



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-320669-24

Development	Permission for retention of alterations during construction to a single dwelling and change of site boundaries as previously granted under PA Reg. Ref. 20190495 and ABP-304730-19 and all associated site works.
Location	Stonybatter, Wexford, Co. Wexford
Planning Authority	Wexford County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	20240045
Applicant(s)	Sharon Byrne
Type of Application	Permission for retention
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Brendan and Fran Long
Observer(s)	none
Date of Site Inspection	29 th November 2024

Inspector

Aisling MacNamara

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is an existing newly built detached part two storey and single storey split level flat roofed house with a floor area of 258sqm on a 0.07ha site located on the L3012 Old Hospital Road within the urban built up area of Wexford town. Ground levels on the site fall to the rear. Existing residential properties adjoin to the rear and side boundaries of the site. The adjoining house to the west is no. 2 Parkview which is located c. 9.2m from the subject house. The adjoining house to the east is a newly built split level bungalow located c. 7.7m from the subject house. The adjoining house to the northeast is no.12 Rose Park which is located c. 10.5m from the subject house and is on lower ground. The access to the house is from a single vehicular entrance to the Old Hospital Road. Wexford General Hospital is located opposite the site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the retention of alterations to the house that were carried out during its construction and for a change in site boundaries as previously granted under PA 20190495 (ABP 304730-19).

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority issued a notification of a decision on 7th August 2024 to grant retention permission for five reasons.

Condition 1 required that the development be retained and carried out in accordance with the particulars of this application including further information dated 16th July 2019 and Ref 20190495/ABP304790-19.

Condition 2 stated that within one year, the building shall be painted and additional landscaping shall be provided around the site to reduce the visual impact of the structure in accordance with a scheme to be submitted for the agreement of the planning authority within three months.

Condition 3 stated that the first floor window to the eastern elevation of the building shall be obscurely glazed at all times.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

Further Information

- The first report of the Executive Planner on 7th March 2024 sets out the background to the development proposal and sets out a recommendation to request further information. The report notes that drawings of the permitted development do not clearly show ground and floor levels and it is difficult to determine the extent to which the constructed development departs from the permitted. The two storey element is austere and has the most significant impact, however noting that permission is granted for a house, that the applicant should be provided with the opportunity to soften the visual impact by further information. A new front boundary wall has been constructed and drawings are required.
- Further Information was requested on 8th March 2024 in relation to three items:
 - (i) The planning authority has concerns regarding the visual impact of an excessively large blank gable on adjacent properties as a result of unauthorised increase in height and bulk of this element – submit measures to lessen and soften the visual impact of the building on neighbouring properties,
 - (ii) submit an elevational drawing of the front boundary wall as constructed, and
 - (iii) provide clarification regarding construction of a possible basement and submit drawings as necessary.
- The applicant submitted a response to the further information request on 16th July 2024. The response included proposals to attach painted panels on the external wall facades to soften the visual impact of the house. Drawings were submitted of the front boundary wall and details were submitted of a small lower level undercroft that was constructed under the house. The applicant

states that this was constructed as a necessary construction measure due to the sloping nature of the site and which is not part of the dwelling. In addition, the applicant responded to third party concerns raised in relation to the installation of a possible future first floor window and stated that there is no intention to install a window. A copy of the response submitted to the planning authority in relation to enforcement action is provided.

- The second report of the Executive Planner on 2nd August 2024 considers the response to the further information request and concludes that the response is acceptable and sets out a recommendation to grant permission as per the decision.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- The report of the Executive Technician, MD Wexford office states that there is no technical observation.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

3.4. Third Party Observations

Two observations were received.

The owners / occupiers of 12 Rose Park (also the appellants) raised the following main issues:

- Building is overbearing and adversely impacts on their residential amenity.
- Building is taller, c. 2m than granted
- The upper storey is bigger and extends 2m closer to the adjoining property – a position where a previous application was refused.
- New openings have been formed in the elevations giving rise to overlooking and further openings may be added in the future.
- The foundation level is above that approved by ABP, a basement has been constructed which was not on the approved plans.

- The submitted drawings are incorrect in identifying elevations.
- Boundary landscaping which was required by ABP to be retained and enhanced has been removed.
- There has been a previous ABP refusal for a similar development.

