



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP321728-25

Development

The provision of 1 no car parking space to the rear, enlargement of existing pedestrian gate to form a new vehicular entrance to the rear off Petty Lane, and all associated ancillary, landscaping and site development works.

Location

15, Newbridge Avenue, Sandymount, Dublin 4, D04 P8F7.

Planning Authority

Dublin City Council.

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

WEB1593/24

Applicants

Myles & Rupee O'Grady.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Refusal of permission.

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant

Myles & Rupee O'Grady.

Observer

None

Date of Site Inspection

18th March 2025.

Inspector

Derek Daly

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located in the southeastern suburb of Sandymount in Dublin city and fronts onto the northern side of Newbridge Avenue. On the site is a mid-terrace two storied redbrick dwelling with a front garden area with a vehicular entrance and an off street parking area to the front of the dwelling. There are two mature trees in the front garden. The front boundary aside from the vehicular access point is defined by a railing over a stone plinth.
- 1.2. The site also has a rear access from Petty Lane and has a pedestrian access onto this road. There are a large number of mews type dwellings with frontage onto both sides of Petty Lane including properties which originally had sites extending from Newbridge Avenue to Petty Lane and which also have a vehicular access onto Petty Lane. Petty Lane itself is relatively narrow but has sufficient width for two vehicles to pass. There are double yellow lines along both sides of Petty Lane.
- 1.3. The appeal site does not currently have a vehicular access onto Petty Lane but as already indicated the vast majority of the properties onto Petty Lane do have vehicular accesses.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development as initially received by the planning authority on the 15th May 2024 is the provision of 1 no car parking space to the rear, the enlargement of existing pedestrian gate to form a new vehicular entrance to the rear off Petty Lane, and all associated ancillary, landscaping and site development works.
- 2.2. Following a request of further information details submitted and dated the 18th November 2024 indicates the proposed rear access and that the existing off-street parking in the front of the property are to be retained.
- 2.3. A planning report submitted with the further information contended the proposal does not solely promote the use of the car within the city in this instance and will not increase the number of vehicles used by No. 15 Newbridge Avenue, it will solely provide more convenience in day-to-day life and an alternative access point. The applicant continues to propose to retain the existing off street parking and create a

second vehicular access from Petty Lane to the rear. The rear vehicular entrance will allow for bicycle and motorcycle access, alternative access for delivery drivers, an EV charging point to the rear and ease of use to accommodate another car parking space on site.

2.4. In terms of the width, the previously proposed 3.2 metres entrance is now reduced to 3 metres.

2.5. The report also refers to precedents in relation to similar proposals

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. The decision of the Planning Authority was to refuse planning permission. On reason was stated;

The proposal for the creation of a second vehicular access from Petty Lane to serve a single family dwelling to the rear of the property when an existing entrance is available within the front garden is contrary to Policy SMT27 (i) (Car Parking in Residential and Mixed use Developments) which seeks to provide for sustainable levels of car parking and car storage in residential schemes in accordance with development plan car parking standards, Volume 2, Appendix 5 so as to promote city centre living and reduce the requirement for car parking. The creation of an additional vehicular access promotes the use of the private car and would be contrary to SMT1 (Modal Shift and Compact Growth) where it is policy to promote modal shift from private car use towards increased use of more sustainable forms of transport. On this basis, the proposed would therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area and set an undesirable precedent for similar developments in the city.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The planning report dated the 10th July-2024 refers to the provisions of the current County Development Plan (CDP); the planning history of the site, an assessment of

the proposal referring to particular provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022 and that the proposed development is acceptable in principle. The report notes the report received from Transportation Planning Division. Further Information was recommended in relation to indicating if they are proposing to remove the vehicular access to the front. In this regard the applicant is requested to provide details on the preferred vehicular access point and parking to this dwelling. If the applicant decides to seek permission for the rear access and parking, the applicant should submit revised drawings showing the removal of the front vehicular entrance and replace it with a pedestrian access only.

- 3.2.2. The planning report dated the 16th December 2024 assessed the further information received and considered the additional entrance will facilitate additional car parking on site which is considered to be excessive. Refusal of permission was recommended.

