



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501491-26

Development	Replacement of 6.4m x 3.35m advertising display with 1 digital 6.28m x 3.4 advertising display.
Location	63/64 Watercourse Road, Cork.
Planning Authority	Cork City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2644546
Applicants	JC Deceaux Ireland Limited.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refusal of permission.
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant	JC Deceaux Ireland Limited.
Observers	None
Date of Site Inspection	10 th August 2026.
Inspector	Derek Daly

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The development is located to the north of Cork city centre and is on the southern gable of a three storey property fronting onto the western side of Watercourse Road an important arterial route N20 linking the centre of Cork city to the northern suburbs and is approximately 600 metres southeast of an important road junction of the N20 and R635. Immediately to the south of the gable is the open forecourt of a filling station also fronting onto Watercourse road. On the gable there is a 6.4m x 3.35m advertising display at the upper level of the gable and there is also an advertising display associated with the filling station at a lower level. There is also an advertising display on the upper level of the northern gable on the property.
- 1.2. The general area in the vicinity of the appeal site is primarily commercial in use and there are residential properties further north of the site in particular Madden Buildings a residential terrace off Watercourse Road. Many of the commercial premises have advertising and associated signage. There is also an advertising display on the eastern (opposite) side of Watercourse to the northeast of the site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1.1. The proposed development as received by the planning authority on the 16th March 2026 comprised of the replacement of a 6.4m x 3.35m advertising display with 1 digital 6.28m x 3.4m with a depth of 300mm advertising display.
- 2.1.2. A planning report was submitted with the application indicating the proposal is an upgrade on the existing sign with a capability of adjusted brightness and implementing a curfew between 2.00am and 6.00am daily. Reference is made to the removal of 2 signs at 37 Watercourse Road and the planning gain arising. Reference is made to precedence and to planning policy and also to the Professional Lighting Guide 05 (PGL05) which offers guidance on illuminated advertisements and maximum permitted recommended nighttime luminance. An assessment is outlined in relation to location, illumination and development management standards and traffic safety.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. The decision of the Planning Authority was to refuse planning permission. Two reasons were stated. The first reason refers to the proposal being a traffic hazard arising from being a distraction to road users. The second reason refers to paragraphs 11.200, 11.194 and 11.195 of the development plan, that the development by reason of its scale and location, the use of digital display and existing signage in the vicinity would result in increased visual prominence and constitute an excessive level of advertising.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The planning report dated the 11th May 2026 refers to the planning history in the area; to provisions of the current city development plan and an assessment of the proposed development.

The report refers to the planning status of the existing advertisement as unclear given the planning history, that does not appear to be a grant of permission for the advertisement hoarding subsequent to the refusal of planning permission since the refusal of permission of a hoarding sign in T.P. 90/15595 and that the existing signage does not establish an accepted principle for advertisement at this location. The internal reports are noted and reference is made to section 11.220 of the CDP in relation to traffic safety. The conservation officer report was also noted and the assessment concludes in general visual amenity terms that the scale and digital type is and would give rise to visual clutter.

Refusal of permission was recommended.

3.3. Other submissions.

- 3.3.1. Internal submission from the transport and mobility department dated 6th May 2026 recommended refusal of permission referring to the traffic movements on Watercourse Road at the location of the development and also pedestrian movements and sign is a traffic hazard and increases the risk of accidents.

- 3.3.2. The conservation officer in a report dated 24th April 2026 although noted the location of the development within an ACA and also the removal of other signs at 37 Watercourse Road indicated being open to consideration of a digital signage at this location however the sign proposed is too large and should be reduced in size and recommended further information.
- 3.3.3. The application was referred to statutory consultees and no submissions were received.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1.1. P.A. Ref. No. 90/15595 / ABP Ref. No. 28/5/ 83097

Permission refused on appeal for retention of an extension to an advertising sign at 63 Watercourse Road following a first party appeal in relation to a refusal of permission by the Planning Authority.

