



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-320128-24

Development	Demolition of rear garage and construction of single-storey mews dwelling, together with all associated works.
Location	101 Boot Road, Clondalkin, Dublin 22, D22 V3Y6
Planning Authority	South Dublin County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	SD24A/0095W
Applicant(s)	Robert and Deborah Doyle.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Robert and Deborah Doyle.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	1 st October 2024.
Inspector	Ciarán Daly

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located in the rear garden of no. 101 Boot Road and consists of part of the rear garden and a single storey flat roofed garage type structure (Doyle's Autos) at the end of the garden and which is bounded by Brideswell Lane which runs to the rear of the houses on this section of Boot Road. The site surrounds to the rear consists of the hard surfaced laneway which appears to be partly in use for surface car parking and storage of cars associated with the commercial garage operations and the streetscape consists of a number of single storey garage / shed structures.. To the front along Boot Road is the established residential estate of two storey terraced and semi-detached dwellings of similar form and appearance.
- 1.2. In the vicinity of the site along the laneway, there are a number of car repair shops operating from some of the rear garages and there is also a childcare premises close to the junction of the laneway and the public road. There are residential dwellings located to the north, south and west and Fonthill Road is located to the north- east of the laneway. A Circle K garage forecourt is located adjacent to the east of the laneway and a three storey commercial building located in a surface car park adjacent to the south of the laneway.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development seeks permission for:
- The demolition of the existing garage building to the rear.
 - A new two bedroom detached single storey pitched roof dwelling to the rear of the existing dwelling and fronting Brideswell Lane.
 - Vehicular entrance off Brideswell Lane.
 - Connection to all public services.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

South Dublin County Council refused permission for the proposed development for the following one reason:

1. Given the lack of pedestrian and cycle infrastructure and poor road dimensions and supporting facilities on the laneway it is unsuitable for residential development and constitutes piecemeal and haphazard development contrary to Section 12.6.8 (Backland Development and Infill Sites) of the Development Plan. Given the proliferation of on-street parking due to commercial operations along the lane and inadequate route for emergency vehicles, the proposal would endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard and would materially contravene the 'RES' land use zoning objective and would seriously injure the amenities of properties in the vicinity.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

Planning Reports

3.2.1. The South Dublin County Council Planner's Report formed the basis of the decision of the Planning Authority. The main conclusions reached included the following:

- The demolition of the garage was considered acceptable in principle.
- The design of the dwelling was considered acceptable in principle.
- With the abundance of permitted dwellings on the lane, the P.A. was not satisfied that the siting and layout of the lane allowed for such scale.
- The site is on a poorly lit and serviced lane not suitable for infill development.
- Overbearing and overshadowing impacts noted on surrounding gardens.
- Concerns noted in relation to access and egress onto the laneway.
- The proliferation of informal on-street car parking is not conducive to residential development.
- Satisfactory access for services has not been demonstrated and cumulative impact of piecemeal residential dwellings would lead to an unsafe residential environment.
- The access along Brideswell Lane is considered a traffic hazard.
- The cumulative impact of development on the laneway is haphazard.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Environmental Health Officer: No objection subject to conditions.
- Roads Department: Refusal of permission recommended.
- Water Services Department: No report received.

3.3. Third Party Observations

None.

4.0 Planning History

SD23A/0152: 100 Boot Road, Clondalkin, Dublin 22. Permission granted on appeal by ABP (ref. ABP-318110-23) following refusal by the Planning Authority for demolition of garage buildings to the rear and construction of a two-bedroom, pitched roof, detached mews dwelling house with vehicular entrance.

SD22A/0063 - 97 Boot Road, Clondalkin, Dublin 22. Permission granted on appeal by ABP (ref. ABP-313559-22) following refusal by the Planning Authority for demolition of garage to rear and construction of a two bedroom single storey pitched roof detached dwelling with attic conversion and single storey flat roof rear projection with vehicular entrance.

