



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

# Inspector's Report

**PL-501667-DS-26**

|                                     |                                         |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| <b>Development</b>                  | Shopfront signage (Protected Structure) |
| <b>Location</b>                     | 9-10 Dawson Street, Dublin 2            |
| <b>Planning Authority</b>           | Dublin City Council                     |
| <b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b> | WEB 5253/25                             |
| <b>Applicant</b>                    | Razorlight Ltd                          |
| <b>Type of Application</b>          | Permission                              |
| <b>Planning Authority Decision</b>  | Grant permission subject to conditions  |
| <b>Type of Appeal</b>               | First Party v. conditions               |
| <b>Appellant</b>                    | Razorlight Ltd                          |
| <b>Observers</b>                    | None                                    |
| <b>Date of Site Inspection</b>      | 28 August 2026                          |
| <b>Inspector</b>                    | B. Wyse                                 |

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. 9-10 Dawson Street comprises a recently refurbished and extended office building with a restaurant, the subject premises, on the ground floor. The main restaurant frontage, made up of large plate glass windows on a stone plinth and the entrance door, is recessed back from the main building frontage. The lowest part of the latter includes the signage fascia panel that extends the full width of the building. Restaurant signage is already in place, comprising individual raised lettering on a black background. There is also a red canopy structure at the front door and planter boxes have been placed along the window frontage.
- 1.2. Immediately adjacent buildings include 11-12 Dawson Street, another recently refurbished and extended office building to the south, and No.8 Dawson Street, a period house to the north. The southbound Luas green line Dawson Street stop extends across the front of the restaurant.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. The public notices describe the proposed development as consisting of a modification to existing shopfront to include new fascia panels and internally illuminated signage, louvred soffit panels, new and amended entrance door to front of building and to reinstate removed fascia and soffit panel over entrance door. The building is a protected structure – see Section 5.1 below.
- 2.2. The Town Planning Report that accompanied the application describes the proposal as signage of individual lettering, yellow in colour, of opal acrylic with warm white LEDs internally, bolted onto a fascia painted in a ruby red, all fitting within the existing frame system of the front elevation of the building. It states that the amended access door is to make it compliant with relevant regulations for public access.
- 2.3. The application also included a Conservation Statement. This includes images of the building frontage prior to the refurbishment works.
- 2.4. Further to concerns raised by the planning authority further information submitted included the following:

- As the restaurant was ready to open shortly after the lodging of the application in September 2025, and before a decision could issue, temporary signage was erected different to that for which permission was sought. (The temporary signage appears to be that which is still there and as described at Section 1.0 above).

Responding to concerns raised by the planning authority Conservation Division the proposal was altered to include the following:

- existing granite plinth to be retained unaltered,
- proposed black painted aluminium panel to sit within existing fascia,
- existing shopfront framework & glazing to be retained unaltered,
- proposed back-lit solid brass signage, gold in colour, fixed to black fascia,
- the individual letters are illuminated from behind,
- section of bulkhead above doors to be repaired and made good, framework to match existing with new infill panel in grey to match stone.

The response also included:

- The extract duct work is currently installed on site, behind the signage /shopfront fascia, in accordance with the approved drawings. In view of this, it is not possible to reduce the depth of the fascia as suggested by the conservation officer.
- In addition, the Conservation Officer asked for a replacement of the aluminium, mentioning in other applications that aluminium only lasts 30 years. However, the nature of shops/restaurants is that they have a turnover more frequently than that period and therefore their signs need to change often in line with a change of tenant.
- The planter boxes have been moved to alongside the windows to create a buffer so as to prevent people waiting at the LUAS stop staring in at diners and using the plinth to stand on to do so. Their retention is the subject of an appeal in a street licensing application.

Responding to the request of the planning authority Transportation Planning Division that the entrance door should open inwards, the applicants submitted that, from a fire safety point of view, the door requires to open outwards.

### 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

#### 3.1. Decision

The decision to grant permission is subject to 10 conditions. Most of the conditions are standard.

