



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-315697-23

Development	Construction of a house, domestic garage, wastewater treatment system percolation area, site entrance, boundary fencing and all associated site development
Location	Mason Lodge, Carrickmacross, Co. Monaghan
Planning Authority	Monaghan County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	22427
Applicant(s)	Angela and Gerard McKeown
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission with conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Tony Durnon
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	23 rd November 2023.

Inspector

Ronan O'Connor

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
3.5. Prescribed Bodies	5
3.6. Third Party Observations	5
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
6.0 Natural Heritage Designations.....	8
7.0 EIA Screening.....	8
8.0 Appropriate Assessment.....	8
9.0 The Appeal	9
9.1. Grounds of Appeal	9
9.2. Applicant Response	10
9.4. Planning Authority Response	11
9.5. Observations	11
10.0 Assessment.....	11
11.0 Recommendation	16
12.0 Reasons and Considerations	16
13.0 Conditions	16
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located on a junction of a regional road and a rural road, on a corner site. It is surrounded by mature trees and hedgerows. To the west of the site is a recently constructed residential property.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Construction of a house, domestic garage, wastewater treatment system percolation area, site entrance, boundary fencing and all associated site development.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Grant Permission subject to conditions. Conditions of note are as follows:

1(a) – Retention of trees (b) lowering of hedgerow to provide sightlines (c) retention of trees and hedgerow (d) hedgerow planting

3(a to f) in relation to visibility and access including that sufficient visibility splays are achieved from the entrance and that the entrance be recessed with sufficient room to contain a stationary vehicle off the public road.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports [dated 09/01/2023]

- Notes the site is not situated within a local needs area (Section 2.8.1)
- No concerns in relation to ribbon development and/or rural character
- No agricultural buildings within 100m
- Required site distances are achievable
- House and garage are sited away from area that might be at risk of pluvial flooding
- Considered remaining trees should be retained as part of the final site design/layout

- Site design/layout is acceptable
- Proposed house and garage design acceptable save for the 35 degree roof pitches

3.2.2. Further Information was requested on 17th November 2022 in relation to the following items:

- Retention of trees
- House and garage to feature 35 degree roof pitches

3.3. Further Information was received on 9th December 2022.

3.4. Summary of Planner's report in relation to FI received:

- Information was considered acceptable
- Grant of permission was recommended

3.4.1. Other Technical Reports

- An Environmental Health Officer report dated 07th September 2022 has been provided, which expresses no objection subject to recommended conditions.
- A Municipal District Engineer report dated 24th October 2022 has been provided, which expresses no objection subject to recommended conditions. Of note, recommended conditions include a requirement for sightlines of 50m for traffic approaching from the north, and 33m for traffic approaching from the south. directions and a request for a contribution of €2,250 which is intended to ensure satisfactory completion of all surface water drainage/boundary work, to prevent surface water draining onto the roadway or damage to the roadway.

3.5. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.5.1. None.

3.6. **Third Party Observations**

3.6.1. Submissions were made by one third party objector (who is the third party appellant in this case). The issues raised are as per the appeal submission, which is summarised below.

4.0 Planning History

06/1402 Grant permission for 1 no. storey and half type dwelling house, served with proprietary waste water treatment plant, percolation area, associated site development works and site entrance onto public road . Not implemented/expired.

11/12/2011

Adjacent site

08/0634 – Grant permission for amendments to 06/0371

06/371 Grant permission for one and a half storey type dwelling house, each served with proprietary waste water treatment plant, percolation area, associated site development works and individual site entrance onto public road

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Monaghan County Development Plan 2019-2025

The site is in a rural, unzoned part of County Monaghan. The Core Strategy Map, Map 2.1, identifies that the site is NOT within an ‘area under strong urban influence’ but lies within the ‘Remaining Rural Area’ (Category 2 – Rural Area Type).

This area comprises all other rural areas outside of the settlements and the rural areas under strong urban influence. Within the remaining rural area, it is recognised that sustaining smaller community areas is important and as such it is considered appropriate to facilitate rural housing in accordance with the principles of proper planning and sustainable development. In these areas the challenge is to retain population and support the rural economy while seeking to consolidate the existing village network. This stability is supported by a traditionally strong agricultural economic base.