The owner of the adjoining recently constructed dwelling raised the following issues:

- In support of the proposed revisions.
- In support of the reconstruction of the front wall.

4.0 Planning History

Appeal site:

- **PA 20190495, ABP 304730-19** – Deirdre Goode – grant Nov 2019 – permission for demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and for the erection of 2 no. dwellings and all associated works with connection to existing public water services.

Condition 2 required the submission of details for the construction of a 1.2m wall with reused stone along the roadside boundary and for the construction of a footpath.

Condition 3 required the planting of a hedge along the rear boundary to no.12 Rose Park and that the wall to the rear of house number 1 and partially to the rear of house number 2 to be increased to 1.5m.

- **PA 20180112, ABP 301505-18** – Deirdre Goode – refused Aug 2018 - permission for the demolition of existing dwelling and outbuilding and for the erection of 2 no. dwellings and all associated site works with connection to existing public services. Refused for one reason as follows: “Having regard to the location of the proposed development on elevated ground above the adjoining residential development of Rose Park and to the nature and scale of the proposed development and proximity of the development to the northern and eastern site boundaries, and notwithstanding the modifications to the design put forward as part of the appeal, it is considered that the proposed development would have an overbearing impact which would seriously injure

existing residential amenity and would give rise to overshadowing. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to proper planning and sustainable development.”

- **PA 20051700, ABP 26.217352** – Eamonn and Deirdre Goode – grant Nov 2006 – permission to demolish existing dwelling and outbuilding and to erect 3 no. dwellings and all associated site works with connection to existing public services

Adjoining to east (part of PA20190495)

- **PA 20231504** – Dorothy Morrissey – grant Feb 2024 – permission for retention of alterations during construction to a fully serviced detached dwelling house and change of site boundaries as previously granted under Planning Authority Reference Number: 20190495 and An Bord Pleanala Reference: ABP-304730-19, all with associated site services.

Enforcement

- Enforcement Notice issued May 2023 in relation to unauthorised raising of height and floor level of the dwelling, installation of windows and doors and construction of 45sqm standalone structure.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028

Chapter 4 Sustainable Housing

- SH01 To ensure that new residential developments contribute to and represent sustainable neighbourhoods which are inclusive and responsive to the physical or cultural needs of those who use them, are well-located relative to the social, community, commercial and administrative services and are integrated with the community within which they will be located.

Chapter 5 Design and Place-making in Towns and Villages

- TV43 To adopt a presumption in favour of the development of infill and brownfield sites and to apply flexibility in the application of development

management standards allowing for the achievement of performance standards for issues such as the protection of adjoining residential amenities, privacy, light and amenity.

- TV44 To ensure the scale of infill development reflects the location of the site and the characteristics of the settlement. The Council will consider the scale of infill development having regard to the need to make efficient use of centrally located sites and the prevailing scale in the area. The Council will encourage development which intensifies the use of the land to at minimum the intensity of adjoining uses but optimally, subject to the appropriate protection of amenities of adjoining residences to a higher intensity.

Volume 2 is a Development Management Manual setting out development standards and guidelines for development.

- Section 2.6 Amenity
- Section 3.4 Extensions to Dwelling Houses

The continued use of existing dwellings and the need for people to extend and renovate their dwelling houses is recognised and encouraged. Accordingly, appropriate extensions to existing dwelling houses will be considered subject to compliance with the following criteria:

- The proposed extension must be of a scale and position on the site which would not be unduly incongruous with its context.
- The design and external finishes of the extension need not necessarily replicate or imitate the design and finish of the existing dwelling.
Contemporary designs and finishes often represent a more architecturally honest approach to the extension of a property and can better achieve other objectives such as enhancing natural light. It should be noted that a different approach may apply in the case of a Protected Structure or within an Architectural Conservation Area.
- The extension should not have an adverse impact on the amenities of adjoining properties through undue overlooking, undue overshadowing and/or an over dominant visual impact.
- The extension should not impinge on the ability of adjoining properties to develop a similar extension.