The conditions the subject of the appeal are as follows:

*5. The Developer shall comply with the following requirements of the Transportation Division of the Planning Authority:*

- a) The main entrance door shall be inward opening and not open outward onto the public footpath.*
- b) All costs incurred by Dublin City Council, including any repairs to the public road and services necessary as a result of the development, shall be at the expense of the developer.*

**Reason:** *In the interests of sustainable transportation and orderly development.*

*6. The Developer shall comply with the following conservation requirements of the Planning Authority:*

- (a) A conservation expert with proven and appropriate expertise shall be employed to design, manage, monitor and implement the works to the building and to ensure adequate protection of the retained and historic fabric during the works. In this regard, all permitted works shall be designed to cause minimum interference to the retained building and facades structure and/or fabric.*
- (b) In advance of works commencing on site, the applicant shall submit the following to the Planning Authority, for their written agreement:*
  - (i) The fascia panel shall be either stone, timber, glass, or steel. Fixing details at a scale of 1:5 shall be submitted showing how the fascia would be affixed to the Protected Structure without any adverse impact on historic fabric,*
  - (ii) The lettering to the signage shall be no greater than 40cm in height. Photographic exemplars of the proposed lettering shall be submitted together with fixing and service details at a scale of 1:10, showing how the light fixtures would be affixed,*

- (iii) Visual samples of the proposed stone infill panel and ironmongery shall be submitted together with a specification for the proposed door and side panels. The proposed frames to the new door and glazed side panels panel shall be bronze – with a profile thickness to match the original curtain walling system,*
- (c) All works to the Protected Structure shall be carried out in accordance with best conservation practice and the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) and Advice Series issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government. Any repair works shall retain the maximum amount of surviving historic fabric in situ. Items to be removed for repair off-site shall be recorded prior to removal, catalogued and numbered to allow for authentic re-instatement.*
- (d) All existing original features, in the vicinity of the works shall be protected during the course of the refurbishment works.*
- (e) All repair of original fabric shall be scheduled and carried out by appropriately experienced conservators of historic fabric.*
- (f) The architectural detailing and materials in the new work shall be executed to the highest standards so as to complement the setting of the Protected Structure and the historic area.*

**Reason:** *To ensure that the integrity of this Protected Structure is maintained and that the proposed repair works are carried out in accordance with best conservation practice with no unauthorised or unnecessary damage or loss of historic building fabric.*

I also note that the standard Condition 1 in this case does not make any reference to the further information submitted although it seems clear that the decision to grant permission was meant to refer to the development as modified at further information stage.

**Reason:** *In the interest of orderly development and visual amenity.*

### **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

### 3.2.1. **Planning Reports** (dated 17/11/2025 and 11/062026)

Include:

- *concern with proposed colours for the signage and the fascia and how they integrate with the façade of this protected structure. The Conservation Division raised concern with the proposed colour scheme and the quality of the materials proposed for the signage.*
- *The door that is proposed to be amended is outward opening. There is an existing heavy footfall of pedestrians on this street and therefore, the door should not open onto the public footpath and should be inward swinging.*
- Agreement with the reports of the Conservation Division and the Transport Planning Division in relation to the responses to the further information submitted.
- No requirement for Appropriate Assessment or Environmental Impact Assessment.

### 3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

**Conservation Officer** (dated 06/11/2025 and 29/05/2026)

Includes:

- *The introduction of planter boxes to the front of the Protected Structure is not acceptable and shall be removed. The introduction of a canopy over the entrance doors is not acceptable and shall be removed.*
- *the proposed design of the shopfronts at ground floor varies significantly from that which was granted planning permission in 2019. (DCC Reg. Ref. 4716/18). It is regrettable that this proposal does not take account of the design proposal for the overall structure, and it represents a missed opportunity to protect and enhance the special architectural character of the modernist structure – a rare example of its type in the city.*
- *The depth and materiality of the proposed fascia panels is contrary to what was previously granted planning permission (DCC Reg, Ref. 4716/18). Moreover, the proposed red colour of aluminium as a cladding material is not appropriate for the special architectural character of the Protected Structure and the ACA and shall be revised. The South City Retail Quarter Architectural Conservation Area document (DCC 2007) states: ‘The materials used in the shop front should be of a high quality*

*and durable to avoid long term maintenance problems. Materials such as stone, timber and glass will be favoured over materials such as plastics, reconstituted stone and aluminium”.*