The reason for refusal in the appeal decision refers to;

The proposed advertising hoarding by virtue of its size and scale and visual prominence, together with the existing level of signage in the vicinity constitutes an excessive level of advertising, and would seriously injure the amenities and depreciate the value of property in the vicinity.

Planning Ref No 1737401.

Permission granted for demolition of ground floor extensions and construction of ground floor WC and the conversion of first and second floor to apartments.

5.0 Policy and Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The statutory development plan is the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028.
- 5.1.2. Chapter 8 relates to Heritage, Arts and Culture and the site is located within the Blackpool Architectural Area (ACA) as defined in volume 3 of the plan.
- 5.1.3. In relation to Built Heritage and ACAs the following objectives include;
- Objective 8.17 Conservation of the City's Built Heritage

- a. To seek to ensure the conservation of Cork City's built heritage.
- b. To ensure that Cork's Built Heritage contributes fully to the social and economic life of the city and to pursue actions that ensure Cork's built heritage will benefit from good custodianship and building occupation.

Objective 8.23 Development in Architectural Conservation Areas. Development in Architectural Conservation Areas should have regard to the following:

- a. Works that impact negatively upon features within the public realm, such as stone setts, cobbles or other historic paving, railings, street furniture, stone kerbing etc. shall not be generally permitted;
- b. Design and detailing that responds respectfully to the historic environment in a way that contributes new values from our own time. This can be achieved by considering layout, scale, materials and finishes and patterns such as plot divisions in the surrounding area;
- c. Historic materials and methods of construction should be retained and repaired where this is reasonable, e.g. historic windows and doors, original roof coverings, metal rainwater goods should be retained along with original forms and locations of openings etc;
- d. Repairs or the addition of new materials should be appropriate and in keeping with the character of the original structures.

5.1.4. Chapter 11 refers to Placemaking and Managing Development. In relation to advertising signage the following sections are relevant;

Section 11.194 Advertising on Buildings. In general advertising on buildings should conform to the following where relevant:

- Be sympathetic in design and colouring both to the building on which they will be displayed and their surroundings;
- The City Council will aim to reduce visual clutter and control the number of signs and advertising that are displayed;
- Illuminated signs or other advertising structures will not be allowed above the eaves or parapet level on buildings in any part of the city.

Section 11.195 Fascia Signage & Illuminative & Projecting Signs. As a general principle fascia signs and projecting signs should be simple in design, not excessive in illumination or size. The following basic guidelines will be applied in assessing planning applications:

1. Plastic derived fascias with product advertising and internally illuminate fascias will not be permitted;
2. Projecting signs should be of 2.4m clearance above street level;
3. Internally illuminated signs shall be restricted;
4. The design of illuminated signage should be sympathetic to the building on which it is to be displayed;
5. Overall illumination of fascia signage or shop fronts of distinctive architectural features should be discreet and limited to spot-lighting, up lighting or disguised minimalist strip lighting;
6. The daytime appearance when unlit will also be considered;
7. The use of banners, flags, billboards and other forms of advertising will be strictly controlled in the City Centre;
8. Product advertising on canopies will not be permitted.

Section 11.196 Advertising Hoardings (Billboards). Excessive outdoor advertising will be strictly controlled. New advertising hoardings and billboards will generally not be permitted. Permanent cross street banners/advertisement symbols will not be permitted in any location within the City unless an agreed timetable for use has been approved by Cork City Council. Tri vision signage will not be permitted.

Section 11.200 Digital Advertising/Signage. The use of digital advertising and signage is playing a more prominent role in urban environments, including the replacement of paper advertisements. While it can play a positive role in displaying public information, there is a need to control digital advertising and signage in terms of its design and location to prevent visual clutter particularly in areas such as historic parts of the city (Architectural Conservation Areas etc.), predominantly residential and high amenity areas such as waterways. It can also have adverse impacts on public and traffic safety.