Policy Objective RSP 3 ‘Rural Settlement Policy’ – Remaining Rural Area

‘To facilitate rural housing in the remaining rural areas subject to the relevant planning policies as set out in Development Management Chapter of the Monaghan County Development Plan 2019-2025.’

Other relevant rural housing policies include: -

HSP15: To require all applications for rural housing to comply with the guidance set out in Development Management Chapter.

HSP16: To ensure that rural housing applications employ site specific design solutions to provide proposals that integrate into the landscape and that respect their location in terms of siting, design, materials, finishes and landscaping.

HSP17: To require that new houses in the rural areas ensure the protection of water quality in the arrangements for on-site waste water disposal, ensure provision of a safe means of access in relation to road and public safety and ensure the conservation of sensitive areas such as natural habitats, the environs of protected structures and other aspects of heritage.

HSP18: Apply a presumption against extensive urban generated rural development, ribbon development, unsustainable, speculative driven residential units in order to safeguard the potential for incremental growth of the towns and their potential beyond the plan period, to utilise existing physical and social infrastructure and to avoid demand for the uneconomic provision of new infrastructure.

Chapter 15 Development Management Standards contains standards and requirements that are relevant to rural housing proposals.

5.2. **National Planning Policy Framework**

National Policy Objective 19 is of relevance to the proposed development. It requires the following:

‘Ensure, in providing for the development of rural housing, that a distinction is made between areas under urban influence, i.e. within the commuter catchment of cities and large towns and centres of employment, and elsewhere:

In rural areas under urban influence, facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on the core consideration of demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area and siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements;

In rural areas elsewhere, facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements’.

6.0 Natural Heritage Designations

- 6.1.1. The site is not located within a European site. The closest such site is Stabannan-Braganstown SPA (Site Code 004091) which is approximately 17.1km to the east. The nearest nationally designated site is Ballyhoe Lough pNHA (001594) which is located approximately 2.4km to the south.

7.0 EIA Screening

- 7.1.1. An Environmental Impact Assessment Screening report was not submitted with the application.
- 7.1.2. Class (10)(b) of Schedule 5 Part 2 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) provides that mandatory EIA is required for the following classes of development:
- Construction of more than 500 dwelling units,
 - Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 ha in the case of a business district, 10 ha in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 ha elsewhere.
- 7.1.3. The subject development comprises a proposed house with detached garage, wastewater treatment system and associated site works, on a site of 0.3ha. It falls well below both of the applicable thresholds for mandatory EIA, as set out above.
- 7.1.4. In respect of sub-threshold EIA, having regard to the limited nature and scale of the proposed development, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment

- 8.1.1. Having regard to the minor nature and scale of the proposed development, the site location outside of any protected site, the nature of the receiving environment and the proximity of the lands in question to the nearest European Site (Stabannan-Braganstown SPA [Site Code 004091] which is approximately 17.1km to the east), it

is my opinion that no appropriate assessment issues arise and that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, on any Natura 2000 site.

9.0 The Appeal

9.1. Grounds of Appeal

9.1.1. A third party appeal has been submitted by Tony Durnon, Maykieron, Carrickmacross. The grounds of appeal are as follows:

- Entrance to lands will be made practically impossible as the entrance is directly across from the site entrance.
- Machinery will no longer have turning space to use the entrance
- There was previously only one entrance to the site from the main road, which was used for the other new dwelling off the main road.
- Site is near a beautiful 2 storey period stone house out with outbuildings
- Will be further diminished if further development is allowed to take place on the site
- The site was originally an orchard
- Vendor no longer lives in the area/applicants are not from the area either
- No detailed site entrance drawings or dimensions
- Existing grass verge facilitates entry onto appellants lands
- Acts as a lay by to allow a vehicle coming in the opposite direction to pass by
- This verge will no longer be available/will force vehicles to reverse back into the main road
- This verge will eventually be incorporated into the property
- Serious flooding occurs along the main road and on the appellants lands/due to a low point in the road/no road side drainage is effective
- Proposed development will magnify this problem/lies within the same low point

- Planning granted does not address or mention this issue/serious issues have been overlooked in arriving at the decision made
- There are enough houses already in this popular and picturesque area/should be designated local needs only

Encl: Map

9.2. Applicant Response

9.3. A first party response to the appeal was received on 24th February 2023 (in two parts, from the agent on behalf of the applicant and from the applicants themselves). The response is summarised below:

