



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-321954-25

Development	Change of use from parochial house to a community building and all associated works
Location	Gaddyduff, Clonmany, Co. Donegal
Planning Authority	Donegal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	24/61978
Applicant(s)	Clonmany Youth and Resource Community Centre
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission with Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	P McGonigle
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	11 th April 2025
Inspector	P Maguire

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. An appeal has been made to An Bord Pleanála ('the Board') by Mr Pat McGonigle under the provisions of Section 37 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended ('the Act'), following a grant of permission under Section 34 of the Act.
- 1.2. This Inspector's Report (IR) and recommendation is made pursuant to Section 146(2) of the Act. The Board are required to consider both before determining the matter.

2.0 Site Location and Description

- 2.1. Situated along and to the southern side of Main Street, the appeal site is located in the village of Clonmany on the Inishowen Peninsula in north County Donegal. Vehicular access to the appeal site is via an informal parking area to the front which leads to a gated access to the rear. The Clonmany River is c. 110m to the southwest.
- 2.2. The appeal site is roughly rectangular shaped and consists of a detached two-storey building with yard area and outbuildings to the rear. As noted, the front of the site is open to the adjoining roadside with a section of footpath incorporated into an area of hardstanding. The eastern boundary is defined by capped and rendered walls. The southern and western boundaries are defined by the gable wall of the building and the external walls of the outbuildings to the rear, in addition to a section of boundary wall.
- 2.3. The appeal site has a stated area of 0.038ha and is generally flat but somewhat elevated above the adjoining open yard area to the south and west. Internal renovation works appeared to be ongoing at the time of my inspection. A two-storey semi-detached house adjoins the site to the east with shop adjacent. Other commercial properties are located in Market Square, opposite the appeal site, including the Market House, a period focal point in the village. Clonmany Youth and Community Resource Centre is located at Clonmany Shamrocks to the southeast.

3.0 Proposed Development

- 3.1. The proposed development is described in the statutory notices as:

The change of use from existing parochial house to a community hub building and all associated site works.

4.0 Planning Authority Decision

4.1. Decision

- 4.1.1. Permission was granted on 30th January 2025, subject to 8 no. conditions.
- 4.1.2. The conditions are standard to the nature of the proposal, but the following are of note:
- Condition 5 – The use of the community retail units herein permitted shall be used as shops as defined in Article 5 of the Planning Regulations 2001.
- Condition 6 – Opening hours of the community retail units shall be confined to between 0830-2000 hours Monday-Friday, 0830-1800 hours Saturday, and 1400-1800 hours Sunday, and shall exclude Bank holidays/Public Holidays, or as otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

4.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 4.2.1. The Planner's Report (27/01/25) can be summarised as follows:

Principle of Development

- Notes that the community hub building will incorporate a mix of community shops, offices, and community hot desk space.
- States that locations within settlements are desirable having regard to Development Plan policies CC-P-1 and CC-P-2 in relation to community development.
- Considers the proposed use acceptable in principle, having regard to the location within a defined settlement and the former use of the building as a parochial house, subject to other criteria, guidelines and standards.
- States that the retail components are in line with policy RS-P-7.

Siting and Design

- Notes that no external alterations are proposed and states that no issues arise.

Residential Amenity

- States that no issues arise in relation to loss of privacy, overlooking or residential amenity given the physical separation distances to neighbouring houses.

Access

- Notes that the site benefits from an existing hardstanding parking area to the front and states that the front of the building provides 'ample space for up to 4-5 cars'.
- Suggests that the retail area (48sq.m) is modest in scale and notes c. 55sq.m of office space on the upper floors.
- States that the proposal is in accordance with the parking standards (Table 16.8) and notes that additional parking is available in the wider village area.
- Considers that there is sufficient space for deliveries and manoeuvring, if required.

Public Health

- Notes existing connections for surface and wastewater, and water supply.

AA and EIA

- Considers the proposal is unlikely to have any significant effect, individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a Natura 2000 site.
- Considers there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment and screens out the need for EIA at preliminary examination stage.

