



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501649-KE-26

Development	Permission for single storey extensions and all associated site works.
Location	The Bungalow, Green Avenue, Newlands North, Naas
Planning Authority	Kildare County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2561396
Applicant(s)	Maire-Therese Dunne & Ken Coonan
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Maire-Therese Dunne & Ken Coonan
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	23/09/2026
Inspector	David Freeland

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	4
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	7
3.4. Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History	7
5.0 Policy Context	7
6.0 EIA Screening	10
7.0 The Appeal	10
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	10
7.2. Planning Authority Response	11
7.3. Observations	11
8.0 Assessment	11
8.2. Scale, Design and Layout	12
8.3. Condition 4	12
8.4. Wastewater	15
9.0 AA Screening	15
10.0 Water Framework Directive	16
11.0 Recommendation	17
12.0 Reasons and Considerations	17
Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	19

1.0 Site Location and Description

The appeal site is located in the townland of Newland North in the rural area to the south-west of Naas and to the north of the rural settlement of Two Mile House. The site is accessed directly from the local road known as Green Avenue which forms its southern boundary. The stated site area is 0.145 hectares.

The site is a rectangular in shape extending northwards from the road. It contains a detached single storey dwelling which is set back from the road and positioned near central within the site with the remainder of the site in garden to the rear. A driveway extends along the western side of the dwelling to an area of car parking to the rear. The site forms part of a group of dwellings along this stretch of Green Avenue. There is a dwelling immediately to the west of the site which the documentation with the application indicates is occupied by a family member.

The eastern boundary is formed by hedging which would appear to predominantly consist of evergreen species to the appellant's boundary although hawthorn trees and other hedgerow species were interspersed throughout.

The western boundary is defined by mature trees and hedgerow. The front boundary onto Green Avenue comprises timber post and rail fencing with roadside hedging.

2.0 Proposed Development

The development for which permission was sought includes single storey extensions consisting of extending the four existing gables, an extension to the rear, repositioning the entrance from the side to the front of the house. The dwelling will increase in floor area from 97.6 sqm to 218.5sq.m, a total extension of 120.9sq.m.

Following a request for further information, amendments made to the development as originally proposed include designated storage provision and the replacement of the existing raised percolation area with a raised soil polishing filter of 90 square metres serving the existing treatment unit.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Kildare County Council decided to grant permission for the development subject to 15 conditions.

Condition 4 only is being appealed. The condition is as follows:

4. Within 3 months of the final grant of planning permission, the Applicant/Developer shall submit for the written agreement of the Planning Authority, revised plans and particulars omitting the eastern extension as notated 'Bedroom 4' and the 'Dressing Room' on the 'Proposed Floor Plan' Drg. No. 25-20-004 Rev.A submitted 20/05/2026.

Reason: In the interests of protecting the existing eastern boundary and the residential amenity of the dwelling house located to the east of the subject site and in the interests of proper planning and sustainable development.

The remaining conditions are generally standard and include Condition 5, which requires the retention and protection of all existing trees and hedgerows along the site boundaries and provides that none shall be removed unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

There are two planning reports on file.

First Planning Report

The first planning report, dated 4 February 2026, is summarised as follows:

- The site is unzoned. Having regard to Section 9.3 of the development plan, unzoned land outside an identified settlement is deemed to be primarily agricultural. The proposal being an extension to an existing dwelling, the principle of development was considered to be established and acceptable.
- Having regard to the single storey nature of the extensions, the proposal was considered to have regard to the form and scale of the existing dwelling and

not to distort its scale or mass. No concerns were raised relating to overshadowing of the adjoining properties.

- Concern was expressed at the proximity of the proposed eastern extension to the existing tree line boundary. The report noted a separation distance of 950m and that the eastern elevation was predominantly a blank façade with the nearest window 2.4 metres from the boundary and considered that a revised design was necessary to increase the separation and mitigate the loss of screening.
- Storage provision was not indicated on the drawings against a requirement of 10 square metres for a four bedroom dwelling under Table 15.2.
- The architectural drawings were considered inaccurate in that the proposed new front entrance had not been hatched as proposed works and levels and finished floor levels had not been provided.
- No historic planning permission was available online for the site. It appeared that the dwelling had been extended after 2009 by approximately 39 square metres to the rear.

Further Information

Further information was requested based on five items relating to; the certification of the wastewater treatment system under Section 5.1 of the EPA Code of Practice together with the agent's professional indemnity insurance; storage provision; revised plans and levels; the separation to the eastern boundary; and evidence of a valid permission for the dwelling or of its existence prior to 1964.

