



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-318145-23

Development	Demolition of annex, shed & chimney, construction of extension to the rear and side, widening of vehicular entrance and all associated site works
Location	26 Fortfield Road, Terenure, Dublin 6W, D6W YX96
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council South
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	4133/23
Applicant(s)	Alan & Ciara Leahy
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant with Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Conor O'Driscoll & Criona Toner
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	5 th August 2024
Inspector	Clare Clancy

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located off the Fortfield Rd (R817) with direct access onto same. The site comprises of a two storey semi-detached dwelling among a row of similar type dwellings. The existing dwelling is setback approx. 18 m from the public road and has a rear back garden depth approx. 39 m. The dividing boundary at the rear of the site between the appeal site and the neighbouring site to the northeast, no. 24, comprises of a partial block wall, timber fencing and hedging.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the demolition of annex to rear, shed and chimney and the construction of a single storey flat roof extension to the rear of the existing dwelling, and the construction of a two storey flat roof extension to the rear and to the side of the existing dwelling, to carry out external insulation and the widening of the existing vehicular access serving the site to 3.5 m, at no. 26 Fortfield Road, Terenure.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Dublin City Council granted permission by order the 5th September 2023 subject to 8 conditions. Mainly standard conditions were included in the final grant relating to surface water run off and management, hours of operation for site development works and the management of construction works and development contributions.

Condition no. 8 – restricts the width of the existing driveway entrance to 3.0 m.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

One planning report forms the basis of the assessment and recommends permission to be granted.

- The proposal is assessed in terms of principle of development noting that the proposed development complies with the zoning objective for the site and considered impacts on adjoining residential amenities.
- Considered the inclusion of a condition in regard to the extension so that it did not extend above the existing eaves to reduce the overall scale, however this condition was not included in the final grant.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Division (14th August 2023) – No objection raised.
- Transportation Planning Division (23rd August 2023) – No objection, notes proposal to widen existing access from 2.72 m to 3.5 m which is in excess of Development Plan Standard and recommended the inclusion of condition for maximum width to be 3.0 m.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

- 3.4.1. One third party observation was received to the proposed development. The issues raised are largely covered by the grounds of appeal.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Appeal Site

No relevant history.

4.2. Adjoining Site to Southwest (No.28)

P.A. Ref. 3353/07 Permission granted to amend 4531/06 with the provision of a full length canopy over ground floor on front elevation of dwellings.

P.A. Ref. 4531/06 Permission granted for the demolition of a bungalow and the construction of 2 no. three storey semi-detached dwellings.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 is the relevant development plan for the area which sets out local planning policy for the area.

5.1.1. Zoning

The site is zoned Z1 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods, the objective for which is “To protect, provide and improve residential amenities”.

5.1.2. Section 15.11 – ‘House Development’ refers to Appendix 18 of the CDP with regard to guidance and standards related to residential extensions.

5.1.3. Appendix 18 – Ancillary Residential Accommodation – sets out guidance on additions and alterations to existing housing stock. Below are the relevant sections of Appendix 18:

- Section 1.1 – General Design Principles sets out considerations in the assessment of residential extensions.
- Section 1.2 – Extension to Rear – outlines the parameters to be considered for ground floor and first floor rear extensions.
- Section 1.3 – Extension to Side – outlines the parameters to be considered for side extensions including for both ground floor and first floor side extensions.
- Section 1.4 – Privacy and Amenity – proposed extensions should seek to ensure that there is not an unacceptable affect on amenities of neighbouring properties, including privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight.
- Section 1.6 – Daylight and Sunlight.
- Section 1.7 – Appearance and Materials.

5.1.4. Appendix 5 – Transport and Mobility: Technical Requirements

Section 4.3.1 – Dimensions and Surfacing

- For a single residential dwelling, the vehicular opening proposed shall be at least 2.5 metres or at most 3 metres in width and shall not have outward opening gates.

5.1.5. Section 15.9.16 of the Development Plan written statement addresses daylight and sunlight standards for residential development.