Development Contribution

- States that the proposal falls under the schedule of general exemptions in the DCS.

Recommendation

- Having regard to the location within the village of Clonmany, removed from any sensitive designations, and to the nature and scale of the development, it considers that the proposal would not injure the amenities of the area, would not be prejudicial to public health and would not endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard.

4.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Building Control (18/12/24): Standard informatives.
- Fire (20/12/24): No objection.
- Roads (19/12/24): No objection subject to conditions (refers to PA ref. 24/61861).

4.3. Prescribed Bodies

- None, although I note that Uisce Éireann was consulted.

4.4. Third Party Observations

4.4.1. Third-party observations received from:

- Pat McGonigle; and
- John Bradley

4.4.2. Issues raised are summarised in the Planner's Report as follows:

- Alleged inaccuracies in the application form with reference to the owner of the site and no consent letter from the landowner.
- Queried vagueness of community shops description and the products which would be sold.
- Comments made into leases associated with the building and lack of engagement with the community over intended use.
- Traffic.
- Application lacked details regarding the number and purpose of the community shops and their function as well as the capacity of the space for hot desking in the office area.
- Compatibility of uses between shop and office hot desk space.
- Oversupply of meeting rooms in the village.
- Health and safety concerns.
- No public consultation with the community on intended uses.
- Potential impact of the proposal on wider businesses.
- Comments relating to another site and café.
- Compatibility of retail and office uses.
- Impact on services such as wastewater infrastructure.

- 4.4.3. I note that the Planner's Report outlines a response to each of the issues raised. In relation to concerns over 'traffic', it states that *"one space will be conditioned for disabled parking"*. Such a condition was not attached to the notification to grant.

5.0 Planning History

5.1. Appeal site:

- 5.1.1. PA ref. 24/61861 – in December 2024, the planning authority deemed an identical application to the appeal proposal invalid for failure to comply with Article 20 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. The planning authority have provided a copy of the road engineers report in relation to this application.

5.2. Adjacent site:

- 5.2.1. PA ref. 24/60275 – in August 2024, the planning authority granted permission for an extension of community garden, development of a children's play park, demolition of storage shed, construction of a two-storey building together with all associated site works. A Natura Impact Statement (NIS) accompanied this application. The decision was appealed and is currently before the Board for determination (ABP-320849-24).

6.0 Policy Context

6.1. Local Planning Policy

County Donegal Development Plan 2024-2030

- 6.1.1. The current Development Plan came into effect on 26th June 2024. The Plan was subject to a draft Ministerial Direction in July 2024 and is pending a final decision by the Minister following public consultation and OPR recommendations (Sept. 2024). The planning authority decision was made under the provisions of this current Plan.
- 6.1.2. I also note that proposed Variation No. 1 of the Plan was at pre-draft public consultation stage in February 2025, the provisions of which do not affect the site.
- 6.1.3. The site is located within the rural settlement boundary of Clonmany (Map 21.28) and is subject to the provisions of Chapter 21 relating to Settlement Frameworks. In this regard, whilst I note that the frameworks identify settlement envelopes and certain

zoning objectives, they also consist of lands that, although not specified as being for a particular use, can be used for a variety of purposes on a case-by-case basis.

6.1.4. This applies to the appeal site which is not subject to any of the land use zoning objectives (Table 21.2). Nor is it subject to any of the land use zoning policies listed.

6.1.5. Other policies and objectives are set out in chapters 5 (Villages etc.), 7 (Economic Development), 11 (Natural Heritage), 12 (Community) and 16 (Technical Standards).