Further information was received on 20 May 2026. The response comprised a site characterisation report and a system report which stated that the existing treatment unit has capacity for a six person loading and recommend replacement of the percolation area with a raised soil polishing filter of 90 square metres; a revised floor plan identifying storage provision; and a rearranged set of drawings with levels and a revised site layout.

On the eastern boundary, the agent stated that further investigation had been carried out to ascertain the exact boundary line, that the original post and wire fence was still visible and that the separation distance had accordingly increased from 950mm to

1,550mm and 1,280mm. Reference was made to Section 15.2.2 of the development plan, to a separation of over 20 metres from the neighbouring dwelling, and to the absence of any proposed window facing that dwelling. On the planning history, the agent stated that the applicants had been led to believe that an extension carried out approximately ten years earlier was exempt and that they wished to include retention for those works.

Second Planning Report

The second planning report, dated 10 June 2026, is summarised as follows:

- The response on the wastewater treatment system was noted and the report of the Environment Section recommending no objection subject to conditions, was accepted.
- The revised floor layout was considered to provide sufficient storage and to be acceptable.
- In relation to the eastern boundary, the response was noted but concerns remained regarding the proximity of the proposed extension comprising Bedroom 4 and the Dressing Room to the existing tree line boundary. It was stated that a revised design had not been received and that there were concerns regarding impacts on the existing trees which provided an element of screening. The report concluded that the existing tree line boundary should be retained and protected and that Bedroom 4 and the Dressing Room should be omitted which could be addressed by condition.
- In relation to the previously constructed rear extension, it appeared that the dwelling was extended after 2009 to provide an extension to the rear of approximately 39 square metres and, having regard to its floor area, this was considered to be exempted development.
- The development was considered to comply with the development plan subject to conditions, and a grant of permission was recommended.

Other Technical Reports

- Water Services: Report dated 12th December 2025 - no objection subject to conditions.

- Transportation, Mobility and Open Spaces: Report dated 17th December 2025 - no objection subject to conditions.
- Kildare Newbridge Municipal District Area Engineer: Report dated 22nd January 2026 - no objection subject to conditions.
- Environment Section: Report dated 8th January 2026 - Further Information recommended in relation to certification of the existing treatment system and percolation area.
- Environment Section: Report dated 28th May 2026 - no objection subject to conditions.
- Heritage Officer: Report dated 22nd January 2026 - no comment

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

No reports received by any prescribed bodies.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

None.

4.0 **Planning History**

None relating to subject site.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1 **Development Plan**

Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029

The Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029, as varied, is the operative plan. Variation No. 3 took effect on 27 April 2026 and amended, among other provisions, Sections 15.2.2 and 15.2.3 and Table 15.2 of Chapter 15 and Objective BI O26 of Chapter 12. The site is not within an identified settlement and is not zoned.

Chapter 9, Our Rural Economy

Section 9.3, Rural Economy and Rural Enterprise, provides that where land is not within an identified settlement and is not otherwise zoned, the use of such land shall be deemed to be primarily agriculture.

Chapter 12, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure:

Chapter 12 seeks the protection of hedgerows and trees. Objective BI O26 requires that the removal of hedgerows to facilitate development be avoided in the first instance and, where removal is demonstrated to be unavoidable, that mitigation planting of similar length and species composition be provided. Objective BI O27 requires the retention and appropriate management of hedgerows so as to ensure an uninterrupted green infrastructure network and Objective BI O30 requires that trees be adequately protected during development and incorporated into the design of new development.

Chapter 15, Development Management Standards

Section 15.2.2, Overlooking / Separation Distances, sets out the separation distances sought between dwellings and opposing windows. It was amended by Variation No. 3 to align with Specific Planning Policy Requirement 1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines (2024), which replaces the traditional 22 metre separation between opposing first floor windows with a minimum of 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms above ground floor level and provides that separation at ground floor level, or to the front of a dwelling, is to be determined on a case-by-case basis. The section also provides that a minimum distance of 2.3 metres shall be provided between the side walls of adjacent dwellings with each building being a minimum of 1 metre from the boundary to allow for adequate maintenance and access. Section 15.2.3, Overshadowing, provides that the protection of the daylight and sunlight amenity of occupiers of adjacent properties is a material consideration and that overshadowing analysis may be required depending on the nature of the development and the context of the site.