5.1.6. Appendix 16 – Sunlight and Daylight – expands on requirements.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1. The nearest European Sites and Natural Heritage Areas in close proximity to the appeal site are the following:

- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA Site Code 004024 – approx. 6.65 km to the east.
- South Dublin Bay SAC Site Code 000210 – approx. 6.65 km to the east.
- South Dublin Bay pNHA Site Code 00210 – approx. 6.65 km to the east.
- Grand Canal pNHA Site Code 002104 – approx. 2.37 km to the north.
- Dodder Valley pNHA Site Code 000991 – approx. 3.1 km to the southwest.

5.3. EIA Screening

5.3.1. The subject development is not within a class where EIA would apply. Refer to Appendix 1.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. One third party appeal submission was received from Conor O'Driscoll and Criona Toner of no. 24 Fortfield Road. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The drawings are inaccurate in regard to the rear extension building line of the appellant's house. The depth of the existing extension is incorrect and the proposed extension will not be in line with it and will protrude significantly beyond it.
- The existing extension is single storey with mono-pitch roof and 2 no. roof lights integrated, and 3.2 m in depth to rear.

- The scale and size of the proposed development is excessive and will be overbearing.
- Negative impacts on appellant's residential amenities due to the proposed extension protruding beyond the rear building line of their existing extension, resulting in overshadowing, loss of light.
- The height of the first floor element will unduly overshadow the appellant's property.
- Negative visual impact from Fortfield Road – the proposed development will be highly visible and will not integrate with the existing structure.
- Construction at the shared boundary wall – the proposed development will be built up against the shared boundary wall with no set back shown giving rise to oversailing and the effects of drainage and the structural integrity impacted.

6.2. Applicant Response

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

- Consultation with the appellants was undertaken prior to initial planning application submission and right through to the appeal process.
- Due regard was given to appropriately respecting the residential amenities of no. 24 by setting back the two storey element of the proposed development away from no. 24.
- Submits that the existing extension at the rear of no. 24 is unauthorised development.
- Regarding the submitted drawings in relation to the depth of the existing extension to the rear of no. 24, whereby part of the proposed extension is to be aligned with the depth of the existing extension but is misrepresented on the drawings, it is submitted that the rear façade of the proposed single storey extension will broadly align with the rear façade of the single storey extension at no. 24. No drawings were available in relation to the existing extension to compare drawings, as it appears to be unauthorised.
- The need for additional space is to support a growing family.

- The adjoining dwellings at no. 28 are three storey with gross floor area of 229 m² and extend c. 4 m beyond the two storey façade of the subject site. The proposed development has been designed broadly in line with the rear façade of no. 28 and in the context of precedent set by this sites redevelopment.
- Examples of existing properties granted in the area with a second two storey extension are provided (Figure 12).
- Appeal response is accompanied by a daylight and sunlight overshadowing analysis.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- 6.3.1. Request that the Board uphold the decision of the Planning Authority, and in the event of a grant, that a condition requiring the payment of Section 48 development contribution is included.

6.4. Observations

None.

6.5. Further Responses

A further submission was received from the appellants Conor O'Driscoll and Criona Toner of no. 24 Fortfield Road which can be summarised as follows:

- No consultation took place with the applicant prior to the submission of the initial planning application.
- Notes that the existing extension is exempted development pursuant to Class 1, Schedule 2 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended). This is elaborated on further within the submission requesting the Board to conclude that the existing extension is exempted development and doesn't amount to unauthorised development and to dismiss this element raised by the applicant (first party).
- The site plan misrepresents the scale and height of the proposed extension which will sit 1 m above the eaves of the existing house.

- The two storey element of the proposed extension which will be in line with that of the existing two storey extension in the adjoining property at no. 28 is misleading and was ignored by the planning authority and the first party. It is stated that this is incorrect, and that the proposed rear extension extends c.2 m beyond the two storey element of no. 28.
- The setback distance of the first floor rear extension from the dividing boundary between no. 24 and the appeal site is stated as 3 m which is incorrect and is only 2.4 m.
- The planning officer raised concern regarding the impact of the two storey extension and incorrectly referred to it as 6 m instead of 6.14 m and notes that a condition can be imposed so that the extension does not extend above the existing eaves and was not included.
- The structural integrity of the dividing boundary between no.'s 24 and 26 has the potential to be compromised and the first party should undertake a structural survey prior to development commencing.
- Regarding precedent cases in the area given by the first party, the examples given do not provide a comparable situation relative to the proposed development the subject of the appeal.