- The dimensions of the proposed lettering (400mm high) would be largely in accordance with the Dublin City Council’s Shopfront Design Guidelines (DCC 2001). However, the submitted drawings indicate that the proposed lettering would consist of opal acrylic faces with a brass rim and aluminium trays. The proposed lettering would be internally illuminated white LEDs.*
- The proposed method of illumination (internally illuminated / halo lighting) is not acceptable by the CO as it produces an overly bright, cool white light and is unsympathetic to the Protected Structure and ACA.*
- The DCC Shopfront Design Guidelines (DCC 2001 p23) states: “Illumination should be discreet, either by concealed neon tubing where the fascia detail permits, or by rear illumination of the individual letters. Spotlights should only be considered where the supporting arms are short and the hoods of the lights are treated to match the background.*
- Moreover, the use of plastics such as acrylic or uPVC and aluminium would not be acceptable as they are considered to be unsympathetic, of insufficient quality and inappropriate to the special architectural character of the Protected Structure. The proposed lettering shall be revised to be brass and/or steel.*
- Aluminium windows and doors additionally have slightly chunkier profiles than steel / bronze. Therefore, the introduction of an aluminium framed door would not be sympathetic to the special architectural character and legibility of the Protected facade. The proposed frames to the door and glazed side panels panel shall be bronze– to match the original fenestration material of the Protected Structure.*

These concerns informed the request for further information issued by the planning authority.

The responses to the further information submitted are reflected in the conditions attached to the planning authority decision to grant permission.

## **Transportation Planning Division**

States that, given the existing heavy footfall of pedestrians on the street, the entrance door should not open onto the public footpath and should be inward swinging.

Recommends Condition 5 as attached to the planning authority decision.

## **Drainage Division**

No objection.

### **3.3. Prescribed Bodies**

#### **Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII)**

Recommends standard conditions re. works in close proximity to Luas infrastructure and a Section 49 Development Contribution.

The National Transport Authority (NTA), Uisce Eireann and all relevant Article 28 bodies were notified and no responses were received.

### **3.4. Third Party Observations**

None received.

## **4.0 Planning History**

### **PA Ref. WEB2295/25**

This is the most recent ( September 2025) grant of permission for the restaurant. The restaurant extends over the ground floor of No.s 9-10 and 11-12 (rear area) Dawson Street. Condition 3 of the permission required signage for the restaurant to be the subject of a separate planning application. Condition 7 de-exempted advertisements, canopies etc.

### **PA Ref. 4716/18**

This is the original 2019 grant of permission for the refurbishment and extension of No.s 9-12 Dawson Street. Subject to relatively minor modifications [under PA Refs. 4798/22, 4661/23, 3263/24 and 3889/24] this is the permission under which the development has been carried out.

## **PA Ref. SF61/2025, ACP Ref. 324086-26**

This is a recent, June 2026, refusal of a licence under Section 254 of the Act for outdoor furniture at the subject premises. The proposed furniture consisted of 4 tables and 12 chairs, a number of planters, a freestanding arched cover and brassed post uprights with menu board and sculpture at the entrance door to the restaurant. The reasons for refusal refer to interference with pedestrian movement at the busy Luas stop and adverse impact on the special character of the protected structure.

## **5.0 Policy Context**

### **5.1. Development Plan**

#### **Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028**

**Zoning: City Centre - Z5** : *To consolidate and facilitate the development of the central area, and to identify, reinforce, strengthen and protect its civic design character and dignity.*

No.s 9-12 Dawson Street are Protected Structures (RPS Ref. 8780). [That is 9-10 and the adjacent buildings 11-12 and building to rear facing onto Dawson Lane].

The protected elements are described as follows:

- Building A - facing onto Dawson Lane: Building envelope and main office spaces.
- Building B - 11-12 Dawson Street: Elevations to Dawson Street and Dawson Lane and the main staircase with stained glass windows.
- Building C – 9 -10 Dawson Street: Front elevation only.

No.8 Dawson Street, the adjoining period house to the north, is also a protected structure (RPS Ref. 2250).

NIAH Ref. 50100075 – this refers to all three of the buildings at 9-12 Dawson Street as described above. Building 9-10 considered to be of regional significance. It includes a

photograph of the front elevation at ground floor level of No.9-10 Dawson Street (the subject premises) prior to its recent refurbishment.

## **Chapter 11 Built Heritage and Archaeology**

### **Policy BHA2 – Development of Protected Structures; includes:**

*That development will conserve and enhance protected structures and their curtilage and will:*

- (a) Ensure that any development proposals to protected structures, their curtilage and setting shall have regard to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011) published by the Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht.*
- (b) Protect structures included on the RPS from any works that would negatively impact their special character and appearance.*
- (c) Ensure that works are carried out in line with best conservation practice as advised by a suitably qualified person with expertise in architectural conservation.*
- (d) Ensure that any development, modification, alteration, or extension affecting a protected structure and/or its setting is sensitively sited and designed, and is appropriate in terms of the proposed scale, mass, height, density, layout and materials.*

