



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-321784-25

Development

Section 254 license for the installation of an 18m dual operator pole, associated equipment together with ground-based equipment cabinets and all associated site development works for wireless data and broadband services.

Location

Raheny Close, Lusk, (ITM E 722177 N: 754714), Co. Dublin

Planning Authority

Fingal County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

S254/04/24

Applicant(s)

Emerald Tower Limited

Type of Application

Licensing of appliances etc. (s. 254)

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse licence

Type of Appeal

First Party (s.254)

Appellant(s)

Emerald Tower Limited

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

23/4/25

Inspector

Ronan Murphy

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site has an area of c.8.82m² (1.8mx4.9m) on the northeastern pinch point of a triangular shaped piece of open space which is located c. 610m to the northeast of Lusk Town centre.
- 1.2. The surrounding area is mixed use in character with residential uses to the south and west (on the opposite side of Rathmore Road). In addition to this, there is an area of open space to the north and two schools to the northwest of the site.
- 1.3. The triangular shaped piece of open space is bound by a number of large mature trees along the western and southern boundaries, a number of less mature street trees planted at regular intervals along the footpath of Rathmore Road along its western boundary and Raheny Close along its northern boundary.
- 1.4. The triangular shaped piece of open space is slightly elevated from both Rathmore Road and Raheny Road and is currently planted with flowers and the grass would appear to be maintained.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. A Section 254 licence is sought for telecommunications infrastructure consisting of a 18m high freestanding galvanised and painted monopole which has a diameter of 0.406m. The monopole would include 2 no. 0.3m link dishes and 2 no. gps antennas.
- 2.2. The proposal includes two operator's cabinets which would be 1.3m wide, 1.3m deep, and 1.65m high.
- 2.3. The stated purpose of the proposed structure is to address mobile and mobile broadband coverage blackspots. The duration of licence sought is 5 years as per the application form.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1 The Planning Authority decided to refuse to licence the proposed development on 13th November 2024 for the following reason:

1. Having regard to the nature, height and location of the proposed development, situated on the approach road to two schools and abutting the boundary of an existing residential property, it is considered the proposed development would be seriously injurious to the visual and residential amenities of the area and thus, would be contrary to the 'RS' – 'Residential' land-use zoning and Objective IUO48 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

3.2.1.1 The area planners report dated 13th November 2024 notes that the appeal site is within the RS Zone and that the proposed development is neither permitted in principle nor not permitted under the zoning objective. The proposal is required to be assessed in terms of its contribution towards achieving the zoning objective.

3.2.1.2 The area planner classifies the site as being within a 'Transitional Zonal Area' having regard to lands on the opposite side of Raheny Close being zoned OS 'open space' and also 'CI' Community Infrastructure, with lands to the northwest being zoned RU Rural.

3.2.1.3 The area planner's report notes that the *Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029* acknowledges that economic benefits and supports the provision of ICT infrastructure. However, the applicant has not demonstrated that alternative sites have been considered. The area planner outlines concerns in relation to the visual impact of the location of the proposed ICT infrastructure in proximity to a residential boundary and in proximity to the Rush and Lusk Educate Together National School. Concerns are also outlined in relation to the impact of the proposal on the landscaping of the green area in which the proposal is located.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- **Water Services Department:** Report dated 26/8/24 outlining no objection.
- **Parks and Green Infrastructure Division:** Report dated 30/8/24 outlining no objection.
- **Transportation Planning Section:** Report dated 25/9/24 stating that the Transportation Planning Section's preference is for any proposed kiosks to be

recessed a minimum of 4.5m from the road edge to ensure that the proposal would not preclude any future potential upgrade of the road and active travel infrastructure.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1 **Uisce Eireann:** Report dated 7/11/24 outlining no objection, subject to condition.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1 No third-party observations have been received.

4.0 Planning History

Subject site

4.1 There is no planning history associated with the subject site.

Nearby

S254/12/22 / ABP-315428-22: Application on the public grass verge along the R127 Rathmore Road, Lusk, Co. Dublin (c. 285m to the north of the subject site) for Streetworks solution to address identified mobile and wireless broadband coverage blackspots. Permission refused. This decision was subject to a first party appeal to An Bord Pleanála who upheld the decision of the Planning Authority and refused permission for the following reason:

1. *Having regard to the provisions of section 254 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029 and the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures Guidelines (1996), as amended / updated by Circular Letters PL 07/12 and PL11/2020, it is considered that, the proposed development, by virtue of its siting on a grass verge between a narrow footpath and the road edge in an area zoned 'Open Space' and noting the existing street furniture on the site, would be prominent onto the public domain and would have an adverse impact on the visual amenities of the area and on the approach into Lusk Town and detract from the landscaping along the road because of the visual clutter presented by the two cabinets. The proposed development would be contrary to the relevant*

provisions of the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029 and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable of the area.