Section 15.2.4, Soft Landscaping, requires that existing trees, particularly mature trees, and hedgerows be retained and incorporated into the design of development layouts, including at boundaries, and that measures to protect trees with secure

fencing prior to the commencement of works be indicated on a site management plan. Where removal is required, a detailed replanting proposal is required.

Table 15.2 sets out minimum floor space and open space requirements for houses, including a storage area of 10 square metres and a minimum private open space of 50 square metres for a four bedroom house.

Section 15.4.12, Extensions to Dwellings, provides that extensions can sustainably accommodate the changing needs of occupants subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities and that it would not be practical to set out a prescriptive approach. The basic principles to be applied include that the extension should be sensitive to the appearance and character of the house and the local area; that it shall have regard to the form and scale of the existing dwelling and should not adversely distort its scale or mass; that its design and scale should have regard to adjoining properties; that in rural areas the design should have regard to the Key Principles of the Rural House Design Guide; that it should not provide for new overlooking or loss of privacy below reasonable levels to the private area of an adjacent residence, or have an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties, or overshadow adjacent dwellings so as to significantly decrease daylight or sunlight; that an adequate area of private open space should be retained; and that, where required, it must be demonstrated that the existing on-site wastewater treatment system can facilitate the additional loading.

5.2 National/Regional Plans/Policies

The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) and the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities guidelines are of general relevance to the consideration of the appeal, although they are directed principally at new residential development. The relevant provisions of SPPR 1 are carried into Section 15.2.2 of the development plan and are referred to above

5.4 Natural Heritage Designations

The site is not located within or adjacent to any European site or (proposed) Natural Heritage Area. The closest Natural Heritage Area is the Grand Canal pNHA (Site Code: 002104) located 0.95km to the north-west. The closest European Sites area

Mouds Bog SAC (Site Code: 002331) – located 6.1km to north-west and
Pollardstown Fen (Site Code: 000396) – located 7.8km to the west.

6.0 EIA Screening

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

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal has been submitted against Condition 4 only. The grounds are summarised as follows:

- The proposed extension of the gable to accommodate Bedroom 4 and the Dressing Room is a blank windowless gable at the same height as the existing gable from which it is extended.
- The extension has two windows, one facing towards the front and the second facing the rear of the site. It does not overlook the neighbouring site or the existing house, which is 20.6 metres away.
- The extension is between 1.2 metres and 1.5 metres from the existing boundary.
- The boundary between the applicants' house and the neighbouring property is screened by a dense *Leylandii* hedgerow, planted by the applicants' grandmother over thirty years ago, which is approximately 5 to 6 metres in height.
- A number of years ago the neighbouring house which the condition seeks to screen constructed a garage or outbuilding against the *Leylandii* hedgerow to the rear of the adjoining boundary. The applicants do not feel that their privacy or amenity has been diminished.

- In conditioning this redesign the planning authority is, in the appellant's opinion, overly restrictive in its reasoning for screening the neighbouring dwelling. The Commission is requested to set aside the condition.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

In a letter dated 27/07/2026, the planning authority confirmed its decision and refers to the Planner's Report and various technical department reports in relating to the assessment of the application.

7.3. Observations

None received.

8.0 Assessment

- 8.1.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the grounds of appeal and the reports of the planning authority, and having undertaken a site visit, I am satisfied that the proposed development is acceptable in principle and is otherwise in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. The appeal relates to Condition 4 only. I therefore consider it appropriate to treat the appeal under section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, as an appeal against a condition.
- 8.1.2. I set out briefly below my assessment relating to the scale, design and layout of the development and relating to wastewater services being the principal issues on which I am satisfied that the development is otherwise acceptable. The substantive issue is whether Condition 4 which requires the omission of the eastern extension comprising Bedroom 4 and the Dressing Room is warranted in this instance. The assessment is set out under the following headings:
- Scale, Design and Layout
 - Wastewater
 - Condition 4