3.3. Other Planning Authority reports

- 3.3.1. The Transportation Planning Division's (TPD) dated 25th of June 2024 refers to;

Petty Lane is not taken in charge by Dublin City Council. Petty lane can be accessed from Lansdowne Village and Newbridge Avenue. There is a number of garages/vehicular entrances with access off the lane providing secondary access to dwellings fronting onto Lansdowne Village and Newbridge Avenue. A number of Mews dwellings are also noted on the laneway. The laneway is a shared surface with double yellow lines. This Division has concerns with the principal of multiple vehicular entrances serving a single property. While it is policy to promote family friendly living in the city it is not intended to promote the use of the car within the city and the provision of a second vehicular entrance is considered excessive, especially when the applicant removed P&D parking along Newbridge Avenue under 3581/11. The applicant should be requested to decide whether to keep the front or rear access, as excessive in-curtilage access and parking for a single dwelling is not supported. The laneway is noted as c. 6.50m at the proposed entrance. Given the width of the laneway and the parking restrictions in place a 3.20m entrance is considered excessive. The proposed width should be reduced to 3m, the maximum standard within the Development Plan.

The Transportation Planning Division's (TPD) dated 29th November 2024 in response to the further information received refers to;

Dwg. 2016-P-11B shows the proposed rear access and Dwg. 2016-P-10B shows the existing off-street parking in the front of the property to be retained. The Response to Request for Further Information by Hughes Planning & Development Consultants notes that; Therefore, it is contended the proposal does not solely promote the use of the car within the city in this instance. The proposal will not increase the number of vehicles used by No. 15 Newbridge Avenue, it will solely provide more convenience in day-to-day life and an alternative access point. The applicant continues to propose to retain the existing off street parking and create a second vehicular access from Petty Lane to the rear. Although the applicant suggests that the secondary access would not increase car usage, the provision of additional vehicular access points inherently promotes private car dependency and detracts from efforts to encourage sustainable modes of transport. The proposal for the creation of a second vehicular access from Petty Lane to serve a single family dwelling is contrary to Policy SMT27 (i) (Car Parking in Residential and Mixed use Developments) which seeks to provide for sustainable levels of car parking and car storage in residential schemes in accordance with development plan car parking standards, Volume 2, Appendix 5 so as to promote city centre living and reduce the requirement for car parking. The creation of an additional vehicular access promotes the use of the private car and would be contrary to SMT1 (Modal Shift and Compact Growth) where it is policy to promote modal shift from private car use towards increased use of more sustainable forms of transport. On this basis, the proposed would therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area and set an undesirable precedent for similar developments in the city. It is noted that the property benefits from an existing pedestrian gate to the rear which can provide access to the proposed cycle parking area and that the property benefits from a vehicular access to the front which was permitted in 2011. Recommendation: Refusal.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. P.A Ref. No 3581/11.

4.1.1. Permission granted for the demolition of the existing single storey extensions to the rear and for the widening of the pedestrian access to create a vehicular access and off street parking to the front of the house. Condition 2 indicated that a maximum of 1 private motor vehicle shall be parked in the front garden area on the proposed car parking area shown on the lodged drawings. The proposed landscaping and planting shown on the lodged drawings shall be carried out within 6 months of the initial use of the car parking area. Reason: To control development and to protect the residential and visual amenities of adjoining properties.

4.1.2. P.A. Ref. No 2839/21

Permission granted for the removal of part of the existing single storey extension to rear, construction of new single storey extension to rear, conversion of the attic to habitable accommodation, provision of 2 no new rooflights to rear, modifications to rear facade and all associated ancillary, conservation, landscaping and site development works.

5.0 Policy and Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1. The statutory development plan is the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.

5.1.2. The subject site has the land zoning Z1 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods with the objective 'To protect, provide and improve residential amenities'.

5.1.3. Chapter 8 refers to Sustainable Movement and Transport and it is indicated that it is the Policy of Dublin City Council in policy SMT1 Modal Shift and Compact Growth *To continue to promote modal shift from private car use towards increased use of more sustainable forms of transport such as active mobility and public transport, and to work with the National Transport Authority (NTA), Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) and other transport agencies in progressing an integrated set of transport objectives to achieve compact growth.*

5.1.4. Policy SMT25 in relation to On-Street Parking indicates it is the policy to *manage on-street car parking to serve the needs of the city alongside the needs of residents, visitors, businesses, kerbside activity and accessible parking requirements, and to facilitate the re-organisation and loss of spaces to serve sustainable development*

targets such as in relation to, sustainable transport provision, greening initiatives, sustainable urban drainage, access to new developments, or public realm improvements.