6.1.6. The following sections are relevant to the proposed development:

- 5.2 – Prioritisation of Town and Village Cores
- 7.6 – Retail Strategy
- 11.2 – Landscape

6.1.7. Summary of policies and objectives relevant to the appeal:

TV-O-1	Seeks to identify appropriate regeneration and renewal initiatives, to strengthen communities in the County's towns and villages.
TV-O-2	Seeks to support initiatives, including collaboration across the community and voluntary sectors, to strengthen the physical environment of towns and villages and encourage place-making.
TV-O-5	Seeks to ensure quality design proposals for new development within towns and villages in order to contribute to positive place-making.
TV-P-3	Sets out criteria (a) to (h) relating to development proposals within town and village centres.
TV-P-5	Seeks to ensure that development proposals make efficient use of land and do not otherwise hinder the future development potential of backlands within urban areas.
TV-P-6	Sets out criteria (a) to (e) relating to proposals for shopfronts.
RS-P-7	Retailing will generally be directed to existing settlements of appropriate size etc.
L-P-2	Seeks to protect areas identified as 'High Scenic Amenity' and 'Moderate Scenic Amenity' on Map 11.1 'Scenic Amenity'. Within these areas, only

development of a nature, location and scale that integrates with, and reflects the character and amenity of the landscape may be considered.

- CC-P-1 Seeks to support the provision of new social and community infrastructure/service-related developments (e.g. community resource centres etc.) where such proposals are consistent with the zoning objectives of the Plan, and otherwise in accordance locational criteria (a) to (d), including within defined boundaries of settlement frameworks.
- CC-P-2 Requires that social, community, cultural development proposals generally comply with the policies and technical standards of the Plan and specific development management criteria (a) to (l), including compatibility with adjacent uses.
- TS-P-1 Requires compliance with all the technical standards set out in Chapter 16 of the Plan including those relating to transportation and parking.

6.2. National Planning Policy and Guidelines

Development Management Guidelines

- 6.2.1. Section 5.13 of the Development Management Guidelines (DEHLG, 2007) states that the planning system is not designed as a mechanism for resolving disputes about title to land or premises or rights over land and this is ultimately a matter for resolution in the Courts. In this regard, it notes that a person is not entitled solely by reason of a permission to carry out any development as per Section 34(13) of the Planning Act.
- 6.2.2. It also states that where in making an application, a person asserts ownership, and there is nothing to cast doubt on the *bona fides* of that assertion, the planning authority is not required to inquire further into the matter. If, however, the terms of the application or a third-party submission raises doubts as to the sufficiency of the legal interest, further information may have to be sought under Article 33 of the Regulations.
- 6.2.3. Whilst the Guidelines also state that permission should be refused where it is clear from the further information response that the applicant does not have sufficient legal interest, they go on to suggest that the planning authority may still grant permission where some doubt remains, confident in the knowledge that Section 34(13) prevails.

6.3. Natural Heritage Designations

6.3.1. Closest designated sites:

- North Inishowen Coast SAC and pNHA (002012) – c. 1.5km north, northwest
- Trawbreaga Bay SPA (004034) – c. 4.4km northeast

6.4. EIA Screening

6.4.1. The proposed development is not a class of development set out in Schedule 5, Part 1 or Part 2 of the Planning and Development Regulation 2001, as amended, and therefore no preliminary examination is required. See Appendix 1.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1. A third-party appeal has been lodged by Mr Pat McGonigle. The appellant has stated that the grounds of objection are contained in his original submission to the Council, a copy of which has been enclosed with the appeal, along with other documents. Additional commentary in relation to the legal interest of the applicant is also provided.

7.1.2. The grounds of appeal can therefore be summarised as follows:

- Submits that the owner of the appeal site is not the applicant and highlights an absence of a letter of consent from the owner.
- Notes the ground floor plan illustrates 4 no. rooms as 'community shops' and queries the nature and provenance of the goods to be sold.
- Raises concerns regarding the lease of the appeal site and the nearby Market House, and the use of the latter as a café, purporting an absence of planning permission for same.
- Raises concerns regarding commercial enterprises and the use of community property and state funding, without discussion with, or regard for, existing local businesses and organizations.