SD22A/0062 - 104 Boot Road, Clondalkin, Dublin 22. Permission granted on appeal by ABP (ref. ABP-313577-22) following refusal by the Planning Authority for the demolition of the existing garage building and construction of two no. two-bedroom, detached two storey pitched roof mews dwellings with a single storey flat roof rear projection, to the rear of the existing dwelling with vehicular entrance.

SD19A/0385 - 99 Boot Road, Clondalkin, Dublin 22. Permission granted on appeal by ABP (ref. ABP-306855-20) following refusal by the Planning Authority for conversion of an existing single storey structure into a two bed mews dwelling, new pitched roof; parking will utilise the existing three spaces off Brideswell Lane.

SD19A/0131 - 104 Boot Road, Clondalkin, Dublin 22. Permission granted by the Planning Authority for demolition of shed buildings, construction of a two storey, two bedroom detached dwelling, existing vehicular entrance off Boot Road.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. South Dublin County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 (CDP)

5.1.1. The subject site is zoned under the 'RES' zoning objective which is to *“to protect and / or improve residential amenity”*.

5.1.2. Chapter 2 of the CDP covers the core strategy and the settlement strategy including the consolidation of areas within the suburbs of Dublin city. Chapter 5 covers quality design and healthy placemaking. Chapter 6 relates to housing. Chapter 11 covers infrastructure and environmental services.

5.1.3. Chapter 12 covers implementation and monitoring and includes the following relevant sections:

- Section 12.6.7 Residential Standards
- Section 12.6.8 Residential Consolidation
- Infill Sites
 - *Development on infill sites should meet the following criteria: à Be guided by the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas – Guidelines for Planning Authorities DEHLG, 2009 and the companion Urban Design Manual;*
 - *A site analysis that addresses the scale, siting and layout of new development taking account of the local context should accompany all proposals for infill development. On smaller sites of approximately 0.5 hectares or less a degree of integration with the surrounding built form will be required, through density, features such as roof forms, fenestration patterns and materials and finishes.*
 - *Larger sites will have more flexibility to define an independent character;*
 - *While the minimum standards set will be sought in relation to refurbishment schemes it is recognised that this may not achieve a positive planning outcome, particularly in relation to historic buildings,*

'living over the shop' projects, and tight (less than 0.25 Hectares) urban centre infill developments. In order to allow for flexibility, the standards may be assessed on a case-by-case basis and if considered appropriate, reduced in part or a whole, subject to overall design quality in line with the guidelines Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, 2020;

- *Significant site features, such as boundary treatments, pillars, gateways and vegetation should be retained, in so far as possible, but not to the detriment of providing an active interface with the street; à Where the proposed height is greater than that of the surrounding area a transition should be provided (See Chapter 5, Section 5.2.7 of this Chapter and Appendix 10: Building Height and Design Guide);*
- *Subject to appropriate safeguards to protect residential amenity, reduced public open space and car parking standards may be considered for infill development, dwelling sub-division, or where the development is intended for a specific group such as older people or students. Public open space provision will be examined in the context of the quality and quantum of private open space and the proximity of a public park. Courtyard type development for independent living in relation to housing for older people is promoted at appropriate locations. Car parking will be examined in the context of public transport provision and the proximity of services and facilities, such as shops;*
- *Proposals to demolish a dwelling(s) to facilitate infill development will be considered subject to the preservation of the character of the area and taking account of the structure's contribution to the visual setting or built heritage of the area;*
- *All residential consolidation proposals shall be guided by the quantitative performance approaches and recommendations under the 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight' (2nd edition): A Guidelines to Good Practice (BRE 2011) and BS 8206-2: 2008 – 'Lighting for Buildings – Part 2: Code of Practice for Daylighting' and /*

or any updated guidance; à It should be ensured that residential amenity is not adversely impacted as a result of the proposed development; à Delivery of Public Open Space and Contribution in Lieu shall be in accordance with the provisions set out under Section 8.7.4 of Chapter 8: Community Infrastructure and Open Space.