- Proposed development will comply with Condition No. 3 as relates to road safety
- Development is of modest scale/will be screened from view/existing trees well be retained with the exception of 1 no. tree
- Site is not located within a rural need area/applicants have lived in the area for 25 years/letters of support from local residents in the area attached
- Site layout plan has appropriate dimensions/validated by MCC
- Verge near the edge of the road belongs to the site/proposed entrance will be set back from the edge of the road in accordance with Condition No. 3
- PA noted that once the proposed building footprint and waste water treatment system were located outside the flood map layer this would be deemed acceptable
- Has been designed in accordance with the policies and guidelines set out in the County Development Plan 2019-2025
- Submit that the appeal is vexatious under Section 138, Chapter III, Part VI of the PDA 2000, revised
- Felt a small dwelling would blend into the beauty of the surrounding area
- Applied for single storey dwelling as did not want a house with stair/ongoing health problems

- Have lived in the community for 25 years/sons were born here/attended school/involved in the local GAA club

Encl: 2 no. letters of support from neighbours/local residents

9.4. **Planning Authority Response**

9.4.1. None received.

9.5. **Observations**

9.5.1. None received.

10.0 **Assessment**

10.1.1. Having inspected the site and considered the contents of the appeal in detail, I consider the main planning issues to be considered are:

- Compliance with the rural housing strategy
- Access
- Drainage/Flooding
- Other Issues

10.2. **Compliance with the rural housing strategy**

10.2.1. The site is in a rural, unzoned part of County Monaghan, approximately 5.5km south of Carrickmacross. The Core Strategy Map, Map 2.1, identifies that the lies within the 'Remaining Rural Area' (Category 2 – Rural Area Type) and not within an area 'under strong urban influence'. As such Policy Objective RSP 3 'Rural Settlement Policy' applies in this instance, which seeks to facilitate rural housing in these areas subject to the planning policies as set out in the Development Management Chapter of the Monaghan County Development Plan 2019-2025.

10.2.2. The third party appellant states that the area should be designated local needs only and states that the applicants are not from the area. The first party response states that the site is not within a rural need area. Notwithstanding same, it is stated that the applicants have been living in the area for the last 25 years.

10.2.3. Given the location of the site, and the applicable policy (RSP 3) I note that there is no requirement to demonstrate rural need for the dwelling house, and therefore I am of the view that a dwelling house at this location, is acceptable in principle.

10.3. **Transport Issues including access and road safety**

10.3.1. The third party appellant has stated that the proposed access to the dwelling house will mean the entrance to his lands will be made impossible as the proposed access is directly opposite the access point to the lands, and it is stated that machinery will no longer have turning space to access the lands. It is further stated that the existing grass verge allows for this access, and it also allows for vehicles to pass each other on the narrow road. It is stated that the removal of the verge would force a vehicle to reverse onto the main road, raising road safety concerns.

10.3.2. The first party, in the response to the appeal, has stated that this verge is part of the site. Notwithstanding, it is stated that the proposed entrance will be set back from the edge of the road, in accordance with Condition No. 3.

10.3.3. The Planning Authority has not raised any concerns in relation to the proposed access, although have included a condition requiring that sufficient visibility splays are achieved from the entrance and that the entrance be recessed with sufficient room to contain a stationary vehicle off the public road (Condition No. 3).

10.3.4. The proposed site entrance is via the minor rural road running north. There is a proposed setback from the road, although this area would still remain within the applicant's ownership and control. The existing grass verge to the west of the site, is within the redline boundary. The entrance to the lands to the east (the appellant's lands) is on the opposite side of the road, and this would appear to be directly opposite the proposed entrance to the dwelling house. The main concern of the appellant, is that the location of the access and the removal of the grass verge would prevent access to the farmlands.

10.3.5. I am not of the view that the location of the two entrances opposite one another is a fundamental issue, given the limited movements associated with a single dwelling house and it is subsequently unlikely that there will be any significant delays or restrictions in vehicle movements to and from both sites. In relation to the removal of the grass verge, there is no evidence submitted by the third appellant to support the claim that vehicle movements to the farm would be restricted, or made impossible,

by the removal of same (i.e. there is no indication of turning circle required, the nature of the machinery being moved etc). Notwithstanding, I note that the entrance of the proposed dwelling will be set back from the road which will still allow space turning movements if needed. This will also allow for a passing place on the road, as the existing rural road is too narrow for two vehicles to pass. Should the Board be minded to approve the proposed development, I would recommend that a condition be imposed that would require this access point and setback from the road be designed to the council's requirements.