7.2. Applicant Response

7.2.1. Doherty Building Surveying responded on behalf of the applicant, Clonmany Youth and Resource Community Centre. It can be summarised as follows:

- The building was acquired by Clonmany Enterprise Development Company CLG in June 2019 and leased to St. Brigid's Youth and Community Co-Operative Society Limited for a 10-year period in January 2022.
- Accepts that the building is not in the ownership of the applicant and that consent from the owner was not included in the application but attaches same, dated 24th March 2025, to the appeal submission ('Exhibit 1').
- Clarifies the purported discrepancy between the applicant and aforementioned leaseholder and refers to a letter ('Exhibit 2') submitted with the application which states that St. Brigid's Youth and Community Co-Operative Society Ltd. is the trading name of the applicant, Clonmany Youth and Community Resource Centre.
- Submits that the proposed uses are the sale of craft fabrics created by local groups and haberdashery with other activities including craft development workshop spaces for social inclusion as per letter from the applicant ('Exhibit 3').
- States that the applicant receives funding from Pobal for a range of community-based activities.
- States that the lease agreement allows for flexibility ('Exhibit 4') in the scope of activities so that they can service the community where they exist to the best benefit of that community.
- Suggests that some parts of the appeal do not raise planning issues.
- Refutes that there is a coffee shop on the ground floor of the building.
- Requests the Board to address the application in a positive light in order to enhance the levels of service to the local community.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

7.3.1. The planning authority's response can be summarised as follows:

- The issues raised are covered in the Planner's Report.

8.0 Planning Assessment

8.1. Preliminary Points

8.1.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on the appeal file, including the appeal submissions and observations, and inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local, regional and national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal.

8.1.2. The issues can be addressed under the following headings:

- Land Use and Development Principle
- Procedural Matter
- Other Issues

8.2. Land Use and Development Principle

8.2.1. Planning permission is sought for the change of use of a parochial house to community building. There are no external works proposed and some internal works were evident during my inspection. The appellant notes that the ground floor plan illustrates 'community shops' and queries the nature and provenance of the goods to be sold.

8.2.2. Noting these concerns at application stage, the Planner's Report recommended a condition restricting their use to retail and this was attached to the notification to grant. This condition does not affect the upper floor which is laid out with a committee meeting room / board room, a manager's office and two community hot desk spaces.

8.2.3. The applicant submits that the proposed uses include the sale of craft fabrics with other activities including craft development workshop spaces for social inclusion.

8.2.4. The appeal site is located within a rural settlement framework boundary (Map 21.28) and is subject to the provisions of Chapter 21 of the County Development Plan. In this regard, I note that the frameworks consist of lands that, although not specified as being for a particular use, can be used for a variety of purposes on a case-by-case basis.

8.2.5. In relation to policy CC-P-1, the provision of new social and community infrastructure / service-related developments is supported on lands other than those subject to a zoning objective where they meet criteria (a) to (d). Only (a) and (b) are relevant here:

- a. *At locations within the defined boundaries of settlement framework/urban areas which are within safe walking distance (i.e. via an existing or proposed footpath) of local services and residential areas or are accessible by public transport and which would otherwise promote social inclusion.*
- b. *At alternative locations within settlement framework/urban areas where it is demonstrated that there are no suitable sites available which meet the locational criteria in point (a) above.*

8.2.6. The provision of social and community development is also required to comply with the following development management criteria (a) to (l) set out in policy CC-P-2:

- a. *Are compatible with adjacent existing or approved land uses.*
- b. *Do not have a significant impact on adjacent residential amenities.*
- c. *Provide adequate effluent treatment in compliance with the wastewater treatment policies of this plan.*
- d. *Do not cause a traffic hazard and ensure the existing road network can safely handle any extra vehicular traffic generated by the proposed development.*
- e. *Provide adequate parking provision, access arrangements, manoeuvring and servicing areas in line with technical standards and policies of this plan. Specifically in relation to schools and similar education facilities, incorporate measures that de-prioritise set-down/drop-off arrangements.*
- f. *Prioritises, and provides for a high level of, pedestrian and cycling permeability and access.*
- g. *Do not create a noise nuisance and or cause significant environmental emissions.*
- h. *The location siting and design of the development is of a high quality, successfully integrates with the host environment including the landscape and/or built environment of the area and does not negatively impact on the visual and scenic amenities of the area.*
- i. *Provides appropriate boundary treatment and screening of storage areas from public view.*
- j. *Does not have a negative impact on the built or natural heritage of the area and complies with the built and natural policies of the plan.*

k. *Complies with the flood risk management guidelines and the associated flood risk policies of this plan.*

l. *Have suitable soil depth and water table (in the case of burial grounds/graveyards).*