### **Policy BHA15 – Twentieth Century Buildings and Structures**

- (a) To encourage the appropriate development of exemplar twentieth century buildings and structures to ensure their character is not compromised.*
- (b) To encourage the retention and reinstatement of internal and external features, that contribute to the character of exemplar twentieth century buildings, such as roofscapes, boundary treatments, fenestration pattern, materials, and other features, fixtures and fittings (including furniture and art work), considered worthy of retention.*

### **Chapter 15 Section 15.17.5 - Shopfront and Façade Design; includes:**

*Shopfront design plays a key part in contribution to the quality of the public realm. Attractive facades and shopfronts have the ability to rejuvenate the streetscape and create an attractive public realm environment.*

*Shopfront signage should:*

- *Be located at fascia level.*
- *The signage relating to any commercial ground floor use should be contained within the fascia board of the shopfront.*
- *The lettering employed should be either on the fascia, or consist of individually mounted solid letters mounted on the fascia. The size of the lettering used should be in proportion to the depth of the fascia board.*

### **South City Retail Quarter Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) (2007)**

The front façade of the building appears to fall within this ACA. Section 4(i) includes the following guidance:

*The materials used in the shop front should be of a high quality and durable to avoid long term maintenance problems. Materials such as stone, timber and glass will be favoured over materials such as plastics, reconstituted stone and aluminium.*

## **5.2. Relevant Ministerial Guidelines**

### **Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities – Department of Arts, Heritage and Gaeltacht, 2011**

#### **Section 8.5.7 – New items fixed to the exterior of the building**

Includes:

*Careful consideration needs to be given to proposals to fix new items to the exterior of a protected structure. Permission should usually only be given for fixtures that respect the architectural design of the structure and do not detract from its appearance. Examples of types of fixtures which may be proposed could include floodlighting, entry phones, name plates or signboards, information plaques, alarm boxes, satellite*

*dishes, window-cleaning eyes, or plastic utility boxes such as gas and electricity meters.*

### **Section 12.6.1 New Shopfronts**

Includes:

*The design of a new shopfront for installation into a protected structure requires careful consideration and should not detract from the character of the rest of the building.*

### **5.3. Natural Heritage Designations**

None relevant.

## **6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)**

- 6.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. See Form 1 in Appendix below.

## **7.0 The Appeal**

### **7.1. Grounds of Appeal**

The appeal is lodged in relation to conditions 5 and 6 of the planning authority decision to grant permission. The main grounds can be summarised as follows:

**Condition 5** – the issue here relates to **part (a)** of this condition that requires the main entrance door to be inward opening only and not to open outward onto the public footpath.

- From a fire safety point of view the door to a public premises such as a restaurant requires to open outwards.
- Details of approved Fire Safety and Disabled Access certificates, and a letter from the Assigned Certifier and relevant drawings, are submitted. These confirm the requirement that the door opens outwards under these approvals.

- The continued use of the premises is conditional on complying with these certificates.

**Condition 6** - the submission refers to all of the parts of this condition.

**Part (a)** – requires relevant conservation expertise etc.

This part is accepted.

**Part (b)** – requires details in relation to design, materials etc.

The response includes the following proposed modifications:

- The fascia panel to be black glass.
- The lettering to be gold in colour.
- The door to be bronze anodised aluminium. The assertion by the planning authority Conservation Officer that a bronze door was removed is not correct. The current door was in place when the applicants took possession. It is now proposed to coat the door in bronze.

**Parts (c) to (f)**

Accepted.

The remainder of the submission largely repeats the applicants response to the planning authority request for further information and, therefore, somewhat confuses the matter. It also refers to the planters and canopy to the front of the premises in the context of separate street furniture license applications and possible future proposals for these.

## **7.2. Planning Authority Response**

None received.

## **7.3. Observations**

None received.

## **8.0 Assessment**

- 8.1. This is an appeal against Conditions 5 and 6 only of the planning authority decision. Given the nature of the conditions, the details of the application and the content of the appeal submissions, I am satisfied that the determination of the application as if it had

been made to the Commission in the first instance is not warranted. The Commission can proceed to deal with the appeal in accordance with Section 139 of the Act and this assessment is carried out accordingly.

