



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-317751-23

Development	Construction of a house and associated works.
Location	10 Castle Park, Monkstown, Co. Dublin, A94 E437
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D23A/0345
Applicant(s)	Anna Gillman & Eric McGrath
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission subject to conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	John Dinn and Mary Kenny
Observer(s)	Christopher Hicks
Date of Site Inspection	15 th December 2023
Inspector	Bernadette Quinn

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site, with an area of 0.039 ha, is situated on a corner plot which forms part of the side garden of an existing dwelling at No. 10 Castle Park. The site has frontage on to Castle Park Road along the north eastern and south eastern boundary and there are existing detached dwellings to the north west (Woodlands) and south west (No. 10 Castle Park).
- 1.2. The area is an established residential estate which includes a mix of single, dormer and two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings, many of which have been extended and modified over the years. To the south, on the opposite side of the road is an area of public open space.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the construction of a detached two storey three bedroom dwelling with vehicular access from the northern corner of the site and pedestrian access on the southern and eastern boundary, located in the side garden of 10 Castle Park.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.2. By order dated 13th July 2023, Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council issued notification of the decision to grant planning permission subject to 13 conditions of a standard nature.

3.3. Planning Authority Reports

3.3.1. Planning Reports

The Planning Authority case officer report states that the development does not adversely impact on the residential or visual amenity of the area and recommends a grant of permission, subject to conditions.

3.3.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Division: No objection subject to standard conditions

Transportation Planning: Report requests further information in relation to proposed front boundary treatment, Autotrack drawings and details in relation to vehicular access.

3.4. Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Éireann: No objection.

3.5. Third Party Observations

Three observations to the proposal received by the planning authority are on file for the Board's information. An observation from the third party appellant raises issues similar to those raised in the appeal. Two observations outline support for the proposed development.

4.0 Planning History

D22A/0928 Permission refused by the planning authority for the construction of a detached dwelling and vehicular entrance in the side garden of No. 10 Castle Park for one reason as follows:

Having regard to the nature, scale and bulk of the proposed development, located within the side garden of an existing dwelling, the proposed development would be visually incongruous in its site context within Castle Park, and would be visually injurious to the Castle Park streetscape. The proposed development would not accord with Section 12.3.7.5 Corner/Side Garden Sites and Section 12.8.3.3 Private Open Space of the Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 and the overall site configuration would result in overdevelopment of the site. The proposed development would seriously injure the residential and visual amenities of the area and depreciate the value of property in the vicinity. Furthermore, the proposed development would, if permitted, set an undesirable precedent for similar development in the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

D21A/0834 Permission granted by the planning authority at no. 10 Castle Park for extension and alterations including a new first floor gable pitched roof extension to the front, side & rear of the property and conversion of ground & upper floor extensions to a granny flat.

D06A/0229 Permission granted by the planning authority for a two storey dwelling in the side garden of no. 10 Castle Park.

V/093/22 Part V Certificate of Exemption granted by the planning authority on 05/12/2022 at no. 10 Castle Park.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The Dún Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan, 2022-2028 is the statutory development plan for the area. It has regard to national and regional policies in respect of infill development within existing built-up areas.
- 5.1.2. The site is zoned Objective 'A' residential with the objective to: "provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities" under which residential development is listed within the 'Permitted in Principle' category of this zoning objective.
- 5.1.3. In Chapter 4 Policy Objective PHP19: Existing Housing Stock – Adaptation states that it is a Policy Objective to densify existing built-up areas in the County through small scale infill development having due regard to the amenities of existing established residential neighbourhoods.
- 5.1.4. In Chapter 12 Development Management, Section 12.3.7 Additional Accommodation in Existing Built-up Areas includes the following:

12.3.7.5 Corner/Side Garden Sites

Corner site development refers to sub-division of an existing house curtilage and/or an appropriately zoned brownfield site, to provide an additional dwelling(s) in existing built up areas. In these cases, the Planning Authority will have regard to the following parameters (Refer also to Section 12.3.7.7):