- Site coverage should be carefully considered to avoid unacceptable loss of private open space.
- The degree to which the size, position and design of the extension is necessary to meet a specific family need, for example, adaptations to provide accommodation for persons with a disability.
- Where required, it will be necessary to demonstrate that the existing on-site wastewater treatment facilities serving the main dwelling house are adequate and can facilitate the additional loading from the extension. Where this cannot be demonstrated, it will be necessary for the on-site wastewater facilities to be upgraded as part of the development proposal

5.2. Local Policy

Note that the Wexford Town and Environs Development Plan 2009- 2015 (extended to 2019) has expired. The statutory process of making the new Wexford Town Local Area Plan 2024-2030 has commenced. Pre-draft public consultation was undertaken during summer 2023 and a draft plan has not yet been published.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

The following Natura 2000 sites are located in the vicinity of the proposed development site:

- The Slaney River Valley Special Area of Conservation, approximately 270m north of the site.
- The Wexford Harbour and Slobbs Special Protection Area, approximately 270m north of the site.

5.4. EIA Screening

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- Development was not carried out in accordance with permitted development PA20190495, ABP304730-19 and has been the subject of enforcement action.
- The development exceeds the permitted bulk and height with an unauthorised additional basement floor and adversely impacts on the appellants' residential amenity and interferes with the enjoyment of their property.
- Concern in relation to overbearing/ visual obtrusion, overshadowing and overlooking impacts.
- Work has been carried out to prepare for a future window on the north elevation and concern over possible future overlooking impacts.
- Unauthorised window on the eastern elevation can be opened and has overlooking impact.
- Condition 3(a) of ABP304730 required that a hedge be planted along the rear boundary. The hedge was damaged during construction and on agreement a wall was constructed in its place. The wall should form part of any permission.
- Note refusal of permission under PA20180112, ABP 301505-18.
- Lighting installed to the exterior of the building impacts on their property.

6.2. Applicant Response

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

- The constructed dwelling is in line with the original planning intent as granted.
- The original planning drawings did not take account of the topography of this steep sloping site.
- Alterations were necessary for compliance with the Building Regulations.

- The first floor rear window referred to by the appellants has not been constructed and there is no intention to install a window.
- The height of the house is as per the granted drawings. No levels were provided for the dwelling under the permission.
- The basement referred to by the appellants is an under-croft.
- The house is not overbearing, does not overshadow the appellants property and does not injure residential amenity.

6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

None

6.4. **Observations**

None

7.0 **Assessment**

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

- Principle of development
- Residential amenity
- Boundary treatments

7.2. **Principle of development**

7.2.1. Permission was granted and carried out under PA20190495 (ABP 304730-19) for the demolition of a single dwelling and for the construction of two dwellings on a larger site that encompasses the subject dwelling on the appeal site and the site of the adjoining single storey house to the east. The subject dwelling was not constructed in accordance with the permission. Enforcement action was undertaken

by the planning authority and the subject application has been made to regularise the constructed development.

- 7.2.2. The appellants have raised that the development is the subject of an Enforcement Notice. In this respect, I note that any matters relating to enforcement fall under the jurisdiction of the planning authority. The application is for the retention of the as built house and will be considered on its merits.
- 7.2.3. The site is located within the built up urban area of Wexford town and I note the provisions of Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028 including objective TV43, TV44 and sections 2.6 and 3.4 of the Development Management Manual which aim to promote infill development including more intensive development subject to the protection of amenities, appropriate design and ensuring that the scale reflects the characteristics of the area.
- 7.2.4. Noting the planning history of the site including the grant of permission under ABP 304730-19 I consider that the principle of the construction of the house on the site is established. Drawings are submitted showing the permitted and as built developments and I note that that in broad terms, the constructed house is similar to the permitted house in design, layout and scale. The constructed house has a floor area of 258sqm which is larger than the permitted house of 206sqm. Permission is sought for revisions to the site boundaries however the curtilage of the as built house is as per the permitted and is acceptable.

7.3. Residential amenity

- 7.3.1. The main issues of contention raised in the appeal relate to the alterations carried out during construction and to the impacts of these on the amenity of adjoining property. The appeal has been submitted by the residents of the adjoining house to the northeast 12 Rose Park who have raised concerns principally in relation to overbearing and visual intrusion, overlooking and overshadowing impacts.

7.3.2. Overbearing / visual obtrusion

- 7.3.3. The submitted drawings show the differences between the permitted development and the as built development. The site layout and footprint of the constructed development is similar to that permitted with the drawings showing that the footprint is extended slightly towards the front, rear and western boundaries. The elevation

and section drawings show that the permitted development comprises a 2.5 storey house with upper and lower ground floors split over two levels and with a first floor over the upper ground level so that the house is two storey at road level and single storey at a lower level at the rear which includes a small open undercroft. The as built elevation shows the same arrangement of floors across the levels.