## **8.2. Condition 5(a)**

- 8.2.1. I note the documentation in relation to the Fire Safety and Disability Access certificates submitted with the grounds of appeal. These relate to codes separate to the planning system and there may or may not be other access arrangements that could satisfy their requirements. As per the report of the planning authority transportation planning division (Section 3.2.2 above) it is clear that the reason for the condition, in planning terms, is founded on a concern that the door should not open onto the public footpath at this busy location beside the Luas stop.
- 8.2.2. As noted at Section 1.1 above, the ground floor frontage of the building, the frontage to the restaurant, is recessed back from the main front elevation of the building. The effect is that the outward opening door only projects very slightly beyond the main building elevation. In addition the front elevation of the adjoining building, Nos 11-12 Dawson Street, is further forward at ground floor level than the restaurant frontage. The result is that the entrance door opens in a relatively sheltered location and is, in my view, unlikely to unduly interfere with pedestrian circulation in the vicinity.
- 8.2.3. I consider, therefore, that the Commission should direct the planning authority to remove Condition 5(a).

## **8.3. Condition 6(b)**

- 8.3.1. The Commission will note that by reference to the grounds of appeal as summarised at Section 7.1 above it is only part (b) of Condition 6 that is contested. The submission indicates that the other parts of the condition are accepted and I do not consider that there is any need for the Commission to revisit these parts.
- 8.3.2. Just two elements of part (b) need to be considered, the fascia panel material and the material for the entrance door and side panel frames. It is noted that the gold coloured lettering, in brass, was already provided for in the further information submitted to the planning authority (Section 2.4 above).

- 8.3.3. As indicated at Section 7.1 above the applicants now propose that the fascia panel be black glass. This would clearly satisfy the planning authority requirement as indicated in the condition.
- 8.3.4. In relation to the entrance door, and side panels, it is now proposed to coat the frames in bronze. The applicants state that the existing aluminium door was in place when they took possession of the property. By reference to the elevation drawings associated with the original grant of permission for the refurbishment and extension of the building, PA Ref. 4716/18, it would appear that the entrance door and side panel have been retained as they were prior to the approved works taking place. I am satisfied that the proposed bronze coating is a reasonable compromise in the circumstances. The work is of a minor nature and would also not rule out a future reinstatement of bronze framework.
- 8.3.5. In overall terms, and having regard to the policy context as set out at Section 5.0 above, I am satisfied that the proposed changes to the said condition can be accepted and that they would not be detrimental to the special character of the protected structure or have an adverse impact on the wider architectural conservation area. They would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 8.3.6. I consider, therefore, that the Commission should direct the planning authority to amend condition 6(b) accordingly.

## **9.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening**

- 9.1. Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project within an established and serviced urban area, and taking account of the screening determination of the planning authority, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.
- 9.2. 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**

- 10.1. I have assessed the 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 & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status) and to prevent deterioration.
- 10.2. Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project in a serviced urban area, 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.

## **11.0 Recommendation**

- 11.1. I recommend as follows:

Having regard to the nature of the conditions the subject of the appeal, the Commission is 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 and, based on the reasons and considerations set out below, directs the said Council under subsection (1) of section 139 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 to:

(a) Remove Condition 5(a).

(b) Amend Condition 6(b) as follows:

Replace the first sentence of Item (i) with 'The fascia panel shall be black glass'.

Replace the last sentence of item (iii) with 'The frames of the entrance door and side panel shall be coated in anodised bronze'.

## **12.0 Reasons and Considerations**

As the restaurant frontage is recessed back from the main building frontage, the outward opening entrance door only very slightly projects onto the public footpath at a relatively sheltered location. Condition 5(a), therefore, is not warranted.

The proposed black glass fascia panel aligns with the requirements of the planning authority. The proposed anodised bronze coating to the entrance door and side panel

is a reasonable compromise. The work is of a minor nature and would not rule out a future reinstatement of a bronze framework. The proposed changes to Condition 6(b) would not be detrimental to the special character of the protected structure or have an adverse impact on the wider architectural conservation area. They would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area

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

---

B. Wyse  
Planning Inspector

15 September 2026

## Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                             |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Case Reference</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | PL-501667-DS-26                                                             |
| <b>Proposed Development Summary</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Shopfront signage                                                           |
| <b>Development Address</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 9-10 Dawson Street, Dublin 2                                                |
| <b>IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                                                             |
| <b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2. |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.                    |
| <p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,</li> <li>- Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)</li> </ul> |                                                                             |
| <b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.<br><b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                             |
| <b>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</b>                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                             |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</b>                                                                                                                          |                                                                           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.<br><b>No Screening required.</b> |                                                                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.<br><b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b>                                                                                      |                                                                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.<br><b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b><br><b>OR</b><br><b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b> |                                                                           |
| <b>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)?</b>                                                                              |                                                                           |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/>                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                           |
| No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                                                                                                                                                                                                       | <b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b> |

Inspector:     B. Wyse

Date:        15 September 2026