- Size, design, layout, relationship with existing dwelling and immediately adjacent properties.
- Impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents.
- Accommodation standards for occupiers.
- Development Plan standards for existing and proposed dwellings.
 - Building lines followed, where appropriate.
 - Car parking for existing and proposed dwellings provided on site.
 - Side/gable and rear access/maintenance space.
 - Adequate usable private open space for existing and proposed dwellings provided.
 - Level of visual harmony, including external finishes and colours.
 - Larger corner sites may allow more variation in design, but more compact detached proposals should more closely relate to adjacent dwellings. A modern design response may, however, be deemed more appropriate in certain areas where it may not be appropriate to match the existing design.
 - Side gable walls as side boundaries facing corners in estate roads are not considered acceptable and should be avoided.
 - Appropriate boundary treatments should be provided both around the site and between the existing and proposed dwellings. Existing boundary treatments should be retained/ reinstated where possible.
 - Use of first floor/apex windows on gables close to boundaries overlooking footpaths, roads and open spaces for visual amenity and passive surveillance.

Section 12.3.7.7 in relation to infill development states that in accordance with Policy Objective PHP19: Existing Housing Stock – Adaptation, infill development will be encouraged within the County. New infill development shall respect the height and massing of existing residential units. Infill development shall retain the physical character of the area including features such as boundary walls, pillars, gates/ gateways, trees, landscaping, and fencing or railings.

5.2. Regional Policy

Regional Policy Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Eastern and Midland Region 2019-2031 5.3.1.

This strategy provides a framework for development at regional level. The RSES promotes the regeneration of our cities, towns, and villages by making better use of under-used land and buildings within the existing built-up urban footprint.

5.3. National Policy

The National Planning Framework - Project Ireland 2040 5.4.1. The government published the National Planning Framework (NPF) in February 2018. Objective 3a is to deliver 40% of all new homes nationally, within the built-up footprint of existing settlements. Objective 11 is to prioritise development that can encourage more people to live or work in existing settlements. Objective 35 is to increase residential density in settlements and makes specific reference to infill development.

5.4. Ministerial Guidance

Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) (the 'Compact Settlements Guidelines'). These guidelines outline appropriate density ranges for different area types and provide residential design standards in relation to separation distances, open space and car and cycle parking.

5.5. Natural Heritage Designations

None in the vicinity of the site.

5.6. EIA Screening

See Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening and Form 2 EIA Preliminary Examination attached to this report. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended, to the established suburban nature of the receiving environment, and to the nature, extent, characteristics and likely duration of potential impacts, I conclude that the proposed development is not likely

to have significant effects on the environment and that the submission of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

One no. third party appeal received from John Dinn and Mary Kenny of 12 Castle Park, Monkstown, located approximately 25m to the east of the appeal site. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- Factual inconsistencies in the planning application relating to information provided on the application form which refers to a two storey dwelling with a floor area of 186sq.m. compared to drawings which refer to a three storey house with a floor area of 233 sq.m.
- Attic space will function as habitable space.
- Proposal is incongruous in its setting as it is significantly larger in scale, volume and height than any other house on Castle Park Green and as such would adversely affect the visual amenity and harmonious streetscape.
- Development on appeal site should not break the frontline of existing neighbouring houses no.'s 10-14 on the green, should be smaller in scale and its orientation on site should harmonise with existing houses facing Castle Park Green. Proposal deviates from the pattern of existing development with its rear garden facing the green area and is visually injurious.
- A previous application on the site was refused permission and the revised proposal is essentially the same development as that previously refused with omission of dormer window.
- Permission was granted (D21A/0834) at No. 10 Castle Park for a family flat connected to the existing house. Development on the appeal site along with the existing house and the permitted family flat will result in overdevelopment

of the site, would set an undesirable precedent and would result in unsafe parking and congestion at entrance to Castle Park Green.