- 7.3.4. The drawings show that the constructed house has a ground to ridge height of 6.3m to the road, a total ground to ridge height of 7.8m and a ground to ridge height of 3.4m at the single storey rear block. It is indicated on the elevation drawings that the ridge level of the constructed two storey block is as per the permitted level at 34.0. The applicant notes that there is no finished floor level indicated on the permitted drawings however a spot level on the driveway has been used as a basis for a permitted floor level. I consider that the applicants rationale is reasonable. The drawings show that the ridge level of the constructed rear single storey block is substantially as per the permitted height of +29.6 and has a slightly lower floor level extending a further c 0.3m lower than permitted (as measured from the drawings), however I do not consider these differences to be significant. I therefore consider that the height of the constructed house relative to surrounding properties is similar to that permitted.
- 7.3.5. In terms of bulk, the depth of the first floor has been increased from 6.7m length permitted to 8.9m constructed, thereby increasing the depth of this element of the structure by a further 2.2m and bringing the rear elevation of this first floor closer to the rear boundary in the direction of number 12 Rose Park. The distance between the northeast corner of this first floor block and the nearest southwest corner of the dwelling 12 Rose Park is 15.5m. At lower ground level, there is a distance of c 10.5m between the two properties. There is a difference in ground levels with the land to the rear of the site falling so that 12 Rose Park is at a much lower level than the constructed house.
- 7.3.6. Having visited the site, I am satisfied that the lower ground level of the constructed house is only partially visible from the garden of 12 Rose Park and is not visually obtrusive. The first floor is highly visible and bulky as viewed from 12 Rose Park, attributed to its height above the level of Rose Park and due its size and contemporary flat roof block design including the expanse of blank northern façade which has a width of 11.2m. That said, the constructed development is similar to that

permitted with the main difference being that the first floor is extended a further c 2m beyond that permitted. Having regard to the differing orientations of the two houses and to the good separation distance between them including the urban context of the location, I do not consider that the house results in an overbearing impact on 12 Rose Park or on any other adjoining properties.

- 7.3.7. The building is currently unpainted grey plaster and this present a poor visual impression. In their further information response to the planning authority, the applicants submitted proposals to paint panels on the façade walls. I consider that the appearance of the block could be improved significantly through painting. The introduction of painted panels would help break the monotony of the façade and would improve the visual appearance of the house as viewed from the surrounding area. Photomontages are submitted however no detailed drawings are submitted and should permission be granted a condition should be submitted for the agreement of these details.
- 7.3.8. Overall, I consider that, subject to a condition for the painting of the façade, that the bulk and height of the dwelling is acceptable and does not result in visual intrusion or have an overbearing impact on the adjoining properties.
- 7.3.9. In relation to the planning history of the site, I note that the refusal of permission under PA20180112, ABP301505. I note that the siting and design of the dwellings previously refused differs with the current proposal. The refused houses were two storey pitched roofs located closer to the northern boundary whereas the permitted and constructed house is a split level house with flat roof and is a design more appropriate to addressing the level differences across the site and with a setback of the two storey part of the structure from the northern boundary.
- 7.3.10. Overlooking
- 7.3.11. A window has been installed at the eastern elevation of the first floor. The window is c 2m from the shared eastern boundary. The applicants have confirmed that it is fitted with opaque glass and a restrictor to allow the window not open outward of the plastered reveal. The appellants have submitted a photograph showing the window opened. I am satisfied that the window overlooks the adjoining single storey house to the east and is due to height above Rose Park, affords a new level of overlooking of 12 Rose Park. However subject to a condition for the installation of a top only

opening window with opaque glass, there would be no overlooking impacts. Should permission be granted it is recommended that a condition be attached to require the replacement of the existing window with a top opening window only with opaque glass.

7.3.12. The appellants have submitted a photograph showing that measures at construction stage including installation of window head and laying of blocks, allow for the installation of a future window on the first floor north elevation. I am satisfied that there is no window currently in place and therefore there is no current overlooking.