Section 11.202 refers to Development in Architectural Conservation Areas and that the overall guiding principle is positive enhancement of the unique qualities that make a place special because of its particular character. The requirements for documentation to accompany planning applications for development within Architectural Conservation Areas and for their subsequent assessment are set out in the 'Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines' (DOEHLG, 2004).

- 5.1.5. Chapter 12 I Land Use Zoning Objectives and the subject site is located within an area with the zoning objective ZO 08 Neighbourhood and Local Centres as outlined in map 03 of volume 2 of the CDP. Objectives in relation to this zoning are;

ZO 8.1 Neighbourhood and Local Centres contribute to sustaining liveable communities and neighbourhoods by fulfilling a local convenience retail, employment and service function, providing a mix of uses and range of services, at an appropriate local scale, to the local population often within a 5- or 10- minute walking distance. Chapter 7 Economy and Employment sets out further objectives for Neighbourhood and Local Centres.

ZO 8.3 Development proposals in this zone must serve local needs and must demonstrate how the proposal would respect, reflect or contribute to the character and vibrancy of the particular Neighbourhood and Local Centre, commensurate with the nature and scale of the development. Developments must deliver a quality urban environment and public realm with a focus on accessibility and permeability.

In relation to permitted uses paragraph 12.4 refers to while the primary objective of each land use zoning is clearly stated, the various uses listed are intended as a general guide and are not an exhaustive list. Land uses open for consideration may be acceptable where the Planning Authority is satisfied that:

- they would not have a detrimental impact on the primary land use zoning objective;
- they would be consistent with the relevant objectives and criteria set out in this Plan; and
- there would not be any significant adverse impacts on-site or on the surrounding environment.

Paragraph 12.5 refers to in exceptional circumstances there may be uses that are not referenced in this Plan; these will be considered on their own merits in accordance with the primary land use zoning objective concerned.

Paragraph 12.6 refers to where developments or uses are proposed that are ancillary to the dominant or main use of a site or development, such proposals will be considered on their own merits.

In relation to non-conforming uses paragraph 12.8 refers to land use zonings are used as a tool to shape the City's development strategy, and therefore may not always reflect established land uses. As a result, there are uses throughout the City that do not conform with the land use zoning objective for the area.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.2.1. The subject site is not located within site designated as a Natura 2000 site or NHA/pNHA and a significant distance of the subject site from any designated site.

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. The proposed development is not one to which Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended, applies and therefore, the requirement for submission of an EIAR and carrying out of an EIA may be set aside.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 7.2. The appellant grounds of appeal in summary refers to;
- The appeal highlights that the planning application seeks to upgrade the existing advertisement that is an established use *in situ* at this location for several decades and photographs of the signage dating back to the 1990s as appendix 1.
 - Reference is made to the recent removal of two full size posters at 37 Watercourse Road.

- Model conditions are outlined which could be applied which comply with the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) in relation to the proposed development.
- Reference is made in relation to the new generation of digital displays in relation to modernisation, sustainability, reduction of signage and implementation of curfew periods and current development plan provisions.
- Specific to the first reason for refusal the proposed replacement will not endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and is not consistent with Transport for London guidance and precedence of planning decisions. When operated with accepted industry standards the displays in practice are entirely safe.
- The Transport for London guidance and other research reviews concluded no demonstratable proof that advertisements cause traffic collisions and refers to distraction at locations where a high level of concentration is required from the driver and to the particular location of the digital display in this regard.
- Reference is made to planning precedence.
- The submission includes a traffic assessment by consulting engineers which refers to another site which concluded no increased accident risk and does not create a traffic hazard.
- In relation to the second reason for refusal reference is made to the planning authority reports which establish that the site is not sensitive in visual or conservation terms and the objective to control digital advertising is not therefore prescriptive as a reason to refuse permission.
- It is an improvement on the display it would replace in the site and planning authorities steadfastly resist technological change and improvements in the public realm and the submission highlights decisions where a proposed digital display would not have a negative impact on the amenity of the area.
- The proposal will not introduce a new use or function at the location or have a negative impact on residential amenity and would be a visual improvement.
- A number of appendices are included in the grounds.