10.4. Flood Risk/Surface Water Drainage

- 10.4.1. The third party appellant has stated that the low lying lands in this vicinity are subject to flooding, and these includes the subject site. It is stated that the road lies within a low point, and that roadside drainage is not effective. A number of photographs of flood events in this area were submitted at application stage.
- 10.4.2. The applicants, in the response to the appeal, state that the proposed building footprint and water treatment lie outside the flood zone, and therefore the proposal was acceptable to the planning authority.
- 10.4.3. The Planner's report notes that the proposed house and garage are sited away from area that might be at risk of pluvial flooding. No objections were raised by the Planning Authority in relation to the issue of flooding. Reference is made to flood mapping in the planner's report, noting that part of the site may be at risk of pluvial flooding, but it is further noted that the house and garage have been sited away from said area. This flood mapping is not on file.
- 10.4.4. Appendix 1 of the Monaghan County Development Plan contains the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. There is no mapping associated with the subject site. There is no flood mapping, including PFRAM Mapping, available on the OPW website (floodinfo.ie) for this specific site. There is no indication of past flooding events on the site on the floodinfo.ie website.
- 10.4.5. The applicant's site layout plan indicates a 'potential area of flooding' as a hatched area, with the proposed house, associated waste water treatment system and garage located outside of this area. There is no reference to the source of this information but the area indicated as being the 'potential area of flooding' generally corresponds to the lower part of the site.

10.4.6. In relation to the issue of pluvial flooding, it would appear that, based on the evidence I have before me, that the lower part of the site may be at some risk of pluvial flooding, but the footprint of the proposed dwelling house and wastewater treatment system lies outside this area, as supported by the commentary within the planner's report, and the lack of objection from the planning authority in relation to flooding issues. There is no indication on the OPW website of past flooding events on this subject site. I note also the principle of a dwelling house on this site has been established, having regard to the previous permission on this site (Planning Reference 06/1402).

10.4.7. In relation to proposed drainage of surface water, it is proposed to drain surface water to a soakaway within the site, located to the north-eastern corner of the site adjacent to the roadside boundary. In relation to the proposals, I note that only a small proportion of the overall site area is proposed to be built over. Having regard to the discussion of flood risk above, it may well be that the lower elevations of the site are subject to some pluvial flooding. However, the soakaway is located away from this area, on a higher elevation, and the percolation tests (as discussed below) indicate that the higher elevations of the site have generally has good drainage characteristics. I am satisfied that, subject to ensuring that the proposed soakaway is adequately sized to accommodate run-off from the site, the development will not increase the risk of surface water flooding elsewhere.

10.4.8. I am satisfied, therefore, that the proposed dwelling and associated wastewater treatment system and garage will not be at risk of flooding, nor will the proposed development increase the risk of flooding off-site.

10.5. Other Issues

Setting of nearby house

10.5.1. The third party appellant has raised concern in relation to the impact on the period dwelling house and outbuildings. While I note these concerns, I am of the view that the proposed site is sufficiently removed (at least 70m) from this period property so as to ensure that there is no material impact on the setting of same.

Wastewater

- 10.5.2. The Site Characterisation Form submitted with the application identifies the category of aquifer as 'regionally important', with a vulnerability classification of 'extreme'. Table E1 (Response Matrix for DWWTSs) of the EPA Code of Practice Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems identifies an 'R2²' response category i.e., acceptable subject to normal good practice and adequate separation distances achieved. i.e. that there is a minimum thickness of 2 m unsaturated soil/subsoil beneath the invert of the percolation trench of a septic tank system or a secondary treatment system as described in Chapters 8 and 9 of the COP is installed, with a minimum thickness of 0.3 m unsaturated soil/subsoil with percolation values from 3 to 75 (in addition to the polishing filter, which should be a minimum depth of 0.9 m), beneath the invert of the polishing filter (i.e. 1.2 m in total for a soil polishing filter/).
- 10.5.3. The Site Characterisation Form indicates that a trial hole with a depth of 2.1m recorded 1.7m of clay and with the water table encountered at a depth of 1.7m below ground level. Bedrock was not encountered. In relation to the percolation characteristics of the soil, a sub-surface percolation test result of 3.78min/25mm was returned. A surface percolation test result of 5.39min/25mm was returned. The report concludes that the site is suitable for the installation of a secondary or tertiary treatment system, subject to the construction of a raised mound to achieve the minimum separation distances between the invert level of percolation pipes and the water table. The recommended system is a BAF 6PE tank wastewater treatment system with a raised percolation area, details of which are included within the Site Characterisation Form and on Dwg. No. 01/001 'Percolation Test', as submitted with the application.
- 10.5.4. Having regard to the site percolation test results, I consider it has been demonstrated that the site can accommodate a wastewater treatment system as recommended in the Site Characterisation Form, subject to the system being installed as recommended and in line with the EPA Code of Practice – Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (p.e. ≤ 10), 2021. I also note the Planning Authority's Environmental Health Officer did not express any concern regarding this aspect of the development nor has the suitability of the site to accommodate a wastewater system been raised by any parties.