8.2.7. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposal and the surrounding context, within the commercial heart of a relatively compact village core, and adjacent to other commercial properties, I am satisfied the proposal meets the relevant locational and specific development management criteria listed above for CC-P-1 and CC-P-2. I am also satisfied that the retailing aspect of the scheme is consistent with policy RS-P-7 which generally directs retailing to the various existing settlements of appropriate size.

8.2.8. Finally, I note that the proposal is consistent with the more general policies and objectives in relation to village centre development as detailed in section 5.2.2 of the Development Plan, including but not limited to objective TV-O-2 and policy TV-P-3.

Conclusion on Land Use and Development Principle

8.2.9. On balance, the proposed development is consistent with the settlement framework for Clonmany and community policies CC-P-1 and CC-P-2. I recommend that the Board attach Condition 5 of the planning authority's notification to grant, or similar, in the event of a grant of permission. Hours of operation should also be conditioned.

8.2.10. In this regard, I conclude that the appellant's ground of appeal should be dismissed.

8.3. Procedural Matter

8.3.1. The appellant's observations to the planning authority and appeal grounds to the Board raise some very specific concerns in relation to the legal interest of the applicant for permission into the lands in question. The appellant has provided land registry details which confirm that site ownership rests with Clonmany Enterprise Development CLG. This entity has a registry address of 'Market House, Clonmany, Co. Donegal'. They have also provided extracts from a disputed lease dating from January 2022.

The Facts

8.3.2. The applicant, Clonmany Youth and Resource Community Centre, have, in the application form, provided a contact address of 'Parochial House, Main Street, Clonmany, Co. Donegal', in addition to a charitable status letter. This letter, under the header of 'Clonmany Community Centre' and with an address linked to the nearby

community centre at Shamrock Park, includes a registered charity number and states that the registered company name is “*St Brigid’s Youth & Community Co Operative Society Ltd T/A Clonmany Youth & Community Resource Centre*”. The aforementioned lease is between the latter entity and the registered owner of the land and the applicant has satisfactorily clarified their relationship to the stated leaseholder.

8.3.3. The provisions of Article 22(2)(g) of the Planning Regulations are explicit in this regard:

A planning application [...] shall be accompanied by –

where the applicant is not the legal owner of the land or structure concerned –

(i) the written consent of the owner to make the application.

8.3.4. The application was lodged with the planning authority on 3rd December 2024. The appellant correctly highlights that the applicant, in Section 10 (Legal Interest of Applicant in Land or Structure) of the application form, indicates that they are the ‘owner’, and thus avoiding the requirement to include the written consent of the owner.

8.3.5. The planning authority have stated that the issues raised by the appellant have been addressed in the Planner’s Report. In this regard, I note that the planning authority stated that “*the application form and its contents were taken at face value*”. To an extent this reflects the advice provided in section 5.13 of the Development Management Guidelines. However, the appellant has demonstrated that the applicant is not the owner, and the applicant has confirmed same. This is determinative, notwithstanding a letter of consent ‘on behalf of the owner’ and submitted with the appeal. This letter is addressed to the planning authority and dated 24th March 2025.

Conclusion on Procedural Matter

8.3.6. Whilst I note that legal disputes are a civil matter outside the scope of the appeal process, and I am cognisant of the provisions of Section 34(13) of the Act, this does not obviate the need to comply with the provisions of Art. 22(2)(g) of the Regulations.

