works to a protected structure

9.4. I note the NIAH appraisal for the church outlines that the protected structure may retain original or internal features of interest. However, this does not include details of these internal features or fittings. I have reviewed the conservation report submitted to the Planning Authority and note the rationale regarding the changes to the internal layout as detailed on page 15. Point no. 1 outlines that the pews are movable and are not part of the original fabric of the building.

9.5. Point no. 8 outlines that the pulpit was originally constructed from previously used materials from another pulpit and is not considered a high quality piece of furniture. Point no. 9 outlines that the pulpit is used more for storage in recent times, and point

no. 10 outlines that it is proportionally big for the space it occupies. Point no. 11 outlines that the church is a place to gather for worship as opposed to a sacred place.

- 9.6. Having regard to the above I do not consider that the proposed works will detract from the special interest of the protected structure as the pulpit is constructed from previously used timber and the pews are not part of the original fabric of the protected structure.
- 9.7. I note the reason for refusal regarding Objective AH022 and the demolition of a protected structure. I am of the view however that the proposed works do not constitute the demolition of a protected structure. I consider the works to constitute the reuse of a protected structure for alternative religious activities and is in accordance with Objectives AH O39 and AH O43 of the Development Plan.
- 9.8. **Pew no.9**
- 9.9. The Planning Authority has included planning condition no.3 that requires the appellant to retain pew no. 9 in its current position to protect the historical layout of the church. I note the details of the Conservation Officer's report which is summarised in the Planner's Report. The Planning Authority has accepted that 2 no. pews will be relocated against the external walls, 2 no. pews will be used for an audio desk, and the remainder of the pews will be removed entirely and be replaced with chairs. They also outline the importance of retaining pew no. 9 in its current position to preserve the historic layout of the church.
- 9.10. I note the rationale provided by the appellant in that the retention of pew no. 9 will result in negative feedback from visitors and will create a peculiar look, and that historically only 2 no. side isles existed with none located within the centre of the church.
- 9.11. I consider that the retention of pew no.9 will impact on the useability of the internal space. I do not consider the pews to constitute the original fabric of the protected structure and I am of the opinion that pew no. 9 can also be removed for storage. I am of the view that this will enable a more flexible internal space to support a variety of religious activities.

9.12. Having regard to the above I therefore recommend to the Commission that pew no. 9 should be removed as it will not detract from the special interest of the protected structure.

9.13. Pulpit and carpet tiles

9.14. The appellant wants to remove the centrally located pulpit to enable adequate space to accommodate a satisfactory number of chairs to match the existing seating capacity of the pews which will be removed. The replacement of the pews with chairs will enable a flexible space that can be adapted for a range of events. The appellant argues that by not being able to move the pulpit it would result in members of the congregation sitting behind the preacher which would not be acceptable.

9.15. The appellant outlines that the installation of carpet tiles is necessary once the pews are removed for the following reasons.

- The carpet will protect the wooden floor which is not the original and dates from the 1990s,
- a new floor covering will be more hygienic and aesthetically pleasing,
- the central isle carpet will become a trip hazard after the pews are removed and,
- it will enable people to sit on the floor during certain group sessions.
- The appellant also outlines that the central isle and carpet is a more recent configuration.

9.16. I note the report of the Architectural Conservation Officer (Conservation Officer) which recommends that permission be refused for the carpet tiles and movement of the pulpit as it is contrary to Objective AH O22 of the Development Plan. The Conservation Officer outlines in their report that the removal of the pulpit and reuse of the joinery materials would not be reversible, does not constitute exceptional circumstances, and therefore is contrary to said objective. The Conservation Officer outlines that the installation of the carpet would further detract from the character of the building.

9.17. I consider that Objective AH O22 of the Development Plan is not applicable in this instance as it does not involve the demolition of a protected structure and therefore

exceptional circumstances are not required. I note that the appeal letter outlines the reasons for the removal of the pulpit and installation of the carpet. This includes achieving a more flexible internal space to enable a variety of religious group sessions and worshipping to be accommodated by removing the pulpit, and the installation of the carpet achieves a safer and more hygienic floorspace whilst protecting the wooden flooring.