- Backland Development

“The design of development on backland sites should meet the criteria for infill development in addition to the following criteria:

- *Be guided by a site analysis process in regard to the scale, siting and layout of development; à Avoid piecemeal development that adversely impacts on the character of the area and the established pattern of development in the area; à Demonstrate that there is no undue overlooking, and that overshadowing is assessed having regard to ‘Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight’ (2nd edition): A Guidelines to Good Practice (BRE 2011) and BS 8206-2: 2008 – ‘Lighting for Buildings – Part 2: Code of Practice for Daylighting’ or any updated guidance; à Access for pedestrians and vehicles should be clearly legible and, where appropriate, promote mid-block connectivity”.*

- Section 12.6.10 Public Open Space
- Section 12.7.4 Car Parking Standards
- Section 12.7.6 Car Parking Design and Layout
- Section 12.11.1 Water Management

5.2. Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines

5.2.1. Having considered the nature of the proposal, the receiving environment, and the documentation on file, I am of the opinion that the directly relevant Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines are:

- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) (Compact Settlement Guidelines).

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.3.1. The nearest designated conservation site is located c. 1.6km to the north which is the Grand Canal Proposed Natural Heritage Area (P.N.H.A.) (site code 002104).

5.4. EIA Screening

- 5.4.1. See completed Forms 1 and 2 on file. Having regard to the nature, size and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations, I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA or an EIA determination therefore is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

One first party appeal was received from Robert and Deborah Doyle. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The development potential to the rear is evident, an efficient use of serviced lands and there is no impact on residential or visual amenity.
- The development and the previous grants of permission at no.s 97, 99, 100 and 104 Boot Road will continue the process of residential provision on residential zoned lands. Map submitted showing locations.
- Development standards have been complied with and the siting and scale is consistent with previously approved laneway residential developments improving the character of the laneway.
- The commercial businesses on the laneway may not have permission and are inconsistent with the land-use zoning objective. The current commercial activities at the subject site will cease following permission and this will remove a number of vehicles for access and parking purposes. There will remain two businesses on the laneway.
- There is no direct pedestrian access to Fonthill Road or the petrol station. Public lighting exists on parts of the lane and there is footpath as far as the

creche building. The laneway width is a minimum of c.6m and the footpath can be extended to provide a c.4.5m access road.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority confirmed its decision and referred to the issues in the Chief Executive's Order.

7.0 Assessment

I consider the main issues in determining this appeal are as follows:

- Principle of Development.
- Adequacy of Laneway.
- Impacts on Residential and Visual Amenity.
- Material Contravention.

7.1. Principle of Development

- 7.1.1. Under the CDP, The subject site is zoned under the 'RES' zoning objective which is to "*to protect and / or improve residential amenity*". Residential use is permitted in principle under this zoning. Noting this and the permitted pattern of residential development located along the laneway, the use of the site for residential development, as proposed, is thus accepted in principle.

7.2. Adequacy of Laneway

- 7.2.1. The appellant has stated that the minimum width of Brideswell Lane is c. 6m and that the footpath can be extended with provision for a c.4.5m access road, further the number of commercial businesses and associated access and parking requirements would be reduced.
- 7.2.2. Vehicular access to the proposed development would be from Brideswell Lane onto a car parking area for two cars. There would be no front boundary treatment proposed and there would be a hard surface area between the laneway and the front of the dwelling. Per Table 12.26 of the CDP the maximum car parking standard for such a two bedroom dwelling is 1.5 spaces. The Compact Settlement Guidelines

under SPPR 3 provide that, in such an intermediate location (within 500m of the planned Bus Service D3 (15 minute interval service)), the maximum rate of car parking provision, where justified, shall be two spaces. I note that no significant issue arises in relation the two car parking spaces to be provided.