Daylight / Sunlight Analysis

- Queries the daylight and sunlight analysis report carried out and the conclusions given as the document is not signed by a specialist in this field.
- The first party submits that the rear façade only receives direct sunlight in the morning before noon. This is refuted by the appellants who state that the rear façade receives sun from 7 am – c. 4 pm on the spring and autumnal equinoxes.
- Queries Section 2.4.2 in regard to the floor element in which it is stated that it has been set back sufficiently to protect third party residential amenity, no qualitative assessment is provided despite the floor plan and proposed elevation falling within the 45° rule.
- Queries the assessment in Section 2.4.2 for December 1 pm, 2 pm, 3 pm and October and is contrary to relevant guidelines.

- Fails to show the French windows and rear facing window within the existing extension.
- Submits that the overbearing impact arising from the proposed development is not adequately addressed by the first party as the overall depth of the proposed two storey element of the proposed extension, the overall height of the existing dwelling, and the extent and location of other single storey extensions being proposed were not considered.
- If granted by the Board, it is requested that a number of conditions are included to reduce the depth, increase the set-back of the first floor extension from the shared boundary by 1 m and reduce its depth to align with the dept of the adjoining extension, and reduce the height of the extension so that it does not break the eaves level, as currently proposed.

7.0 **Assessment**

Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the report(s) of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Impact on Amenities
- Visual Amenities
- Other Matters
- Appropriate Assessment

7.1. **Principle of Development**

- 7.1.1. The appeal site is zoned Z1 the objective of which is to 'To protect, provide and improve residential amenities'. The proposed development seeks to provide a residential extension to the existing dwelling. I note that a number of dwellings in the wider area have extensions including two storey extensions to the rear. I consider an

extension to the subject dwelling to be acceptable in this regard, and I would note that the appellants do not express an objection to the principle of the proposed extension, but to the nature of the extension and the potential impact on residential amenities. The proposed development is therefore acceptable in principle.

7.2. Impact on Amenities

- 7.2.1. The grounds of appeal raise concern with regard to the size and scale of the proposed extension and adverse impacts to amenity with respect to visual dominance, loss of light and overshadowing. It is stated that the drawings are inaccurate and misrepresent the depth of the existing extension to the rear of the appellant's dwelling which has a stated depth of 3.2 m and consequently, the proposed extension at ground floor and first floor will not align with the existing extension as proposed on the site layout plan (dwg no. 22052-pp-03) and will result in on loss of light.
- 7.2.2. In response, the first party has raised the matter of unauthorised development in relation to the appellant's existing extension stating that no plans were available to examine. While I note that a minor discrepancy has occurred in the drawings in relation to the depth of the existing ground floor extension to the rear of no. 24, and having regard to my site inspection, I am satisfied that the drawings provided are of an adequate standard to assess the application.
- 7.2.3. Notwithstanding, I noted pursuant to my site inspection and measurements taken that the existing extension to the rear of the appellant's property has a depth of 3.37 m and is constructed adjacent to the shared boundary, with a gap between the gable wall of the extension and what appears to be the original existing partial block boundary wall, measuring approx. 36 cm.
- 7.2.4. The rear ground floor extension closest to the shared boundary with the appellant's property will be set back from the boundary by approx. 20 cm, as indicated on plans. It will have a proposed rear depth of 4.55 m and a max roof height of 3.51 m with flat roof profile and a roof light incorporated. In considering this element of the proposed development on its own relative to the appellant's property, I would have no objection to same. While it does not align with the footprint of the appellant's extension and has a slightly greater depth by approx. 1.13 m, I do not consider this to be excessive or significant and would be acceptable.