- 5.1.5. Policy SMT27 (i) in relation to Car Parking in Residential and Mixed Use Developments seeks to *provide for sustainable levels of car parking and car storage in residential schemes in accordance with development plan car parking standards, Volume 2, Appendix 5 so as to promote city centre living and reduce the requirement for car parking.*
- 5.1.6. Policy SMT29 in relation to Expansion of the EV Charging Network seeks to *support the expansion of the EV charging network by increasing the provision of designated charging facilities for Electric Vehicles on public land and private developments in partnership with the ESB and other relevant stakeholders; and to support the Dublin Regional EV Parking Strategy.*
- 5.1.7. Volume 2, Appendix 5 'Transport and Mobility: Technical Requirements' refers to;
- 4.0 Car Parking Standards indicates

4.0 Car Parking Standards Parking is an integral element of overall land-use and transportation policy within the City, and the purpose of the parking standards set out in Table 2 is to ensure that an appropriate level of parking is provided to serve all new development. In relation to car parking standards the site is within Parking Zone 3. Table 2 outlines maximum car parking standards for various land uses indicating for houses apartments/ duplexes of 1 per dwelling in parking zone 3.

It is also indicated that there is a predisposition to consider residential off-street car parking, subject to design and safety criteria, particularly along Core Bus Corridors (CBCs) and to facilitate traffic management proposals. However, proposals for off-street parking in the front gardens of single dwellings in predominantly residential areas will not be permitted where residents are largely reliant on on-street car parking and there is a strong demand for such parking. Residential parking spaces are mainly to provide for car storage to support family friendly living policies in the City. It is not intended to promote the use of the car within the City. Car parking for housing developments can be provided in the form of on street or curtilage car parking. In all new developments, where car parking is provided within the curtilage

of a dwelling, the car parking should not dominate the front garden and should be discrete, set within the landscaping features.

Section 4.1 On Street Parking

Public on-street parking is a necessary facility for shoppers and business premises and is necessary for the day-to-day functioning of the city. Dublin City Council will preserve available on-street parking, where appropriate. There will be a presumption against the removal of on-street parking spaces to facilitate the provision of vehicular entrances to single dwellings in predominantly residential areas where residents are largely reliant on on-street car-parking spaces or where there is a demand for public parking serving other uses in the area.

Section 4.3 'Parking in Front Gardens': states that: *'Planning Permission is required for the alteration of a front garden in order to provide car parking by creating a new access, or by widening of an existing access. Proposals for off-street parking in the front gardens of single dwellings in mainly residential areas may not be permitted where residents rely on on-street car parking and there is a strong demand for such parking.'*

Section 4.3.1 'Dimensions and Surfacing': states that:

Vehicular entrances shall be designed to avoid creation of a traffic hazard for passing traffic and conflict with pedestrians. Where a new entrance onto a public road is proposed, the Council will have regard to the road and footway layout, the impact on on-street parking provision (formal or informal), the traffic conditions on the road and available sightlines. 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. Where a shared entrance for two residential dwellings is proposed, this width may increase to a maximum of 4 metres.

The basic dimensions to accommodate the footprint of a car within a front garden are 3 metres by 5 metres. It is essential that there is also adequate space to allow for manoeuvring and circulation between the front boundary and the front of the building.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.3. The subject site is within and not proximate to any European site.

5.4. EIA Screening

5.5. The proposed development is not one to which Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended, applies and therefore, the requirement for submission of an EIAR and carrying out of an EIA may be set aside at a preliminary stage.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. The first party appeal in summary refers to;

- The appeal grounds set out the rationale of the proposed development referring to providing a safe and secure location for high quality EV charging.
- There are issues with accommodating two parking spaces in the front garden and a previous planning permission precludes using the front garden for more than one vehicle.
- Having an additional parking space at the rear will remove the need to acquire an on street parking permit freeing up parking on the street for others.
- Many of the dwellings on Newbridge Avenue have front and rear car parking and vehicular entrances.
- Petty Lane is a residential street with mews houses and full vehicular access.
- Many properties on Newbridge Avenue have two parking spaces in the front garden area.
- The proposal will provide for ease of access for a vehicle and can be used for access by service vehicles and provision of an EV facility and also eliminate looking for an additional space in the front garden area and retaining mature trees in the front garden area.

