Inspector's Report

PL-501733-DS-26

Development	Retention of the clear glazing installed in two windows at first floor on the southern elevation of the house.
Location	199A, Strand Road, Sandymount, Dublin 4, D04T1H5.
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB2071/26
Applicant(s)	Ray McGovern.
Type of Application	Retention.
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse permission.
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Ray McGovern.
Observer(s)	Richard & Una Crowe.
Date of Site Inspection	13/10/26
Inspector	Anthony Abbott King

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. No. 199A Strand Road is a two-storey contemporary design oblong shape house with a flat roof, and an internal axial atrium giving access to first floor reception spaces and ground floor bedrooms, located between no. 199B Strand Road (earlier infill to the south) and no. 197 Strand Road (north) on the west site of the street.

1.2. The shorter sides of the oblong present to Strand Road (east facing frontage approximately 6m) and to the rear garden (west elevation), respectively. The longer side elevations present to adjoining property boundaries to the north and south (199B Strand Road).

1.3. Strand Road is a heavily trafficked link road (coast road) between Sandymount Village and the Merrion Road. The subject site is approximately 150m north of the Merrion Gates.

1.4. There is an eclectic building typology on this section of Strand Road facing east reflecting the infill of the gardens of larger period properties in the twentieth century.

1.5. The site area is given as 1117 sqm.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Retention of clear glazing in two first floor window openings on the southern elevation of no. 199A Strand Road.

2.2. The first floor windows the subject t of this first party appeal are defined by the appellant for clarity as follows:

Window “A” : glazed panel facing south positioned at the corner of the south and rear elevations.

Window “B”: glazed panel positioned toward the middle of the south elevation.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. **Decision**

3.1.1. Refusal

Having regard to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, the Z2 zoning objectives where it is an objective to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas and characteristics of the existing site, the retention of the clear glazing at the side elevation of a property at first floor level would adversely impact the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers. The development would therefore be seriously injurious to residential amenity and contrary to the Z2 zoning objective of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed retention would set and undesirable precedent for similar type development and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The decision of the CEO of Dublin City Council reflects the recommendation of the planning case officer.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

No objection subject to condition.

3.3. **Third Party Observations**

There is one third party objection, with appended documentation (Exhibits 1-6), on file from the adjoining property owner (no. 199B Strand Road), which is summarised below:

- Permission for the demolition of an existing single storey house at no. 199A Strand Road and the construction of a larger 2-storey house was granted permission circa. 2001 by the planning authority.
- The initial application was refused by the planning authority on 4 grounds (Reg. Ref: 0403/01) (Exhibit 1 of the third party observation).
- A subsequent amended development proposal application was made for a replacement house (Reg Ref: 1574/01). The application *inter alia* proposed first floor living accommodation with bedrooms at ground floor level (Exhibit 3). In

specific the application provided the southern first floor window to the dining room to be obscured to negate overlooking from this window.

- It was recognised at the time of the grant of permission by the planning authority (Reg Ref: 1574/01) that the proposed development would have negative impacts on the adjoining property at no.199B Strand Road in consequence mitigation measures where proposed to address these adverse impacts including by way of condition to provide opague or stained glass in the first floor south façade openings.
- Planning permission was granted by An Bord Pleanála subject to 3 conditions following appeal by the third party (Exhibit 4 & 6).
- Condition 1 (restricted glazing) of the permission provided the third party with an enhanced residential amenity for the past 25 years. However, in January 2025 the glazed panels in both windows on the south facing façade where replaced by “clear see through glass”, which it is claimed contravenes Condition 1 of the original planning permission.
- Condition 1 (ABP PL 295.126020) of the permission states: facing windows in the southern façade at first floor level shall be permanently obscure glazed. The condition is attached by reason to prevent overlooking of adjoining properties.
- The third party claims that this unlawful action to remove the obscure glazing has a severe adverse impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining property (no. 199B Strand Road) in terms of the enjoyment of the garden and patio, which is overlooked from the subject window openings located in the south façade.
- The third party asks that permission to retain the clear glass currently in these windows by reason of unauthorised replacement be refused.