8.2. Scale, Design and Layout

- 8.2.1. The development would increase the floor area of the dwelling from 97.6 square metres to 218.5 square metres, an increase of 120.9 square metres, and would increase the accommodation from three bedrooms to four. It provides for three en-suite bedrooms, an enlarged shared living, dining and kitchen area, a separate living room in the form of a snug, and utility and storage space.
- 8.2.2. The site is located in a rural area, outside any identified settlement and the lands are unzoned. Section 9.3 of the development plan provides that where land is not within an identified settlement and is not otherwise zoned, the use of such land shall be deemed to be primarily agriculture. The proposed development does not however, involve the provision of a new dwelling in the countryside. It comprises extensions to a dwelling already established on the site. Section 15.4.12 of the development plan provides that the adaptation of residential units through extensions can sustainably accommodate the changing needs of occupants, subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities, and sets out the basic principles to be applied, including that an extension should be sensitive to the appearance and character of the house and of the local area, should have regard to the form and scale of the existing dwelling and should not adversely distort its scale or mass, and should have regard to adjoining properties. The planning authority considered the principle of development to be acceptable. I am satisfied that the principle of the proposed development is acceptable, subject to the assessment of the issues set out below.
- 8.2.3. The dwelling would largely retain its existing style, single storey form and proportions. The extension is large when compared with the existing dwelling. However, having regard to the scale and pattern of development in the area, I am satisfied that it is reasonable. The design integrates successfully with the original dwelling and the resulting scale is consistent with that of development on the adjoining sites.

8.3. Condition 4

- 8.3.1. Condition 4 requires the omission of the eastern extension comprising Bedroom 4 and the Dressing Room. The reason given is the protection of the existing eastern boundary and of the residential amenity of the dwelling house to the east of the site.

The key questions in relation to the boundary are the status of the hedging, its distance from the proposed extension and the extent of removal likely to be required.

- 8.3.2. The site visit indicated that the hedging along the eastern boundary is of mixed species. It is most dense to the south adjacent to the roadside boundary where it comprises evergreen hedging which the appellant states is *Leylandii* and it transitions to hawthorn and other species towards the northern end. The boundary appears to be double planted with hawthorn to the eastern side and the evergreen species within the appeal site. The hawthorn is intertwined and interspersed throughout the evergreen hedging. It is not apparent on the ground precisely where the boundary line falls between the two.
- 8.3.3. The documentation and revised plans submitted as part of the further information, suggest that the proposed eastern extension would be between 1,288mm and 1,551mm from the boundary line. Having viewed that separation on site, it is likely that the hedging immediately adjacent to the proposed extension would at the very least be required to be maintained and cut back and/or it may be required to be removed to that section of the boundary. It is not clear whether the construction of the extension would impinge upon the root system of the hedging immediately adjacent to it or whether the hawthorn hedging to the eastern side would also require removal or would suffer damage to its root system. The section of boundary likely affected would amount to a length of c.7 metres.
- 8.3.4. I am of the view, that this is a limited part of the overall boundary. The remainder of the eastern boundary and the boundaries of the site generally would be unaffected and would be retained. The extent of any removal and of any compensatory planting required in its place is a matter which can be addressed by condition.
- 8.3.5. In terms of screening and visual amenity, I do not consider that the potential loss of hedging over this limited section would have a significant or adverse effect on the visual amenities of the area by increasing the prominence of the dwelling. The appeal site has an existing, albeit immature hedge along its front boundary which has the potential to provide supplementary screening as it matures. The adjoining site to the east has mature and extensive hedging which provides significant screening of that dwelling from the roadside and of much of the boundary with the appeal site. The works are single storey and set back from the public road. I am

satisfied that the development including any associated removal of hedging, would not adversely affect the character or the visual amenities of this rural area.

- 8.3.6. In terms of biodiversity the hedging likely to be affected is the evergreen species within the appeal site which is not native. Its removal is not likely to significantly or adversely affect biodiversity. I am of the view that its replacement would open up the potential to provide a native hedgerow boundary in its place. Objective BI O26 of the development plan requires that the removal of hedgerows be avoided in the first instance and that, where removal is demonstrated to be unavoidable, mitigation planting of similar length and species composition be provided and Objective BI O27 requires the retention and appropriate management of hedgerows. Section 15.2.4 requires that existing hedgerows be retained and incorporated into development layouts, that measures to protect retained planting be indicated before works commence, and that a detailed replanting proposal be submitted where removal is required. Those requirements are capable of being met by condition.
- 8.3.7. In relation to the residential amenity of the dwelling to the east, that dwelling is 20.6 metres from the eastern elevation of the proposed extension. The extension is single storey and does not exceed the height of the existing dwelling. The eastern gables are blank. Bedroom 4 is served by a window in the rear elevation and the Dressing Room by a window in the front elevation and neither faces the dwelling to the east. As such, there would be no new overlooking of that dwelling or of its private open space. Having regard to the single storey height of the extension, to the separation distance in excess of 20 metres, and to the extensive hedging retained on the eastern side of the boundary, I am satisfied that the extension would not overshadow that dwelling or have an overbearing impact upon it. I am satisfied that the relevant requirements of Section 15.4.12 of the development plan are complied with.
- 8.3.8. I accept that the applicant could have set the eastern elements of the extension further from the boundary. However, the question is whether the omission of Bedroom 4 and the Dressing Room is warranted in order to protect the interests indicated within Condition 4. The extent of hedging likely to be affected is limited, the large extent of the boundary would be retained, the screening of the dwelling to the east is largely provided by hedging on its own side which is likely to be unaffected, and the residential and visual amenities of the area would not be adversely affected. Having regard to the context of the site and to the scale and nature of the

development, I consider the requirement to omit two rooms from a single storey domestic extension to be disproportionate.