4.2 In addition to this above, I note that the following license applications are referred to in the first party appeal statement:

FW20A/0008/ ABP-307220-20: Application for the construction of telecommunications infrastructure comprising of; an 18-metre-high monopole with telecommunications equipment attached, and ancillary ground-based equipment, cabinets and fencing to the rear of Salmon's Public House Mountview Rd Coolmine Dublin 15. Permission refused. This decision was the subject of a first party appeal to An Bord Pleanála where the decision of Fingal County Council was overturned.

S254W/09/22 / ABP-315321-22: Application for Streetpole solution to address identified mobile and mobile broadband coverage blackspots on a public grass verge along Diswellstown Road, (ITM E = 706074.603, N = 737418.278, Porterstown, Dublin 15. Permission refused. This decision was the subject of a first party appeal to An Bord Pleanála where the decision of Fingal County Council was overturned.

S254/05/22/ABP-314937-22: Application for S254 licence for 18m freestanding streetpole solution, equipment cabinets and associated site works at public grass verge along the R106 Road (Swords Road), Malahide, Co. Dublin. Permission refused; this decision was subject to a first party appeal to An Bord Pleanála where this decision was overturned.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1 The *Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029* is the operational plan for the area. The appeal site is zoned 'RS' 'Residential' with the associated land use objective to 'Provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity.' The vision for lands zoned residential is to ensure that any new development in existing areas would have a minimal impact on and enhance existing residential amenity.

5.1.2 The following policies and objectives are pertinent:

IUP36 which seeks to facilitate the coordinated provision of telecommunications / digital connectivity infrastructure.

IUO48 which seeks to promote and facilitate the provision of high-quality ICT network and appropriate telecommunication infrastructure while protecting the amenities of urban and rural areas.

IUO52 which seeks to ensure that applications comply with the Guidance on the Potential Location of Overground Telecommunications on Public Roads 2015.

IUO53 which seeks to ensure a high-quality design of masts, towers, antennae, and other such telecommunications infrastructure.

IUO54 which seeks to support the appropriate use of existing assets for the deployment of telecoms equipment.

DMSO17 where possible new utility structures should not be forward of the front building line of buildings or open space.

DMSO18 Requires new utility structures to be of a high quality.

DMSO222 Requires co-location of antennae on existing support structures, where this is not possible documentary evidence of non-availability is required.

DMSO223 Encourages the location of telecommunications services at appropriate locations.

DMSO224 Requires the following information with respect to telecommunications structures at application stage:

- Compliance with the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures – Guidelines for Planning Authorities.
- Significance of the proposed development as part of a national telecommunications network.
- Indicate on a map, the location of all existing telecommunications structures within a 2 km radius of the proposed site, stating reasons why (if not proposed) it is not feasible to share existing facilities.
- The degree to which the proposal will impact on the amenities of occupiers of nearby properties, or the amenities of the area and the potential for mitigating visual impacts including low and mid-level landscape screening, tree-type

masts being provided where appropriate, colouring or painting of masts and antennae, and considered access arrangements.

- Ensure that when such licences are sought nearby property owners and occupiers are made aware of the application prior to Fingal County Council or An Bord Pleanála agreeing the licence.

Section 14.20.10: relates to Section 254 Licences and states that the planning authority will have regard to the impacts on public realm and visual amenity and Guidance on the Potential Location of Overground Telecommunications Infrastructure on Public Roads 2015.

It is also noted that a proposed route of the Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan runs along Raheny Close.

National Guidance

The Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DELG, July 1996)

The Guidelines state that the rapid expansion of mobile telephone services in Ireland has required the construction of base station towers in urban and rural areas across the country. This is an essential feature of all modern telecommunications networks. In many suburban situations, because of the low-rise nature of buildings and structures, a supporting mast or tower is needed.

Section 4.3 of the Guidelines refers to visual impact and states that only as a last resort, and if the alternatives are either unavailable or unsuitable, should free-standing masts be located in a residential area. If such a location should become necessary, sites already developed for utilities should be considered, and masts and antennae should be designed and adapted for the specific location. The proposed structure should be kept to the minimum height consistent with effective operation and should be monopole (or poles) rather than a latticed tripod or square structure.