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. The following planning history is relevant:

- Under Reg. Ref: 1574/01 planning permission subject to 3 conditions was granted in 2002 by an Bord Pleanála for the demolition of the existing single-storey house on site and its replacement with a larger two-storey house.

Reg. Ref: ABP PL 295.126020 Second Schedule is relevant and states:

1. *The two facing windows in the southern façade at first floor level shall be permanently obscured glazing.* ***Reason:*** *To prevent overlooking of adjoining properties.*
2. *The proposed balcony and stairway on the first floor level, leading to the rear garden located in the western gable, shall be omitted from the proposed development and revised drawings shall be submitted to the planning authority prior to commencement of development, indicating a less obtrusive means of rear access.* ***Reason:*** *In the interests of residential and visual amenity.*
3. *Deep vertical fins, directing views from the proposed entrance deck on the first floor level parallel to the site, shall be installed directly west of the said deck.* ***Reason:*** *In the interests of residential and visual amenity.*

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The relevant local planning policy document is the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.

Zoning

The relevant land-use zoning objective of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 (Map H) is Z2 (Residential Conservation): *To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.*

The proposed development is a permissible use.

Residential Conservation Area Designation

The rational for residential conservation area designation is that the overall quality of an area in design and layout terms is such that it requires special care in dealing with development proposals, which would affect structures both protected and non-protected in such areas. The objective is to protect conservation areas from unsuitable new developments or works that would have a negative impact on the amenity or architectural quality of the area. In this regard development standards in conservation

areas, Chapter 15 (Development Standards) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 is relevant and states:

All planning applications for development in Conservation Areas shall:

- *Respect the existing setting and character of the surrounding area.*
- *Be cognisant and/ or complementary to the existing scale, building height and massing of the surrounding context.*
- *Protect the amenities of the surrounding properties and spaces.*
- *Provide for an assessment of the visual impact of the development in the surrounding context.*
- *Ensure materials and finishes are in keeping with the existing built environment.*
- *Positively contribute to the existing streetscape. Retain historic trees also as these all add to the special character of an ACA, where they exist.*

Furthermore, Chapter 11 (Archaeology & Built Heritage) Policy Objective BHA9 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 *inter alia* states:

> *To protect the special interest and character of all Dublin's Conservation Areas – identified under Z8 and Z2 zoning objectives…….. Development within or affecting a Conservation Area must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible.*

Residential Extension

Appendix 18 (Ancillary Residential Accommodation), Section 1 (Residential Extensions), Section 1.1 (General Design Principles) inter *alia* states:

> *The design of residential extensions should have regard to the amenities of adjoining properties and in particular, the need for light and privacy. In addition, the form of the existing building should be respected, and the development should integrate with the existing building through the use of similar or contrasting materials and finishes.*

5.2. **Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines**

- The Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2007).

6.0 EIA Screening

6.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

The grounds of this first party appeal are summarised below:

- The development to be retained the subject of this appeal is the substitution of obscure glazing with clear glazing to two first floor windows located in the side elevation of the applicant house facing south onto the boundary with no.199B Strand Road. The window openings and the positions of the openings on the elevation remain as was granted planning permission aside from the clear glazing that has been installed.
- The two windows are identified as “Window A” (glazed panel facing south positioned at the corner of the south and rear elevation) and “Window B” (glazed panel positioned toward the middle of the south elevation). “Window B” is approximately 65% of the area of “Window A”.
- “Window A” is located at the corner of the rear elevation where there is a clear glass window that overlooks the rear garden facing west. The west facing window does not form part of the subject appeal as it is not on the southern elevation of the house.
- Notwithstanding that the planning authority refused retention permission, the planning authority recognises the change in site characteristics since the original grant of planning permission (ABP PL29S.126020) in February 2002, which

regulated the glazing type in the first floor south elevation windows (permanent obscure glazing).