- 7.2.3. The laneway is notable for the haphazard car parking along it which appears to be associated with the commercial business in the vicinity. There are no pedestrian or cycle facilities on the laneway, which is taken in charge, save a short footpath in the vicinity of the creche building at its northern end.
- 7.2.4. I note that such facilities could be provided on the laneway by the Council. The Roads Department report recommended refusal of permission of permission in relation to lack of pedestrian and cycle infrastructure and public lighting, increase in movements and safety issues on the laneway. Standard conditions were recommended should permission be granted.
- 7.2.5. Effectively, the issue at hand is whether Brideswell Lane can facilitate the traffic movements associated with the development and whether it is safe for pedestrians and cyclists. It is noted that vehicle speeds on this cul-de-sac are low given the laneway layout and the haphazard parking effectively creates a self-regulating street environment.
- 7.2.6. It is also noted that permission has been granted for 5 no. dwellings at no.s 97, 99, 100 and 104 Boot Road along the laneway all of which would be accessed off the laneway. In these cases, the Board granted permission and had no issue with the adequacy of the laneway to accommodate the proposals without endangering public safety by reason of a traffic hazard. The refusal reason also noted the role of the commercial development on the laneway and its contribution towards the informal parking. Given the planning history on the laneway in relation to infill residential development, I consider it likely that this commercial led car parking will reduce over time. This development would contribute to such reduction.
- 7.2.7. Given the precedents along the laneway in favour of infill residential development, noting the laneway width to be sufficient, I consider that the proposed development,

in the emerging context, would not result in any significant traffic hazards and that it can be facilitated on this basis. There are a number of precedents for this type of development and given the potential for the laneway to be upgraded and the general policy sought in relation to infill development and densification, I consider such policy to be generally favourable for the proposed development.

7.3. Impacts on Residential and Visual Amenity

- 7.3.1. I note that residential development is permitted in principle under the 'RES' site zoning. The internal floor areas of the dwelling would be in excess of the minimum requirements for such a two bedroom dwelling. In relation to the site layout, there are no significant issues noted in relation to garden depths and the quantity and quality of the private amenity space. There would be c.16m separation distance between opposing first floor windows which aligns with S.P.P.R. 1 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines and this, and the layout of the dwelling following broadly the line of the adjacent permitted dwellings, gives rise to no significant concerns in relation to overlooking or undue loss of privacy for adjacent properties. Having regard to the two storey scale of the proposed dwelling and its position on the site, I have no significant concerns in relation to undue overshadowing or overbearing impacts on adjacent amenities.
- 7.3.2. Having regard to Section 12.6.8 of the CDP which relates to infill and backland development, I do not consider that the site could not be satisfactorily adapted, in terms of access and egress as outlined above, to cater for the proposed development. The height and scale of development would be consistent with the pattern of permitted residential development, would integrate with the permitted streetscape and would not be piecemeal in this context. I have no significant concerns in relation to the adherence to CDP policy for infill and backland development, or in terms of impacts on residential and visual amenity in the vicinity. I note that the proposed demolition of the garage/shed on the site would facilitate the infill residential development, and I have no significant concerns regarding the loss of such non-habitable space. There is a lack of detail regarding boundary treatments, particularly to the front of the dwelling, and, should permission be granted, this can

be dealt with via a compliance condition. I recommend that permission be granted for the proposed development.

7.4. Material Contravention

7.4.1. In their reason for refusal, the Council cited a material contravention of the 'RES' land use zoning objective for the site following stating that the development would endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard. The development comprises an infill house and complies with the zoning objective for the site, and is supported by policy for infill development and densification. I do not consider therefore that the development materially contravenes the 'RES' zoning objective. If, however, the Board considers that a material contravention of the Development Plan arises and that a grant of permission is nonetheless merited, I draw its attention to Section 37(2)(b) of the 2000 Act as amended and the criteria (i) to (iv) which a grant of permission would be required to satisfy if the Board is of the view that a material contravention of the Development Plan arises.