- 7.2.5. At first floor, the proposed extension projects for a depth of 4.5 m and would be situated over the rear ground floor extension which projects for a depth of 8.5 m. It will be constructed adjacent to the southwestern boundary of the site and will align approximately with the two storey gable of no. 28 to the southwest. The overall height of the extension will be 6.14 m with flat roof profile proposed, and will be set back by approx. 2.6 m from the shared boundary with no. 24.
- 7.2.6. The first party response has included a shadow impact assessment for four different times of the day in March, June, September, December. The rear of the appeal site faces southeast.
- 7.2.7. In relation to the appeal site and the adjoining site to the southwest (no. 28), I note that there does not appear to be habitable windows to the side elevation of no. 28 as the existing windows at first floor level are opaque / obscured. I am satisfied that impacts arising will not directly affect residential amenities overall but may have a level of impact on ambient light on the northeast facing elevation of no. 28.
- 7.2.8. In relation to the appellant's property (no. 24) to the northeast, the rear of the dwelling has a south easterly facing aspect. The main areas for which impacts could arise are the existing ground floor extension which contains 2 no. roof lights and the patio sliding windows and door. The appellants submit that the rear facing sliding windows sit significantly within the 45° test when done on a floor plan or elevation level and therefore requires a more detailed BRE assessment which is not carried out by the first party.
- 7.2.9. Having considered the above and assessed the shadow impact analysis submitted on the appeal file, I note that the nearest ground floor window to the shared boundary is the sliding / patio window which I would consider to be potentially most affected from light reduction. As noted above, there are a number of other windows providing lighting to the space within the existing extension.
- 7.2.10. In the application of the 45° approach, I have considered the proposed development with regard to loss of daylight and overshadowing.

- Loss of Daylight to Window

In considering the 45° test on both plan and elevation, I am satisfied that the proposed development will not have significant impact or further compound loss of light further

in comparison to that already occurring to the existing sliding / patio windows, and I do not consider that the existing roof lights are unduly impacted. It should be noted that this assessment has been carried out noting that the footprint of the appellant's extension is 3.37 m in depth, as per measurement taken at time of site inspection.

- **Overshadowing**

There will be limited increased overshadowing associated with this element of the proposal, however as the rear garden of the appellant's property is southeast facing, most overshadowing will be associated with the house on its own individual plot and will be transient in nature.

7.2.11. The suggestion by the appellants to amend the design of the proposed development to reduce the depth of the rear and first floor extension to align with that of the appellant's ground floor extension, and to increase the setback of the first floor extension from 2.4 m to 3.4 m (the depth of the first floor extension) are not proposals which need to be considered, as I am satisfied having viewed the sites that the impact of overbearing and visual dominance is not significant.

7.2.12. The policy guidance set out in Section 1.2 Appendix 18 of the CDP relating to extensions notes that extensions to the rear including first floor extensions will only be permitted where there will be no significant negative impacts on adjoining residential or visual amenities and which will generally be in harmony with existing in terms of design and finishes. Having regard to the foregoing and to my assessment, I consider that the proposed extension is acceptable in terms of design and scale and that it adequately integrates with the existing dwelling on site.

7.3. Visual Amenities

7.3.1. The appellant notes that the two storey element protrudes from the side elevation by c.1.5 m and above the eaves creating an incongruous form when viewed from the front and rear and does not integrate with the dwelling and is contrary to Section 1.3 of Appendix 18 of the CDP.

7.3.2. I note that Section 1.3 sets out that ground floor side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size and visual harmony with existing. In relation to first floor extensions, it notes that in certain cases a set-back of an extension's front

façade and roof profile and ridge may be sought to protect amenities and integrate into the landscape.

- 7.3.3. The Planning Authority in considering the development and matters raised by the third party in terms of the proposed extension being visually obtrusive and overbearing, considered the inclusion of a condition to ensure that the extension does not extend above the existing eaves so as to reduce the overall scale. It is noted the condition was not included in the final grant.
- 7.3.4. It is noted that the eaves of the existing dwelling sit at approx. 5 m and the overall ridge height of the dwelling is 8.5 m. The first floor extension will be set back from the public road from approx. mid-way along the southwest gable elevation and will be approx. 6.1 m in height. While the first floor rear extension exceeds the height of the eaves of the existing dwelling, in the context of the overall front elevation, it is considered that views of the rear of the roof and the extension from public areas are minimal and intermittent and therefore I do not consider it to be visually obtrusive on the streetscape.
- 7.3.5. Having regard to the foregoing, and having regard to the variety and pattern of similar type developments and more substantial type developments existing in the area, I consider the proposed development to be acceptable in terms of design, scale and finish and will adequately integrate with the existing dwelling on the site. Furthermore I do not consider that it would appear visually dominant relative to the appellant's property as the first floor element is stepped back from the shared boundary and will be aligned with the ground floor extension. Therefore the need to include a condition to reduce the eaves of the proposed development is not warranted.
- 7.3.6. In relation to external finishes, I note from the drawings that render wall finishes are specified and that some elements of the external finishes are to be decided prior to construction or during the build. I consider it appropriate to include a condition to ensure that material finishes adequately integrate with the overall development.