6.2. Applicant Response

The applicant's response to the grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

Nature of Appeal

- The appeal is without substance or foundation and is frivolous and should be dismissed on this basis.
- The appeal is materially inaccurate and misleading in its statement that the proposed development is the same design as that proposed in a previously refused planning application on the site.
- The discrepancies in floor area referred to relate to attic storage floor area, correspondence from the project architect confirms the floor area.

Design and Layout

- The proposed development has been amended from the previous refusal on the site, including a reduction in floor area, removal of a dormer window and upstairs extension, reduction in footprint and increase in garden space. This has resulted in an appropriately designed and scaled dwelling and this is acknowledged in the local authority planning officers report.
- The development complies with development management policy and standards including section 12.3.7.7 of the Development Plan relating to design of new infill development, and national planning policy relating to development in built up areas. The local authority planning officer considered the proposal acceptable and consistent with the provisions of the development plan.
- The design has been informed by neighbouring properties, is in line with the established building line along castle park and is in keeping with the height and scale of existing dwellings in the area. The dwelling is consistent with the character and streetscape of the area ensuring the protection of the established residential amenity.

- The proposed development will not be visible from inside the appellants home and will have no visual impact on the appellant or on the surrounding area.
- Orientation is in keeping with existing dwellings in Castle Park and there is precedent in the area for infill dwellings, including infill dwellings orientated differently to existing dwellings.
- Fenestration and pedestrian entrance orientated towards the public open space provides passive surveillance.
- The proposed driveway is in line with the adjoining neighbour at Woodlands and it is proposed to retain as much of the existing boundary hedging as possible.
- Proposed dwelling avoids any excessive mass to prevent undue impacts with regard to overbearing and overlooking.
- Surrounding neighbours are fully supportive of the proposed development and includes letters of support with the appeal.
- Planning history on the site includes a previous grant of permission by the planning authority for a new dwelling on the site in 2006.
- Includes an engineering opinion that relocating the vehicle entrance to the southeast corner could potentially negatively impact the safety of pedestrians and cyclists and obstruct visibility egressing from the site. The vehicular entrance as proposed in the planning application is a more suitable option.
- The third party claims that existing neighbouring dwellings range in height from 9.1 to 9.3 metres are incorrect. The existing neighbouring houses have heights of 9.45m (no. 12 Castle Park) and 9.565 m (No. 10 Castle Park). The appellant has not taken account of the topography of the area and that the ground floor of the proposed dwelling will be 14 centimetres lower than that of No. 10 castle park.
- The dwelling will not be three stories, the attic area is not proposed to be used as habitable space and the floor area is similar to adjoining dwellings.

- In relation to concerns regarding proximity to boundary wall, the planning officer considered the set back to be acceptable and that there would be no overbearing or negative impact on the public realm.
- The existing hedging and railing is proposed to be retained and supplemented and will have no negative impact regarding visibility and visual amenity.

Compliance with Planning Policy and Other Issues

- Proposed development provides for an additional residential unit in a well served location on under used land providing for a consolidated and compact development, is in compliance with the zoning objective for the site and policy objectives of the Development Plan including in relation to density, protection of existing residential amenity, infill development and development in corner and side garden sites.
- Delays arising from the appeal will result in a financial loss to the first party.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

Response dated 22nd August 2023 states no new issues raised which justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

6.4. Observations

One observation received from Christopher Hicks of 25 Castle Park, Monkstown. The issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- Supports the proposed development which is appropriate for the site having regard to the design, layout and boundary treatments.
- Refutes appellants concerns that the development will be visible from no. 12 Castle Park.
- The development will not harm the amenity of existing dwellings or have any negative effect on property values.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, and inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issue in this appeal are as follows:

- Design and Visual Impact
- Other Issues

7.2. Design and Visual Impact

7.2.1. The appeal raises concerns that the height, scale, massing, positioning and orientation on site would be inconsistent with the streetscape and character of the area, and that it would have adverse impacts on visual amenity in terms of being overbearing and visually intrusive, as well as breaking the existing building line and established pattern of development in the area. Concerns are also raised in relation to the extent of permitted development on the host site which along with the proposed development will result in overdevelopment.