7.3. **Planning Authority Response**

The planning authority made no response to the grounds of appeal.

7.4. **Other responses**

The appeal was referred by An Coimisiún Pleanála in accordance with section 131 to statutory bodies and no response were received.

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. The main issues in this appeal are principle of the development and the grounds of appeal in particular the design of the proposed development and impacts on the visual amenities of the area and traffic related issues. Building conservation also is an issue to be considered. Appropriate Assessment also needs to be considered. I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise.

8.2. **The principle of the development**

8.2.1. The proposal as submitted is for the replacement of a 6.4m x 3.35m advertising display with 1 digital 6.28m x 3.4m with a depth of 300mm advertising display. The development plan outlines policies and guidance to be considered in considering advertising displays which are outlined in section 5 of this report.

8.2.2. In relation to the development as proposed reference is made to that it is a replacement of an existing sign with a digital display of approximately the same dimensions.

The planning status of the existing advertisement is indicated in the planning authority report assessment as unclear given the planning history and in relation to planning history there was a refusal of permission under P.A. Ref. No. Planning Ref No 90/15595 / ABP Ref. No. 28/5/ 83097 on appeal for retention of an extension to an advertising sign at 63 Watercourse Road following a first party appeal in relation to a refusal of permission by the Planning Authority. The appellant refers to in the current grounds of appeal that the planning application seeks to upgrade the existing advertisement that is an established use *in situ* at this location for several decades and photographs of the signage dating back to the 1990s as appendix 1 were submitted in support of this but offers no documentation to indicate an authorised permission for the existing sign or a pre-1963 authorisation. This raises the issue of

the replacement of a sign the status of which has not been clearly established as authorised and whether it can therefore be considered as a replacement. The only matter that that can be stated is that a retention of an extension to an advertising sign at this location was refused planning permission on the 25th of September 1990 with no clear evidence of authorised sign prior to and post the 25th of September 1990.

It cannot therefore be concluded based on the documentation that the existing signage establishes an accepted principle for authorised advertisement at this location and whether the application is a replacement and should have referred to retention and replacement of the existing sign.

- 8.2.3. I would also note that reference is made in the grounds of appeal to reduction of signage in the area with the recent removal of two full size posters at 37 Watercourse Road. While this may be considered in the overall consideration of visual clutter in the area it is not directly material to the current proposal. While this can be interpreted as a planning gain it is not directly related to being a gain arising from the current proposal by the removal of signage as a constituent part of the application under appeal.

8.3. Grounds of appeal

- 8.3.1. Specific to the grounds of appeal they largely address the reasons for refusal namely traffic hazard and visual matters relating to paragraphs 11.200, 11.194 and 11.195 of the development plan.

8.4. Traffic related matters.

- 8.4.1. The first reason for refusal refers to the proposal being a traffic hazard arising from being a distraction to road users. A submission from the transport and mobility department dated 6th May 2026 recommended refusal of permission referring to the heavily traffic movements on Watercourse Road at the location of the development. It noted that Watercourse Road to the north of the site splits into two lanes one of which continues northwards to Blackpool; that there is a right turning lane onto the North City Link Road; that there are pedestrian movements with conflicting movements and also movements associated with filling station. It concluded that a changing digital display is a traffic hazard that may distract drivers and increases the risk of accidents.