8.3.9. The concerns which the planning authority sought to address can in my view, be adequately addressed by condition without requiring the omission of the eastern extension. I consider that the extent of any removal of hedging may be agreed prior to commencement of development, that the retained hedging be protected during construction and that compensatory planting be provided where removal is required. A landscape plan submitted for the written agreement of the planning authority is sufficient for that purpose. I note that Condition 5 of the planning authority's decision which is not the subject of the appeal and which already requires the retention and protection of all existing trees and hedgerows along the site boundaries and provides that none shall be removed unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority. An amended Condition 4 requiring a landscape plan allows for such agreement with respect to the eastern boundary.

8.3.10. I therefore recommend that Condition 4 be amended.

8.4. Wastewater

8.4.1. The applicant has demonstrated that the existing on-site wastewater treatment system is sufficient to serve the development. The site characterisation report confirms that the existing treatment unit is in good working condition and has capacity for a six person loading, and provides for the replacement of the existing raised percolation area with a raised soil polishing filter of 90 square metres designed in accordance with the EPA Code of Practice. The Environment Section of the planning authority has no objection subject to conditions. I am satisfied that the requirements of Section 15.4.12 of the development plan are met in this respect, and the matter is dealt with by conditions of the planning authority's decision which are not the subject of the appeal.

9.0 AA Screening

The proposed development comprises extensions to an existing dwelling in a rural area, served by an existing on-site wastewater treatment system which is to be

retained and whose percolation area is to be upgraded. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project, and taking account of the screening determination of the planning authority, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any 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. Appropriate Assessment, therefore, is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

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, together with relevant guidance published by the Environmental Protection Agency (Ireland), including applicable codes of practice for the protection of water quality.

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.

The proposed development has been designed in accordance with EPA codes of practice and best practice guidance, ensuring that appropriate measures are incorporated to prevent pollution, control runoff, and protect both surface water and groundwater receptors.

Furthermore, the development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the maintenance or attainment of Good Ecological Status/Potential and Good Chemical Status, as required under the Directive.

Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4

11.0 Recommendation

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and to the condition the subject of the appeal, I am satisfied that the determination by the Commission of the relevant application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted.

Based on the reasons and considerations set out below, I recommend that the Commission under subsection (1) of section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, AMEND condition number 4 as follows:

4. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit for the written agreement of the planning authority a landscape plan for the eastern boundary of the site. The plan shall identify the hedging to be retained and the extent of any hedging to be removed in order to facilitate the construction of the eastern extension, shall specify the measures to be taken to protect the retained hedging during the course of construction and shall provide for replacement planting (native species) of a length at least equal to that of any hedging that may be removed, to be carried out in the first planting season following the completion of the development. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed plan.

Reason: In the interest of the protection of the existing boundary hedging, of biodiversity and of the visual amenities of the area.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the rural location of the site, to the provisions of the Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029 (as varied), to the single storey scale and design of the proposed extension and its relationship with the existing dwelling, to the absence of window openings in its eastern elevation, to the separation distance in excess of 20 metres between the extension and the dwelling to the east, to the mixed species and double planted character of the hedging along the eastern boundary and the limited extent of that hedging likely to be affected by the development, and to the extent of hedging which would be retained on both sides of that boundary, it is considered that the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential

amenity of the dwelling to the east or of property in the vicinity, would not adversely affect the character or visual amenities of the area, and would not significantly affect biodiversity. The concerns which the planning authority sought to address by way of Condition 4 can be adequately addressed by a condition requiring the submission and agreement of a landscape plan for the eastern boundary, and the omission of the eastern extension comprising Bedroom 4 and the Dressing Room is therefore not warranted.

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."

David Freeland
Planning Inspector

01/10/2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501649-KE-26
Proposed Development Summary	Permission for single storey extensions and all associated site works.
Development Address	The Bungalow, Green Avenue, Newlands North, Naas
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 ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☐	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____