- 9.18. I refer to Chapter 5 of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2011. S5.2.1 outlines the importance of respecting liturgical requirements in adapting places of worship for contemporary requirements. This includes flexibility in seating arrangements and openness of space, and relocation of the alter-table under such circumstances. S 5.2.4 requires that a Planning Authority carefully considers the liturgical requirements regarding the alteration of a protected structure, and s5.2.6 outlines that appropriate consideration should be given to enable changes to accommodate other compatible activities to ensure the viability of the protected structure.
- 9.19. I am of the opinion that it is important to ensure that there are a variety of religious activities within the church to ensure its long term viability. I consider the reuse of the existing pulpit joinery in the new pulpit and bench, and for the installation of floor boards in place of the existing pulpit to be a reasonable design approach in terms of preserving the original wood. I consider the argument put forward by the appellant to be rational and reasonable in that the removal of the pews with the retention of the pulpit will limit the abilities of the space to cater for a variety of seating configurations.
- 9.20. As per the 2011 Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities liturgical requirements must be considered in determining whether alterations to protected structures are acceptable. I acknowledge that the planning authority has considered the requirements in their assessment in accepting the removal of the pews and creation of an audio area. However, I consider that the position of the pulpit undermines the ability to create a robust internal space in what I consider a somewhat limited floor area. I consider that the rationale provided by the appellant regarding the removal of the pulpit and the installation of a new pulpit against the external wall to be reasonable.

- 9.21. Having regard to the above I am of the opinion that the movement of the pulpit, removal of pew no.9, and installation of carpet tiles is in response to liturgical requirements and does not constitute works that will detract from the special interest of a protected structure. I therefore consider the works to be in accordance with Objective AHO39 and AHO43 of the Development Plan and Chapter 5 of the 2011 Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities.
- 9.22. I therefore recommend to the Commission that permission be granted for the removal of the pulpit and pew no. 9, and installation of the carpet tiles.

10.0 AA Screening

- 10.1. I have considered the project in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The appeal site is located at the Presbyterian Church, North Main Street, Naas, Co. Kildare, W91 C5R approximately 8.5km northeast of the Mouds Bog SAC (002331) and circa 8.5km northwest of the Red Bog, Kildare SAC (000397).

The permission is for a number of internal modifications to the church which is a protected structure.

No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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

I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

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

11.0 Water Framework Directive

No water framework directive issues arise as no construction is involved.

12.0 Recommendation

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

13.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to:

- The provisions of the Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029 including Objectives AH O39 and AH043 which promotes the appropriate reuse of historic and protected buildings and ensures best practice conservation principles are implemented.
- Chapter 5 of the 2011 Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities in that liturgical requirements need to be considered in the reconfiguration of spaces of protected structures and to maintain such buildings as functional religious spaces.
- Details of the NIAH which confirms the retention of original parts of the protected structure. Removal of pews and alterations of the pulpit do not detract from the special interest of the building and represent modifications to original parts which are being retained.

It is considered that the proposed development, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below would not detract from the special interest of the protected structure. Therefore, the proposed development would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

14.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, 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. All removed pews shall be numbered and stored on site, or where this is not feasible, placed in a safe and suitable storage facility for potential future reinstatement. Prior to the storing of the pews off site, the storage method and location shall be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of preserving the character of the features of the protected structure.

3. Following completion of the works, records of the existing and as-constructed works including photographs, drawings and storage location of pews—shall be:
 - (a) Archived in a dedicated building file within the Parish.
 - (b) Matching records shall be submitted to the Planning Authority for placement on file.

Reason: In the interests of preserving the character of the features of the protected structure.

4. A framed professional photograph (min A4 size) illustrating the historic interior complete with pews in situ shall be displayed within the church following the completion of works.

Reason: In the interests of preserving the record of the original character of the protected structure.

5. All works shall be supervised by a suitably qualified conservation professional, (recommended RIAI Grade 1 Conservation Architect).

Reason: In the interests of preserving the character of the features of the protected structure and to ensure adherence to best conservation practice.

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

Donal Farrelly
Planning Inspector

03/09/26

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501431-KE-26
Proposed Development Summary	The proposed development consists of a number of internal modifications to the Presbyterian Church which is a protected structure. This includes moving the pulpit, removal of a number of pews, provision of an audio area, and a new carpet to a section of the church floor.
Development Address	Presbyterian Church, North Main Street, Naas, Co. Kildare, W91 C5RP
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	☐ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☒ No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	

☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
☐ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
☐ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR	

If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes ☐	
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____