- 8.4.2. In the grounds of appeal, it is contended that the proposed replacement will not endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and the refusal is not consistent with Transport for London guidance and precedence of planning decisions. The appeal argues that when operated with accepted industry standards the displays in practice are entirely safe, that there is no demonstratable proof that advertisements cause traffic collisions. It refers to distraction at locations where a high level of concentration is required from the driver and to the particular location of the digital display in this regard and the submission includes a traffic assessment by consulting engineers which refers to another site which concluded no increased accident risk and does not create a traffic hazard.
- 8.4.3. In relation to advertisement signage static or digital the purpose of signage is to draw attention to material advertised and they are a feature in the proximity of many roads in particular heavily trafficked roads.
- 8.4.4. I have reviewed the report of the transport and mobility department and noted that Watercourse Road is a heavily trafficked route which was evident from my site inspection, the location of a junction to the south and also the junction to the north which provides for a modal split of traffic continuing onto Blackpool and also to the Northern Link Road all of which contribute to complicated manoeuvring for road users in the area. There are also traffic movements associated with the filling station and traffic movements across the carriageway and pedestrian movements.
- 8.4.5. I would also note that there are many commercial premises in the area with signage including fascia signage and there is signage including a totum pole on the filling station site and the advertising display which it is proposed to replace has been in existence for a long period of time. The proposed replacement to a digital advertising display will not I consider negatively impact traffic on Watercourse Road or materially alter the current level of signage. Due to the location of the advertising, it will be visible only to traffic travelling north and the site is sufficiently distant from the junction to the north. Traffic is moving within a 50kph limit and owing to traffic volumes and signal crossings is often moving at speeds lower than 50kph. Traffic moving southwards towards the city centre will have the advertising display located behind them, therefore offering no view to the advertising display.

8.4.6. Therefore, I do not consider that the proposed replacement of an existing advertising display with a digital display will negatively impact on road users along the Watercourse Road notwithstanding it replaces a static sign or that it will give rise to a level of distraction that will unduly distract or impact traffic safety to warrant consideration as a traffic hazard.

8.5. Visual issues.

8.5.1. The second reason for refusal refers to significant visual obtrusion and unnecessary visual clutter, increased visual prominence and constituting an excessive level of advertising. Reference in this regard is made to paragraphs 11.200, 11.194 and 11.195 of the CDP.

8.5.2. In the CCC planning report specific reference is made to paragraph 11.200 in concluding a recommendation of refusal.

8.5.3. In the grounds of appeal, it is contented that the planning authority reports establish that the site is not particularly sensitive in visual or conservation terms, that the proposal is an improvement on the display it would replace in the site, that the planning authorities steadfastly resist technological change and improvements in the public realm, and that the proposal will not introduce a new use or function at the location or have a negative impact on residential amenity.

8.5.4. In considering and assessing this proposal paragraph 11.200 of the CDP refers to digital advertising and signage playing a more prominent role in urban environments, including the replacement of paper advertisements noting it can play a positive role in displaying public information, there is however a need to control digital advertising and signage in terms of its design and location to prevent visual clutter particularly in areas such as historic parts of the city (Architectural Conservation Areas etc.), predominantly residential and high amenity areas such as waterways. It can also have adverse impacts on public and traffic safety.

8.5.5. Specific to the site is in an area with the zoning objective ZO 08 Neighbourhood and Local Centres where there is a mix of uses but commercial premises predominate in the immediate vicinity. It is also within an ACA and the conservation officer report although noting its location within the ACA and fixed to a historic building, also noted that the setting of the site has been substantially altered, in particular south of the gable of the building on which the sign is located. The report expressed more

sensitive conservation concerns in relation to the sign on the northern gable of the property and which has a more direct relationship to important buildings in the ACA notably Maddens Buildings and was open to consideration of a reduced sign and recommended further information.