7.3.13. Overshadowing

7.3.14. As referenced above, the ridge height of the constructed house is substantially as per the permitted development. The depth of the first floor has been extended by 2.2m however the overall footprint is pushed slightly forward. Having regard to permitted development including the orientation of the constructed house and to the good separation distance, I am satisfied that the proposed house would not result in significant overshadowing of 12 Rose Park. The adjoining property to the east is closer however again I do not consider that any impacts would be significantly greater than that already permitted.

7.3.15. External lighting

7.3.16. The appellants have raised issue with the external lighting attached to the external façade of the house. Due to the height difference I accept that any external lighting has potential to impact on adjoining properties. Should permission be granted a condition should be attached requiring lighting be cowled so as not to overspill any adjoining properties.

7.4. Boundary treatments

7.4.1. Under PA 20190495, ABP304730, a condition was attached requiring that a 1.2m high stone wall be constructed from the reused stone of the original wall of the site. The constructed wall is treated with the original stone however is taller than that permitted at 1.6m. The applicants state that a higher wall is required for privacy. Having regard to design and the character of the area, I consider that the wall is acceptable on visual grounds. The wall is setback from the roadside boundary and a new footpath is to be constructed along the boundary and I consider that the

increased height does not raise new significant traffic safety concerns in terms of sightlines from the entrance.

- 7.4.2. Condition 3(a) required that a line of trees along the boundary to 12 Rose Park is to be supplemented with hedge planting. During construction, the original boundary planting was damaged and removed and a new wall was constructed in its place, in agreement with the owners of 12 Rose Park. This new boundary is acceptable. The introduction of additional planting on the site would aid the assimilation of the building into the area. The planning authority attached a condition requiring additional landscaping be undertaken and should permission be granted I recommend that a similar condition be attached.

8.0 AA 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 not located within or adjacent to any European Site. The closest European Site, part of the Natura 2000 network, is the Slaney River Valley Special Area of Conservation and the Wexford Harbour and Slobbs Special Protection Area located c 270m to the north of the proposed development.
- 8.3. The proposed development is located in a central urban area and comprises retention of alterations to a dwelling.
- 8.4. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the proposed development I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any appreciable effect on a European Site.
- 8.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- the nature of the proposed development for alterations to a permitted house,
 - the location of the development in a serviced urban area,
 - distance from the European site network and
 - absence of ecological or hydrological pathways to a European site.

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

9.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be granted for subject to the conditions as outlined below.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Wexford County Development Plan 2022-2028, the planning history of the site, including permitted development, and the nature and scale of the development to be retained, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the development would not seriously injure the residential amenities of the area, would not result in traffic hazard, would not unduly impact on the visual amenities of the area, and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

1.	<p>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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The development shall be amended as follows:</p> <p>(a) The first floor window on the eastern elevation shall be replaced with a window that is top opening only and is installed with obscure glass.</p>

	<p>(b) The façade shall be painted in full and shall incorporate painted panels to provide visual breaks in the façade walls.</p> <p>(c) External lighting shall be installed so as to avoid light spill or glare on adjoining properties.</p> <p>Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>The agreed works shall be completed within six months of the date of this permission.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.</p>
3.	<p>The site shall be landscaped in accordance with a comprehensive scheme of landscaping, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority within three months of the date of this permission. This scheme shall include a plan to scale of not less than [1:500] showing –</p> <p>(a) the species, variety, number, size and locations of all proposed trees and shrubs and</p> <p>(b) a timescale for implementation.</p> <p>All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from planting, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity</p>
4.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the</p>

	<p>area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.</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.

Aisling Mac Namara
Planning Inspector

14th January 2024

Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála	320669-24		
Case Reference			
Proposed Development Summary	Permission for retention of alterations during construction to a fully serviced detached dwelling house and change of site boundaries to previously granted PA20190495 (ABP304730-19)		
Development Address	Stonybatter, Wexford		
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	Tick if relevant and proceed to Q2.
		No	Tick if relevant. 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)?			
Yes		State the Class here.	Proceed to Q3.
No	x		No further action required
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes		State the relevant threshold here for the Class of development.	EIA Mandatory EIAR required

No			Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes		State the relevant threshold here for the Class of development and indicate the size of the development relative to the threshold.	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)

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

Inspector: _____
Aisling Mac Namara

Date: 14th January 2024