8.3.7. In such circumstances, the Board may wish to seek further information from the parties under the provisions of Section 131 of the Planning Act, however based on the information before me, including the land registry details provided by the appellant in his appeal submission, I do not recommend such a course of action. The applicant has failed to comply with Article 22(2)(g) of the Planning Regulations and their attempt to rectify the situation in their submission is beyond the scope of this appeal procedure.

- 8.3.8. To my mind this situation could have been avoided by the applicant indicating the true legal interest and submitting the requisite letter of consent with the application. In this regard, I conclude that the appellant's substantive ground of appeal should succeed.

8.4. Other Issues

- 8.4.1. Whilst I note the appellants concerns in relation to the lease of the appeal site and the nearby Market House, and the use of community property and state funding for enterprise, these issues are outside of the Board's remit as they do not have an ombudsman role on such matters. Likewise, the enforcement of planning control falls outside the remit of the Board. This is for the planning authority to deal with as they see fit. I do not, therefore, propose to deal with these matters as detailed in the appeal.

Traffic

- 8.4.2. As noted, in relation to 'traffic', the Planner's Report states that *"one space will be conditioned for disabled parking"*. No such condition was attached to the notification to grant. I also note that the roads section had no objections subject to the *"same conditions as previous ref number 2461861"*. Whilst that application was deemed invalid, I note that the comment simply states, *"no objections from a road point a view"*.

- 8.4.3. Having regard to section 9.5 of the Planner's Report and Table 16.8 (Car Parking Standards) of the Development Plan, I am satisfied that 4 no. spaces is sufficient to serve the site, 1 no. of which should be designated for those with mobility impairment.

Residential Amenity

- 8.4.4. Condition 6 of the notification to grant restricts the opening hours of the community retail units in the interests of residential amenity. Given the proximity of the appeal site and the neighbouring residential property to the east, these hours are considered reasonable. I recommend that the Board attach such conditions in the event of a grant.

Visual Amenity

- 8.4.5. Conditions 7 and 8 govern the display of advertisements and whilst the appeal site is not within an architectural conservation area (ACA), it is within an area of 'High Scenic Amenity', with the peaks and ridges of the Urris Hills evident to the southwest. In such circumstances, I recommend that advertising is also controlled in the event of a grant of permission in accordance with the provisions of Development Plan policy TV-P-6.

Conclusion on Other Issues

- 8.4.6. On balance, I am satisfied that the residual traffic, residential and visual amenity issues could be addressed by planning conditions. The above assessment represents my *de novo* consideration of all planning issues material to the proposed development.

9.0 AA Screening

Screening the need for Appropriate Assessment: Screening Determination (Stage 1, Article 6(3) of Habitats Directive)

I have considered case ABP-321954-25 in light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

The proposed development is located within a mixed commercial and residential area near the centre of Clonmany village and comprises the change of use of an existing building to a community building and associated works. The closest European site, part of the Natura 2000 Network, is the North Inishowen Coast SAC, located c. 1.5km north of the proposed development.

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

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Small scale nature of the development and the absence of external works
- The location of the development in a serviced urban area, distance from European Sites and urban nature of intervening habitats, absence of ecological pathways 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.

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

10.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be **refused** for the reasons and considerations below.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

On the basis of the submissions made in connection with the planning application and appeal, the Board is not satisfied that, at the time of lodgement, the application was made by a person(s) who had -

- (a) sufficient legal estate or interest in the land the subject of the application to enable the person(s) to continue the existing use of, or carry out the proposed development on the land, or
- (b) the approval of the person(s) who has such sufficient legal estate or interest.

In these circumstances, it is considered that the Board is precluded from giving further consideration to the granting of permission for the development the subject of the application.

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

P Maguire

Inspectorate

16th April 2025

Appendix 1 (EIA Screening)

Form 1 – EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-321954-25		
Proposed Development Summary	Change of use from parochial house to a community building and all associated works.		
Development Address	Gaddyduff, Clonmany, Co. Donegal		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	X
		No	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?			
Yes			Proceed to Q3.
No	X		No further action required
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No			Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes			Prelim. exam. required (Form 2)

5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	X	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q4)
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____

Date: 16th April 2025