- 8.5.6. I would generally agree with the conservation officer assessment in relation to the overall setting of the site, that the setting north of the site would be into areas of stronger conservation importance and that the area to the south is characterised by modern buildings and the removal of a strong streetscape. I would not consider that the reduction in the area of the sign as indicated in the conservation officer assessment would be material as the signage would remain visible. The sign in its current location is however located within the ACA and I would note that the building to which it is fixed is important to the streetscape of the ACA and the current sign is in a visually prominent location and entry into the ACA.
- 8.5.7. The site could be considered as a historic part of the city but as indicated many historic features in the vicinity has changed. The site is not in a predominantly residential area or a high amenity area. Paragraph 11.200 of the plan does however express that there is a need to control digital advertising and signage in terms of its design and location to prevent visual clutter particularly in areas such as historic parts of the city which I consider is a reasonable provision.
- 8.5.8. The application requires considering on its merits and the other provisions of the CDP in particular paragraphs 11.194, 11.195 and 11.196 which refer to advertising on buildings, fascia signage and illuminative and projecting signs and advertising hoardings (billboards). Many of the provisions set out in these paragraphs largely relate to fascia signage but section 11.194 does refer to advertising on buildings. In general advertising on buildings should be sympathetic in design and colouring both to the building on which they will be displayed and their surroundings and to reduce visual clutter and control the number of signs and advertising that are displayed. Section 11.195 which relates to fascia signage and illuminative and projecting signs and which is specifically referred to in the reason for refusal refers in general to fascia signage which I consider does not apply in relation to the development under appeal. Under section 11.196 advertising hoardings (billboards) it is indicated that excessive outdoor advertising will be strictly controlled and new advertising

hoardings and billboards will generally not be permitted and tri vision signage will not be permitted. The development as proposed could be considered as a billboard.

8.5.9. Taking these provisions into consideration the sign is in a visually prominent location on the gable of a historic building which forms an entry to an ACA and would not be sympathetic in design and colouring to the building onto which it is to affixed. There is a high level of advertisement material in the vicinity of the site and a painted sign on the lower section of the gable wall. For reasons already outlined there is no clear documentary information to support a position that it is a replacement of an authorised sign and there is a strong sense of visual clutter in the immediate vicinity of the site and the proposal contributes to this clutter.

8.5.10. I would therefore conclude that the development would result in and contribute to an excessive level of advertising and unnecessary clutter which impacts on the visual amenities of the area.

9.0 AA Screening

9.1. I have considered the proposal for the construction of an extension to an existing dwelling and all associated site works in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located on an established residential site and within an established residential area.

9.2. The proposed development comprises in effect a relatively minor development as outlined in section 2 in the Inspectors report. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows; the nature of the development, the distance to designated sites and the absence of pathway to these sites.

9.3. I conclude that 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 and likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework

10.1. The subject site is not located immediate to a waterbody The development comprises minor construction works as referred to in section 2 of this report. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

10.2. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of works regarding the nature and scale of the development.
- The context of the surrounding area.
- Location and distance from nearest Water bodies and lack of hydrological connections.

Conclusion

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that permission be refused.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development located in a prominent location on a heavily trafficked road and the pattern and character of development in the vicinity; and to the policies and provisions of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028, it is considered that the proposed development when considered with the existing level of advertisement and signage in the immediate vicinity give rise to an increased and excessive level of advertising and unnecessary visual clutter and in this regard the Commission is not satisfied that the proposal as submitted constitutes replacement of authorised signage. It is also considered that the development would also detract from the character of the area in particular with the core elements of the Blackpool Area of Architectural Conservation in which the development is located given the prominence of the location of the site in the entry to the Blackpool Area of Architectural Conservation. The proposed development would, therefore, be in 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, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Derek Daly
Planning Inspector

16th September 2026

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	501491-CC-26
Proposed Development Summary	Replacement of 6.4m x 3.35m advertising display with 1 digital 6.28m x 3.4 advertising display.

Development Address	63/64 Watercourse Road, Cork.
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?	☐ , it is a 'Project'.. X No , No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ it is a Class specified in Part 1 .	
☐	
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?	
X 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.	
No , the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.	
Yes , the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)	

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)
No X ☐	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: Derek Daly Date: 16th September 2026