10.5.5. Should the Board decide to grant permission, I recommend a condition be attached requiring the applicant to agree the detailed specification of the on-site wastewater treatment system with the Planning Authority.

Invasive Species

10.5.6. From my observations on site, it would appear that there is Japanese Knotweed within or adjacent to the boundary hedgerow (as there is signage related to this on the boundary of the site). While not raised as an issue at application stage, I consider it prudent to require an Invasive Species Management Plan to be submitted to the Planning Authority for approval. Should the Board be minded to grant permission, I recommend a condition related to same be imposed.

11.0 Recommendation

Having regard to the foregoing assessment it is considered that the proposed development should be granted for the following reasons and considerations and in accordance with the following conditions.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed development of a dwelling in an area designated 'Remaining Rural Area' and outside of an area that is defined as being 'under strong urban influence', is acceptable in principle, having regard to the provisions of the Monaghan County Development Plan 2019-2025. The site is suitable for the disposal and treatment of effluent. The proposed house design would not detract from the visual or residential amenities of the area being in keeping with houses in the area. The proposed development would accordingly be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted on the 9 th Day of December 2022, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following
----	---

	<p>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 agree particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity</p>
2.	<p>The detailed treatment of the splayed entrance, gates, road boundary set-back and roadside area shall be as agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of traffic safety.</p>
3.	<p>Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Surface water from the site shall not be permitted to drain onto the adjoining public road.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of traffic safety</p>
4.	<p>All landscaping works shall be completed, within the first planting season following commencement of development, in accordance with the details submitted to the planning authority on the 9th Day of December 2022. Any trees and hedging which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of 3 years from the completion of the development, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of biodiversity and the visual and residential amenity of the area.</p>
5.	<p>Prior to the commencement of development, an Invasive Species Management Plan shall be submitted to, for approval in writing by, the Planning Authority, which shall set out management procedures to deal with Japanese Knotweed in particular.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of biodiversity.</p>

6.	<p>(a) The proposed effluent treatment and disposal system shall be located, constructed and maintained in accordance with the details submitted to the planning authority and in accordance with the requirements of the document entitled "Code of Practice – Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (p.e. ≤ 10)" – The Environmental Protection Agency, 2021. Arrangements in relation to the ongoing maintenance of the system shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>(b) Within three months of the first occupation of the dwelling, the developer shall submit a report from a suitably qualified person with professional indemnity insurance certifying that the proprietary effluent treatment system has been installed and commissioned in accordance with the approved details and is working in a satisfactory manner in accordance with the standards set out in the EPA document.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</p>
7.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act</p>

	be applied to the permission.
--	-------------------------------

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.

Rónán O'Connor
Senior Planning Inspector

06th December 2023

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	315697-23			
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a house, domestic garage, wastewater treatment system percolation area, site entrance, boundary fencing and all associated site development.			
Development Address	Mason Lodge, Carrickmacross, Co. Monaghan			
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		
		No	No further action required	
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?				
Yes		Class.....	EIA Mandatory EIAR required	
No		No	Proceed to Q.3	
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?				
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)	Conclusion
No		N/A		No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Class (10)(b) of Schedule 5 Part 2 Construction of more than 500 dwelling units;	1 dwelling house on a site of 0.3 Ha	Proceed to Q.4

		Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 ha in the case of a business district, 10 ha in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 ha elsewhere.		
--	--	--	--	--

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	No	Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____

Date: _____