The Guidelines also state that visual impact is among the more important considerations which should be considered in arriving at a decision for a particular application. In most cases, the Applicant will only have limited flexibility as regards selecting a location given the constraints arising from radio planning parameters, etc. Visual impact will, by definition, vary with the general context of the proposed development.

The Guidelines also state that some masts will remain quite noticeable despite best precautions. For example, local factors must be taken into account in determining the extent to which an object is noticeable or intrusive. This may include intermediate objects (buildings or trees), topography, the scale of the object in the wider landscape, the multiplicity of other objects in the wider panorama, the position of the object with respect to the skyline, weather, lighting conditions, etc. Softening of the visual impact can be achieved through a judicious choice of colour scheme and through the planting of shrubs, trees etc. as a screen or backdrop.

- Circular Letter PL 07/12 (DECLG, October 2012) revised elements of the Telecommunications Guidelines. It provides guidance to planning authorities on time limits, minimum separation distances, bonds, monitoring arrangements on health and safety and future development contributions.
- Circular Letter PL11/2020 ‘Telecommunications Services – Planning Exemptions and Section 254 Licences’ was issued in December 2020. It provides Planning Authorities advice on what works require approval under a section 254 licence, what overground works require a Section 254 Licence and exemptions for telecommunications infrastructure.

National Planning Framework (NPF) – Ireland 2040 Our Plan, 2018.

This document is a planning framework to guide development and investment over the coming years. The companion to this document is the National Development Plan, a ten-year strategy for public capital investment of almost €116 Billion.

National Strategic Outcome 5 - A Strong Economy Supported by Enterprise, Innovation and Skills states that: “Data innovation is recognised as important for future growth. Harnessing the potential of the data economy can bring considerable benefits in terms of productivity, new services and knowledge creation. It is also recognised that emerging disruptive technology and innovation has the potential to accelerate the delivery of NPF National Strategic Outcomes. In the short term, opportunities provided by access to high quality broadband services will be fully exploited through the roll-out of the State intervention segment of the National Broadband Plan, delivering a step-change in digital connectivity and ensuring that coverage extends to remoter areas including villages, rural areas and islands”.

Updated National Planning Framework April 2025

National Strategic Outcome 6 states that ‘The practical impact of digitalisation will only increase in the years ahead and this will pose both opportunities and challenges which will require a coherent and informed policy response’. It further states that ‘in the short term, opportunities provided by access to high quality broadband services will be fully exploited through the roll-out of the State intervention segment of the National Broadband Plan, delivering a step-change in digital connectivity and ensuring that coverage extends to remoter areas including villages, rural areas and islands’.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1 There are no designated sites in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. The closest sites are Rogerstown Estuary SAC, Rogerstown Estuary SPA and the Rogerstown Estuary pNHA which are located c.2.1km to the southeast of the site. A watercourse (Palmerstown River) is approx. 33m north of the appeal site, this river flows south and east to the estuary but there is no direct connection thereto. This will be discussed in further detail within Section 8.0 below.

5.3. EIA Screening

5.3.1 The proposed development is not a class of development set out in Schedule 5, Part 1 or Part 2 of the Planning and Development Regulation 2001 (as amended) and therefore no preliminary examination is required. Please see From 1.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1 A first party appeal has been lodged by Entrust Limited on behalf of Emerald Tower Limited. The main grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The site is the optimal solution for the location of a street pole as it is within an existing road corridor where these types of structures are an expected streetscape element within the urban context.

- The site is located to have minimal visual impact on the residents of the area, being located within an urban streetscape environment, sited alongside mature trees and vegetation. Given the level of screening, there would be no significant impacts on residential amenity.
- The appearance of the structure would not seriously impact on the visual or residential amenity of the area, nor would it be an obtrusive feature impacting on the nearby schools. The proposed height, colour and design represent the best compromise between visual impact of the proposed development on the surrounding area and meeting the technical requirements for the site and would provide a service for EIR initially and a second operator on a single structure as opposed to two separate structures.
- The orientation and arrangement of dwellings to the west (Bramble Way and Huntsman Way) means that none of these dwellings would front directly onto the appeal site, minimising any visual or amenity impacts.
- An alternative site assessment and sequential approach was taken to choosing a suitable site within the Lusk search ring area in accordance with the *Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029* and the 1996 Government guidelines. Every effort was made to find a co-location solution and as this was not possible a new site was sought. This appeal site represented the optimum solution.
- An Bord Pleanála have granted permission for ICT structures within residential areas and in proximity to schools.
- The proposal would ensure high speed, reliable communication networks to the surrounding area. The proposal strikes a good balance between environmental impact and operational considerations.
- The site maybe in the RS zone but due to its location on a junction, adjacent to roadways it is assumed that the site would not be used for residential or open space purposes.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- 6.2.1 Letter dated 24/2/25 stating that the Planning Authority has no further comment to make and An Bord Pleanála is requested to uphold the decision of the Planning

Authority. If the appeal is successful then provision should be made for conditions relating to financial contributions to the Local Authority.