- The proposal does not propose the removal of on street parking.
- The width of the vehicular access has in the further information response been reduced to 3 metres to comply with development plan requirements.
- The development will not increase the use of traffic using the site and result in increased reliance on cars and will improve the residential amenity of the existing dwelling.
- The proposal will improve ease of movement and security and less disruption in relation to the existing dwelling.
- The DCP provisions facilitate the provision of EV charging on public and private lands and there are no charging points on Newbridge Avenue.
- Reference is made precedence and that every site has including mews properties have vehicular access onto the southern side of Petty Lane other than the appeal site.
- The precedence is outlined in the submission in relation to permissions granted to the front and rear granted by the planning authority.

6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

The planning authority in a response dated the 7th February 2025 requests the Board to confirm its decision and if permission is granted to include a condition requiring the payment of a section 48 development contribution.

7.0 **Assessment**

- 7.1. The main issues in this appeal are principle of the development and the grounds of appeal. Appropriate Assessment also needs to be considered. I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise.

The issues are addressed under the following headings:

- The principle of the development
- Grounds of appeal.

7.2. **The principle of the development.**

- 7.2.1. The proposal as submitted is for the provision of 1 no car parking space to the rear, the enlargement of existing pedestrian gate to form a new vehicular entrance to the rear off Petty Lane, and all associated ancillary, landscaping and site development works.

The provision of a parking space and the enlargement of a pedestrian gate to form a vehicular entrance is acceptable in principle subject to consideration of on-site characteristics and an assessment in the context of the current development plan provisions.

7.3. Grounds of appeal

- 7.3.1. The primary issue raised in the appeal relates to the stated reason for refusal of the application which in effect is an objection to the creation of a second vehicular access on the site to serve a single family dwelling when an existing entrance is available within the front garden and is therefore contrary to Policy SMT27 (i) which seeks to provide for sustainable levels of car parking and car storage in residential schemes in accordance with development plan car parking standards. Reference in the decision to refuse also refers to Volume 2, Appendix 5 so as to promote city centre living and reduce the requirement for car parking and that the creation of an additional vehicular access promotes the use of the private car and would be contrary to SMT1 where it is policy to promote modal shift from private car use towards increased use of more sustainable forms of transport.
- 7.3.2. The first party appellants in the grounds of appeal refer to the rationale of the proposed development referring to providing a safe and secure location for high quality EV charging. Reference is made to issues with accommodating two parking spaces in the front garden and a previous planning permission precludes using the front garden for more than one vehicle.

Having an additional parking space at the rear will remove the need to acquire an on street parking permit freeing up parking on the street for others.

The grounds note that many of the dwellings on Newbridge Avenue have front and rear car parking and vehicular entrances and Petty Lane is a residential street with mews houses and full vehicular access and also that many properties on Newbridge Avenue have two parking spaces in the front garden area.

It is contended that the proposal will provide for ease of access for a vehicle and can be used for access by service vehicles and provision of an EV facility and also eliminate looking for an additional space in the front garden area and retaining mature trees in the front garden area and also that the proposal does not propose the removal of on street parking.

The width of the vehicular access has in the further information response been reduced to 3 metres to comply with development plan requirements.

The development will not increase the use of traffic using the site and result in increased reliance on cars and will improve the residential amenity of the existing dwelling and will improve ease of movement and security and less disruption in relation to the existing dwelling.

Reference is made to precedence and that every site has including mews properties have vehicular access onto the southern side of Petty Lane other than the appeal site and also in relation to permissions granted to the front and rear granted by the planning authority.

- 7.3.3. In relation to the properties fronting onto the northern side of Newbridge Avenue and also have frontage onto Petty Lane I noted that many of the properties have vehicular accesses onto both roads. There are also many mews properties on both sides of Petty Lane have individual vehicular access points.
- 7.3.4. The overall policy thrust in relation to promote modal shift from private car use towards increased use of more sustainable forms of transport as stated in the current development plan is reasonable.
- 7.3.5. Consideration of the provision of on-site vehicular parking in to some degree largely determined by site specific considerations in many cases there is only sufficient space to accommodate one vehicle on the site, in other sites shared spaces are made available and in other sites vehicles can only be accommodated on the road carriageway.
- 7.3.6. Specific to the appeal site there is currently one parking space permitted in the front garden area by way of a condition of a previous planning permission. It would be possible to provide two spaces but this would be possible by removal of trees on the front garden area and would require alterations to the front boundary, would aesthetically adversely impact on the visual appearance of the area and would be

contrary to the provisions of the city development plan which indicates that car parking should not dominate the front garden and should be discrete, set within the landscaping features which I consider to be reasonable.