7.4. Other Matters

7.4.1. Proposed Entrance

I note that as part of the proposed development, the applicant sought to widen the existing entrance to 3.5 m. I note that the Planning Authority included a condition in

relation to restricting the wide of the existing access to 3.0 m in accordance with the provisions of Section 4.3.1 of Appendix 5 of the CDP. This element of the proposed development was not raised in the grounds of the third party appeal. Accordingly, I consider it appropriate to include this condition as per the requirements of the CDP.

Unauthorised Development

The matter of unauthorised development in relation to the existing rear extension of the appellant's property is raised within the appeal submissions by the first party. The third party appellants have requested the Board in their submission to make a determination on the fact that the existing extension to the rear of no. 24 is exempted development.

Section 5 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) is the mechanism by which the relevant parties can obtain a declaration in respect of the existing development in question. Any matters relating to unauthorised development is a matter for the Planning Authority, as enforcement falls under the jurisdiction of the Planning Authority. Consequently, the issues raised in the appeal submissions regarding the status of the existing extension are not a matter for the Board to consider in this appeal.

7.4.2. Shared Boundary

The appellants raise concern at the location of the proposed extension relative to the shared boundary between the appeal site and no. 24 stating that the proposed development may compromise the integrity of the existing boundary.

The submitted drawings do not indicate that the proposed development will encroach or over-sail the existing boundary and I note that the proposed development will not be constructed either of the shared boundaries of the site, and that there is a proposed separation distance of approx. 20 cm between the ground floor extension and the adjoining shared boundary with no. 24.

Matters relating to shared boundaries and boundary disputes are a civil matter, having regard to the provisions of Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended). Party wall agreements are covered under separate legislation and are not a matter for the Board.

7.5. AA Screening

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

The subject site is located approx. 6.65 km to the east of the nearest European Site(s) (South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA Site Code 004024, South Dublin Bay SAC Site Code 000210). The proposed development comprises of minor demolition works within the curtilage of the existing dwelling and the construction of an extension to the side and rear of the existing dwelling. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature of and scale of the proposed development.
- The sites' location in an established residential area on zoned lands that are serviced with public foul sewer and public water.
- Location-distance from the nearest European site(s) and the lack of connections.
- Screening assessment of the Planning Authority.

I consider that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually, or in-combination with other plans and projects, on a European Site and appropriate assessment is therefore not required.

8.0 Recommendation

I recommend a GRANT of permission subject to the following conditions.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the zoning objective of the site Z1 Sustainable Neighbourhoods the objective for which is 'To protect , provide and improve residential amenity', and to the planning policies, objectives and development standards of the Dublin City

Development Plan 2022-2028, the nature, scale and design of the proposed development relative to the existing dwelling and adjoining dwellings, and to the existing pattern of development in the wider area, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development is an acceptable form of development at this location and would not seriously injure the amenities of adjoining property, and would therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The proposed development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application on the 12th July 2023 except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions required details to be agreed with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<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 the 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. The application of any indexation required by this condition 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.</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</p>

	Development Contribution Scheme made under Section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.
3.	<p>Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed extension shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with the planning authority, prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
4.	<p>The driveway entrance shall be at most 3.0 m in width and shall not have outward opening gates.</p> <p>Reason: In the of traffic safety.</p>
5.	<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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management.</p>
6.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 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.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>

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.

Clare Clancy
Planning Inspector

26th August 2024

Appendix 1 – Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-318145-23		
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of annex, shed & chimney, construction of extension to the rear and side, widening of vehicular entrance and all associated site works.		
Development Address	26 Fortfield Road, Terenue, Dublin.		
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	
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			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
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)
No	✓		No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required.
Yes			Proceed to Q.4

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?

No		Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____