- There are substantial evergreen trees and hedges along or adjacent to the southern boundary between the properties that have matured since the completion of development in the early 2000s that obscure views of the adjoining property to the south.
- However, it is noted for the information of the Commission that subsequent to the lodgement of the retention application the height of the southern boundary vegetation has been reduced by the owner of the adjoining property at no. 199B Strand Road without the appellant's permission. It is claimed this has resulted in a contrived view between the properties where previously there was dense planting.
- It is claimed that any view from the window(s) is no more intrusive on the amenities of the adjoining property than is generally the case between houses in a suburban context with similar orientations.
- In the matter of "Window B", the planting along the boundary in combination with a timber screen installed on the boundary wall completely obscures views of the adjoining house.
- The planning authority inexplicably concluded that clear glazing in the windows in question adversely impacts the amenities of neighbouring occupiers notwithstanding the planning officer did not access the property to see the views out the windows toward the adjoining property. It is claimed that this is a material consideration in the assessment of the development to be retained.
- It is further claimed that the refusal of permission is unwarranted. It is not considered that significant adverse impact arises from the views from the subject windows and in consequence the refusal of planning permission is not justified.
- Finally, in the reason for refusal the planning authority cites undesirable precedent, which it is claimed is inconsistent with the central principle of planning assessment based on the individual merits of the development proposal notwithstanding any decision that has been made on the same property or a property in the immediate vicinity. Furthermore, there is no rule of precedent in a

planning decision creating no obligation on the planning authority to grant a similar development(s).

7.2. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority have not responded to date.

7.3. Observations

There is one observation on file from the adjoining property owner, which is summarised as follows:

- The observer(s) are long term residents at no. 199B Strand Road (Knockaburra) immediately to the south of the applicant site.
- The owner of the adjoining property at no. 199A Strand Road received planning permission for a replacement house with living accommodation on the first floor and bedroom accommodation on the ground floor.
- Two living room window openings on the upper floor side elevation now referred to as “Window A” and “Window B” directly overlook our rear garden and patio area.
- Another window opening to the living room in the west elevation looks directly down the rear garden of no. 199A Strand Road and was not of concern.
- Planning permission for the replacement house was granted on appeal (Reg. Ref: 1574/01) subject to condition in specific a condition regulating the glazing of the first floor “Window A” and “Window B”, which were required to have ‘permanently obscured glazing”.
- The observer trusts that all of the background information, including previous submission, is available to the Commission (please see Section 3.4 of this Report).
- A planning application was lodged by the owners of no. 199A Strand Road (Reg. Ref: 2071/26), for the retention of clear glass, following an enforcement action resulting from the removal of the obscure glazing in the subject windows in January 2025.

- The third party claims that the residential amenity enjoyed for 20 years by the requirement to have obscure glass is undone due to overlooking of their rear garden and patio facilitated by the unilateral insertion of clear glazing by the adjoining property owner.
- The planning authority accepted the arguments of the third party and refused planning permission for clear glazing of the first floor side elevation windows as it would adversely impact the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.
- The third party discounts the essence of the subject appeal against the refusal of planning permission on the grounds that vegetation has grown in the intervening timeframe between the original permission and the retention application for clear glazing providing that the windows are now obstructed by dense planting and are no longer intrusive. It is claimed that the vegetation is not permanent and can be cut back and that the vegetation screen is not subject to an enforceable planning requirement.
- The observer position is that the subject windows are the same physically as when the original permission for the replacement house was granted and as such have a serious adverse impact on their residential amenity in specific their private garden space and patio.
- The observer asks the Commissioners to uphold the decision of the planning authority to refuse clear glazing and to reinstate the historical requirement for the two windows (A&B) to be permanently glazed with obscure glass.

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. I have examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant planning policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Zoning / principle of development
- Impact on the dwellinghouse on site

- Impact on neighbouring properties

8.2. Zoning / principal of development

8.3. The site is zoned Z2 (Residential Conservation) in the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028: *To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.* Residential development is acceptable in principle and may be permitted where the proposed development is compatible with the overall policies and objectives of the zoning.

8.4. The development to be retained is located within a residential conservation area. The replacement clear glass is to two existing window openings in the side of the dwelling (south elevation) at first floor level located behind the front building line. The openings are not visible from the street. I consider that the development to be retained would not have a significant visual impact on the residential conservation area.