Building Line

7.2.2. The appeal site is located at the junction of two roads in Castle Park and with dwellings either side of the appeal site facing the road fronting the respective property. These two existing dwellings do not currently form a coherent building line with the dwelling at no. 10 Castle Park set back from the building line of Woodlands to the north. The proposed dwelling is positioned in line with No. 10 Castle Park, the neighbouring two storey dwelling to the west (the host property) and is situated approximately 7.2m forward of the building line of Woodlands, the neighbouring dormer dwelling to the north. The proposed dwelling includes a single storey element which is located a distance of 9.7m from the property to the north and a two storey element located 16.5m from the adjoining property to the north. Having regard to the separation distances I am satisfied that the variation in building line will not give rise to an unacceptable visual impact at this location.

Orientation

- 7.2.3. The proposed dwelling has been designed such that the rear private amenity space is located to the south and backs on to the public road adjoining the host property at No. 10 which fronts onto this section of road. The front garden and vehicular access are located to the north adjoining Woodlands. The third party raises concerns in relation to failure of the proposed dwelling to harmonise with the orientation of existing dwellings at no. 10-14 Castle Park which front on to an area of public open space. The existing southern and eastern boundary comprises a low wall with railing to a height of 2.1m with planting which is to be largely retained providing privacy for the private amenity space. Pedestrian access gates are proposed along the southern and eastern boundary and vehicular access proposed on the north eastern boundary. The southern and eastern elevations contain bedroom and landing windows at first floor which will provide for some overlooking on to the public street and I note that surrounding houses address the public road and open space in the vicinity. Having regard to the design proposed which provides for passive surveillance of the public open space and street, and to the site's location with road frontage on two sides, I do not consider it necessary to require the proposed dwelling to have the same orientation as no.'s 10 – 14 Castle Park and I am satisfied that the orientation proposed is acceptable.

Overbearing

- 7.2.4. The proposed dwelling is two storey and has a pitched roof with a ridge height of 9.7m and an eaves height of 5.5 m. The contiguous elevation indicates the proposed height is in line with the height of the neighbouring no. 10 Castle Park. A contiguous elevation view of the north elevation and showing the neighbouring dwelling at Woodlands has not been provided. Woodlands is a dormer dwelling and is not substantially lower than No.10 Castle Park. The proposed dwelling is positioned such that the two storey element it is in line with No.10 and as such is unlikely to result in overbearing impacts on properties to the west. Having regard to the separation distance between the proposed dwelling (the two storey element is located approximately 16.5m from Woodlands), I am satisfied that the development will not have an overbearing impact on properties to the north. A separation distance of 1.7m is proposed between the eastern side elevation and the site boundary. I consider the height, scale and massing of the dwelling is in keeping with existing

dwellings in the vicinity of the site and that adequate distance from site boundaries are provided for. I am satisfied that the dwelling will not have a negative visual impact on the streetscape or on the character of the area.

- 7.2.5. I note the third party concerns that the proposed development is the same as that previously refused by the planning authority on the site for reasons relating to visual impact and non-compliance with development plan standards. Having reviewed the drawings submitted and visited the site I am satisfied that the design proposed is acceptable for this location and will not result in an unacceptable visual impact on the character of the area. I am also satisfied that the development complies with the criteria set out in Section 12.3.7.5 of the Development Plan relating to corner/side garden sites.

Overdevelopment

- 7.2.6. The first party raise concerns in relation to the extent of development on the overall site, including the host property, where permission has been granted but not yet constructed for an extension and granny flat under planning permission D21A/0834. Condition 2 of this permission requires the family flat be for an immediate family member and shall not be let or sold independent of the main dwelling. I do not share the concerns of the first party that granting permission for the proposed development along with existing and permitted development will result overdevelopment, noting the size of the site, the nature and scale of existing development, and the design and layout of permitted and proposed development.