- 7.3.7. The appeal site does however offer an alternative to additional front garden parking and street parking as it has street frontage onto Petty Lane. The vast majority of properties onto both sides of Petty Lane have vehicular access points and notwithstanding the provisions of the development plan given the specific site circumstances which has two road frontages I consider that a second vehicular access could be favourably considered.
- 7.3.8. I note references to precedent in the grounds of appeal and the cases stated are not identical to the current case but there is precedent in one case for a parking in both the front and rear of a property.
- 7.3.9. The creation of the vehicular access is onto a public road and as indicated most of the properties fronting onto Petty Lane have vehicular accesses. The issue of traffic hazard does not I consider arise as the carriageway width is sufficient to provide a safe entry and exit from the site onto the road carriageway and there is adequate width for the safe passing of vehicles. It is noted that the Transportation Planning Division of the Planning Authority did not raise any objection to the actual provision of a vehicular entrance recommending conditions including reduction in the overall width of the entrance which was addressed in the further information response.
- 7.3.10. To conclude I consider the provision of the rear vehicular access to be reasonable and preferable to additional front garden parking and would not necessarily militate against the overall policy thrust in relation to promote modal shift from private car use towards increased use of more sustainable forms of transport.
- 7.3.11. In permitting the development a grant of planning permission should provide for the reduction in width of the access to 3 metres as outlined in the revised details submitted by way of further information.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

- 8.1. I have considered the proposal for the provision of 1 no car parking space to the rear, the enlargement of existing pedestrian gate to form a new vehicular entrance to

the rear off Petty Lane, and all associated ancillary, landscaping and site development works in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is an established residential site.

- 8.2. The proposed development comprises in effect a relatively minor alteration and minimum development works as outlined in section 2 in the Inspectors report. 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 the development, the distance to designated sites and the absence of pathway to these sites.
- 8.3. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects and likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1. I recommend that permission be granted.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature of the proposed development, the scale of the development, the pattern of development in the area and the existing residential use on site and the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 it is considered that the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area of property in the vicinity and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

1.	(a) The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the drawings and particulars as received by the Planning Authority on the
----	---

	<p>15th day of May 2024 and in accordance with the drawings and particulars received by the Planning Authority on the 18th day of November 2024, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require points of detail to be agreed with the Planning Authority, these matters shall be the subject of written agreement and shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The proposal shall provide for t</p> <p>(a) the continuing use of the front garden area of existing dwelling with a maximum of one off street car parking space.</p> <p>(b) the entrance gateway serving the access onto Petty Lane shall be a maximum of 3 metres in width.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity and orderly development.</p>
3.	<p>Water supply and drainage requirements, including surface water collection and disposal, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure a proper standard of development.</p>
4.	<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.</p> <p>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>
5.	<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</p>

	<p>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.

. Derek Daly
Planning Inspector

31st March 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	321728-25		
Proposed Development Summary	The provision of 1 no car parking space to the rear, enlargement of existing pedestrian gate to form a new vehicular entrance to the rear off Petty Lane, and all associated ancillary, landscaping and site development works.		
Development Address	15, Newbridge Avenue, Sandymount, Dublin 4, D04 P8F7.		
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	Tick if relevant and proceed to Q2.	
	No X	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	Tick/or leave blank	State the Class here.	Proceed to Q3.

No X	Tick or leave blank		Tick if relevant. No further action required
---------------------------	---------------------------	--	--

3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?

Yes	Tick/or leave blank	State the relevant threshold here for the Class of development.	EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No X	Tick/or leave blank		Proceed to Q4

4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?

Yes	Tick/or leave blank	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	Screening determination remains as above (Q1 to Q4)
Yes	Tick/or leave blank	Screening Determination required

Inspector: Derek Daly Date: 31st March 2025