Impact on the dwelling house on site

8.5. The first party states that the refusal of planning permission by the planning authority is not warranted. It is claimed that the mature planting along the shared property boundary obscure views of the adjoining house to the south (no. 199B Strand Road) and that there is no adverse impact on the residential amenities of the conservation area.

8.6. On the day of my site visit, I note that the first floor reception area (living / dining room) the location of the subject window openings is a large elevated bright room entered from a top lit central atrium. The atrium accommodates a staircase from the ground floor.

8.7. The room is accessed through an expansive door opening from the atrium creating a vista through the atrium from the living room / dining room to the reception space(s) facing east over Strand Road.

8.8. There are multiple windows lighting the living / dining room, including the subject south facing openings. There is an unrestricted elevated view west into the rear garden of the property.

8.9. I do not consider that either prospect or light was compromised in this room prior to the replacement of clear glass in the south facing openings.

8.10. I conclude that the replacement of obscure glazing with clear glass to the south elevation window openings represents a marginal increase in the residential amenity of the occupants of no.199A Strand Road.

Impact on adjoining properties

8.11. The planning authority refused retention permission on the grounds that the replacement of obscure glass with clear glass in the subject first floor south facing window openings would *adversely impact the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.*

8.12. The subject window openings face south onto the boundary with no. 199B Strand Road (third party observer). The substantive matter is the impact of the replacement of obscure glazing with clear glazing on the amenity of the adjoining property to the south.

8.13. The third party has documented that the use of obscure glazing as a condition of the original planning permission prevented overlooking of the adjoining property. The condition is attached to the permission for the subject replacement house in order to protect overlooking of adjoining property (ABP PL 295.126020).

8.14. I accept the third party bon fides in stating that the enjoyment of the garden and patio of no.199B Strand Road has been protected by the obscure glazing of the subject window openings for over 20 years and that the residential amenity of the adjoining property has been depreciated by the substitution of clear glazing due to overlooking concerns.

8.15. I note Appendix 18 (Ancillary Residential Accommodation), Section 1 (Residential Extensions), Section 1.1 (General Design Principles) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.

8.16. I consider that the general design principles for extension and alteration apply to the subject retention development in specific the requirement to design domestic alterations to protect the amenities of adjoining properties and, in particular, the need for light and privacy.

8.17. In the instance of the subject assessment the substantive issue is privacy. The third party claims that the clear glazing results in significant overlooking of the adjoining property to the south.

8.18. The first party counter argues that view(s) from the window(s) is no more intrusive on the amenities of the adjoining property than is generally the case between houses in a suburban context with similar orientations.

8.19. I do not agree with the first party as the design concept underpinning the subject house is to position the living spaces of the house at first floor level (inversion of floor plan) providing for a level of activity at first floor level that is not equivalent to bedroom accommodation, which is the standard arrangement of the suburban home.

8.20. I consider that the potential to overlook or be externally observed from the clear glazed south facing first floor openings is significantly greater than equivalent first floor bedroom window openings.

8.21. Furthermore, internal activity in reception spaces is greater during daylight hours when the adjoining garden and patio area would be enjoyed by the occupants of no.199B Strand Road.

8.22. I conclude that there is a significant potential to overlook the adjoining property to the south without effective mitigation measures. In this regard, I concur with the third party that such measures should be enforceable, as required by the Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2007).

8.23. I recognise the change in site characteristics since the original grant of planning permission (ABP PL29S.126020) in February 2002. The site boundaries are characterised by mature planting providing screening along the property boundaries.

8.24. I accept the first party argument that the proposed retention application should be assessed on its merits rather than assessed on legacy or other criteria.

8.25. In this regard, I conducted a detailed site visit including internal inspection of the prospect and view corridor afforded by the south facing openings furnished with clear glass.

"Window "B"

8.26. In the matter of Window "B" (first floor glazed panel positioned toward the middle of the south elevation), there is potential prospect but no view of the adjoining property to the south. The view is obscured by mature evergreen planting and a timber screen.

8.27. I do not concur with the planning case officer that the retention of clear glazing in Window “B” would be contrary to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.