7.3. Other Issues

- 7.3.1. In relation to irregularities referred to between drawings and the application form, I note that the third party raised this matter in their observation to the planning authority and that the planning authority was satisfied with the details submitted. The first party response to the appeal states that the additional area relates to attic storage space and I am satisfied that there is adequate information on file to assess the proposed development and that the concerns raised in relation to design have been assessed in section 7.2 above.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

- 8.1. Having regard to the nature of the development, the location of the site in a serviced urban area, and the separation distance to the nearest European site, it is concluded that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise, and it is not considered that the development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1. I recommend that planning permission should be granted, subject to conditions.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 10.1. Having regard to the pattern of development in the area, the residential zoning objective relating to the site under the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028, and to the standards for the development of corner/side garden sites set out in section 12.3.7.5 of that plan, it is considered that the proposal, subject to the conditions set out below, would not seriously injure the character of the area or the amenities of property in the vicinity, and would be acceptable in terms of design, traffic safety and amenity. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

1. The development 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.

2. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed dwelling shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

3. The width of the new vehicular entrance shall be a maximum of 3.5 metres. Any works to the existing gate or front boundary wall shall include dishing and strengthening at the developers own expense and shall be agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Any new or replaced boundary walls to the front of the dwelling herein permitted shall be a maximum of 1.1 metres in height.

Reason: In the interest of orderly development.

4. Drainage arrangements, including surface water collection and disposal, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure a proper standard of development.

5. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into water and/or wastewater connection agreement(s) with Uisce Eireann.

Reason: In the interests of public health.

6. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between 0800 to 1900 hours Mondays to Fridays inclusive and 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays, and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

7. All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. Any relocation of utility infrastructure shall be agreed with the relevant utility provider. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity

8. The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction and Environmental Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust management measures, waste management and recycling of materials, environmental protection measures, welfare facilities, site deliveries, complaints procedure, pest control and traffic management arrangements.

Reason: In the interest of public safety, environmental protection, and residential amenity.

9. 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 the An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

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 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.

Bernadette Quinn
Planning Inspector

01st May 2024

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-317751-23		
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a house and associated works.		
Development Address	10 Castle Park, Monkstown, Co. Dublin, A94 E437		
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	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	X		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)
No		N/A	No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Class 10(b)(i) and (iv) of Schedule 5 Part 2	Proceed to Q.4

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?

No	X	Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 1 - Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-317751-23	
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a house and associated works	
Development Address	10 Castle Park, Monkstown, Co. Dublin, A94 E437	
<p>The Board carries out a preliminary examination [Ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)] of, at least, the nature, size or location of the proposed development having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations.</p>		
	Examination	Yes/No/ Uncertain
<p>Nature of the Development</p> <p>Is the nature of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment?</p> <p>Will the development result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants?</p>	<p>Proposal for residential development on land zoned residential located in an existing suburban area is not considered exceptional in the context of the existing urban environment.</p> <p>No, the proposal will be connected to the existing water supply and waste water drainage infrastructure. Construction waste can be managed through standard waste management conditions.</p>	No
<p>Size of the Development</p> <p>Is the size of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment?</p> <p>Are there significant cumulative considerations having regard to other existing and/or permitted projects?</p>	<p>The proposed development seeks permission for 1 house on a site measuring 0.039 ha which is not considered exceptional in the context of the existing urban environment.</p> <p>No</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>

<p>Location of the Development</p> <p>Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining or does it have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location?</p> <p>Does the proposed development have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area?</p>	<p>No, South Dublin Bay SAC and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA are located approx. 900m to the north and South Dublin Bay proposed NHA is approx. 900m north of the site.</p> <p>There are no other locally sensitive environmental sensitivities in the vicinity of relevance.</p>	No
Conclusion		
<p>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>EIA not required.</p>		

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____

Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)