7.4.2. I have reviewed these criteria and I do not consider that the development meets the majority of the criteria as it is clearly not of strategic or national importance given its scale and type; there are no conflicting objectives in the development plan or objectives which are not clearly stated in relation to the development; the RSES, the Section 28 Guidelines, policy directives under section 29, the statutory obligations of the Council, and Government policies do not provide for over-riding reasons for this type of development. However, it does appear to meet the criteria in relation to pattern of development, and permissions granted in the area since the making of the development plan as the three most recent grants of permission since the adoption of the CDP provide precedent or support for the granting of permission in this case. It is thus advised that the Board can consider granting permission using the material contravention powers open to it if it considers that a material contravention of the development arises under Section 37(2)(b)(iv).

8.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

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

8.2. The subject site is located in an urban area remote from any European site. The nearest such site is located c.6.4km to the south at Glenasmole Valley Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (site code 001209).

8.3. The proposed development comprises demolition of a garage/shed, a new two bedroom dwelling, vehicular entrance and associated works. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any appreciable effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- the small scale and domestic nature of the development,
- the location of the development in a serviced urban area, at a significant distance from European Sites and the urban nature of intervening habitats, and absence of ecological pathways to any European Site,
- taking into account the screening determination by the Planning Authority.

8.4. 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.

9.0 Recommendation

Following the assessments above, I recommend that planning permission for the proposed development should be granted, subject to conditions, for the reasons and considerations set out below.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the zoning objective for the site which is “*to protect and / or improve residential amenity*”, to the nature and capacity of the adjacent laneway and to the pattern of existing and permitted development in the area, to the nature and scale of the proposed development and its access arrangements, and to the provisions of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028 and the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024), it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions below, the proposed development would respect the character and setting of the area, would not seriously

injure the residential amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity, would provide a suitable level of amenity for future occupants, would be acceptable in terms of road safety and convenience, would not lead to the creation of a traffic hazard and would not be likely to have a detrimental impact in terms of drainage or green infrastructure. 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 and to ensure an appropriate high standard of development.

3. Boundary details to the rear, front and side boundaries shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of proper planning and orderly development.

4. The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.

Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interests of sustainable drainage.

5. The developer shall ensure that the site is appropriately maintained and that the public road remains free of any dirt and debris during the construction phase of development.

Reason: In the interest of proper planning and orderly development.

6. All public service cables for the development, including electrical and telecommunications cables, shall be located underground throughout the site.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

7. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 07.00 to 19.00 hours Mondays to Friday inclusive, between 08.00 to 14.00 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.

8. The developer shall ensure that the development is served by adequate water supply and/or wastewater facilities and shall enter into a connection agreement(s) with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network within 9 months of this grant of retention permission.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.

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 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.

Ciaran Daly
Planning Inspector

10th October 2024

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.

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-320128-24		
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of rear garage and construction of single-storey mews dwelling, together with all associated works.		
Development Address	101 Boot Road, Clondalkin, Dublin 22, D22 V3Y6		
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			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)
			Conclusion
No		N/A	No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes	X	Class (10)(b) 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: _____

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-320128-24	
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of rear garage and construction of single-storey mews dwelling, together with all associated works.	
Development Address	101 Boot Road, Clondalkin, Dublin 22, D22 V3Y6	
<p>The Board carried 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> <p>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</p>		
	Examination	Yes/No/ Uncertain
<p>Nature of the Development. 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>	The proposed development is for a dwelling house within an urban area and which is connected to water services and wastewater services.	No
		No
<p>Size of the Development 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>		No
		No
<p>Location of the Development Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining, or does it have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location, or protected species?</p>	<p>No designations apply to the subject site.</p> <p>No sensitivities located on the site or adjoining it.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>

Does the proposed development have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area, including any protected structure?	The proposed development will be connected to the public water and sewer network.	
Conclusion		
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. EIA is not required.		

Inspector:

Date:

DP/ADP: _____

Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)