8.28. I conclude that there is no overlooking issue from Window “B” and that the mitigation of obscure glazing would be superfluous as the mature evergreen planning and timber screen provide the required mitigation.

Window “A”

8.29. In the matter of Window “A” (first floor level glazed panel facing south positioned at the corner of the south and rear elevations), the dual aspect corner window provides prospect and a wide view corridor to the west and south west over the rear curtilage of nos. 199A and 199B Strand Road. There is no timber screen to the south opposite Window “A”.

8.30. The line of vision extends above the shared property boundary comprising a screen of mature vegetation at ground floor level. The mature evergreen vegetation is noticeably lower opposite Window “A” (principally a Grisel Inia hedge) than opposite Window “B”.

8.31. I conclude that the replacement of obscure glazing to clear glazing in Window “A” results in significant overlooking of the rear amenity space of no. 199B Strand Road inconsistent with Section 1 (Residential Extensions), Section 1.1 (General Design Principles) of Appendix 18 (Ancillary Residential Accommodation) of the plan, which protects *inter alia* the privacy of adjoining properties.

8.32. I concur with the planning case officer that the retention of clear glazing in Window “A” would be contrary to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and the residential conservation zoning objective, which seeks *to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.*

8.33. Finally, I note there is no other discernible impact on neighbouring properties other than the overlooking impact on the rear amenity space of no. 199B Strand Road from the development to be retained at Window “A”.

8.34. In conclusion, I do not agree with the first party that no significant adverse impact arises from the views from the subject windows. In consequence the refusal of planning permission by the planning authority in the matter of Window “A” is justified.

9.0 AA Screening

I have considered the proposed development in-light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

The subject site is located within an established suburban area and is connected to piped services. It is adjacent a European site. However, the proposed development comprises replacement of obscure glazing with clear glazing in 2 existing window openings.

No significant nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site given the small-scale nature of the development.

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

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

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. The site is located in Sandymount on the east coast. The site is immediate to a visible watercourse.

The proposed development comprises replacement of obscure glazing with clear glazing in 2 existing window openings.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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. 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 the small scale and nature of the development.

I conclude based on objective information, the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration of 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 a split decision.

Grant for Window “B”

Refuse for Window “A”

12.0 **Reasons & Considerations (A) Grant**

Having regard to the Z2 zoning objective for the area, which seeks to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas, and the characteristics of the site, the retention of the clear glazing at Window “B”, first floor gazed panel positioned toward the middle of the south elevation of the dwelling house at no.199A Strand Road facing south, would not adversely impact the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers at no.199B Strand Road given the mitigation provided by the existing timber screen and mature vegetation located along the shared property boundary opposite Window “B”, which obstructs the line of vision south. Therefore, the development to be retained at Window “B” would not have an adverse impact on the dwelling itself or neighbouring properties and would be consistent with the residential conservation zoning objective and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

1. The development to be retained (Window “B”) shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the

application except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity

13.0 Reasons and Considerations (B) Refuse

Having regard to the Z2 zoning objective for the area, which seeks to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas, and the characteristics of the site, the retention of the clear glazing at Window “A”, first floor level glazed panel positioned at the corner of the side (south) and rear (west) elevations of the dwelling house at no. 199A Strand Road facing south, would adversely impact the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers at no.199B Strand Road by reason of overlooking of the rear amenity space of the adjoining dwelling house to the south. Therefore, the development to be retained at Window “A” would be seriously injurious to residential amenity contrary to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, in specific, Section 1 (Residential Extensions), Section 1.1 (General Design Principles) of Appendix 18 (Ancillary Residential Accommodation), would be inconsistent with the residential conservation zoning objective and 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.

Anthony Abbott King
Planning Inspector

15 October 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501733-DS-26
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of clear glazing installed in two windows at first floor level.
Development Address	**199A, Strand Road, Sandymount, Dublin 4.**
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☐ No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified **in Part 1.** **EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.**	**State the Class here**
☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	

3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
☒ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. **No Screening required.**	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. **EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required**	**State the Class and state the relevant threshold**
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. **Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)** **OR** **If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)**	**State the Class and state the relevant threshold**

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

Inspector:_____ **Date:** _____