6.3. Observations

6.3.1 There are no observations on file.

6.4. Further Responses

6.4.1 There are no further responses on file.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having examined the appeal details and all other documentation on file, including submissions and responses, the report of the local authority and inspected the site. I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Site Selection (Alternatives Considered)
- Residential and Visual Impact
- Transport
- Appropriate Assessment

7.2 Principle of development

7.2.1 The appeal site is zoned RS' 'Residential' with the associated land use objective to *'Provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity.'* The vision for lands zoned residential is to ensure that any new development in existing areas would have a minimal impact on and enhance existing residential amenity.

7.2.2 Telecommunication structures are neither 'permitted in principle' nor 'not permitted' under the 'RS' zone and as such will be assessed in terms of their contribution towards the achievement of the Zoning Objective and Vision and its compliance and consistency with the policies and objectives of the Development Plan.

7.2.3 In view of the emphasis placed in national and regional policy documents on the provision of adequate telecommunications including broadband and the fact that the policies and objectives of the current *Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029* also

support adequate telecommunication infrastructure, I consider the principle of the development to be acceptable.

7.3 Site Selection (Alternatives Considered)

- 7.3.1 This application has been made as the operator (Eir) require a site in this area in North Lusk to allow for the rollout 3G/4G and 5G networks as the current sites do not provide adequate indoor service or capacity for high-speed mobile broadband in the area.
- 7.3.2 The first party appeal statement states that there are network coverage gaps in the area. This is evidenced in Figures 3 and 4 within the first party appeal statement.
- 7.3.3 An analysis of alternative sites along Rathmore Road was carried out. This analysis determined that one alternative location was not feasible having regard to the clearance required from overhead electricity lines. A second alternate location was deemed too far from Rathmore Road and would be contrary to the requirement of the Section 254 licence pre-requisites.
- 7.3.4 In terms of potential co-location, the first party appeal shows that there are 3 existing telecommunications facilities in the general area of the subject site but all three are outside the search ring. None of these sites were considered to be suitable due to their location outside the search ring and therefore could not meet the technical coverage requirements of this proposal.
- 7.3.5 I have examined the Comreg Outdoor Coverage Mapping for 3G, 4G and 5G network coverage for the area. Eir's coverage for 3G and 5G is rated as very good, but there is a slight drop off to good for 4G coverage.
- 7.3.6 In summary, detailed technical justification has been provided by the Applicant demonstrating that there are service deficiencies in the area, which would be resolved by the proposed development.
- 7.3.7 The proposal is consistent with Objectives **IUO48, IUO52 and IUO53** of the *Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029*. In addition to this, the proposal would be supported by the 1996 Guidelines, which require co-location of antennae on existing support structures, but that where this is not feasible to submit evidence of non-availability. I consider that the Applicant has submitted adequate justification detailing the non-availability of alternative site options, and that this is consistent with the requirements of national guidance.

7.4 Residential and Visual Impact

- 7.4.2 The Planning Authority's reason for refusal is due to the nature and height of the proposed telecommunications infrastructure and its impact on the visual and residential amenities of the area.
- 7.4.3 In broad terms, the *Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029* supports high quality telecommunications and digital connectivity infrastructure at appropriate locations. The appeal site is within a predominantly residential area with an area of open space to the north and community infrastructure zoning to the north-west. I acknowledge that the proposed development would, therefore, have some level of visual impact on the local environment by virtue of its height and potential for visual intrusion. As referenced in the 1996 Guidelines, sites such as these, and particularly those close to existing residential housing, are accepted as being particularly sensitive from a visual and residential amenity perspective.
- 7.4.4 The *Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029* (Objective IU053) seeks to ensure a high-quality design of masts, towers, antennae, and other such telecommunications infrastructure in the interests of visual amenity. Objective **DMS018** is also relevant in that it seeks to require new utility structures such as electricity substations and telecommunication equipment cabinets to be of a high-quality design and to be maintained to a high standard.
- 7.4.5 While I note the importance of ICT infrastructure and the support for such in *the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029*, the location of the proposed development is a key consideration in terms of its acceptability.
- 7.4.6 Regarding the schools to the north-east of the site the applicants state that the proposed development would be removed from the school and is not directly visible from the campus. The applicants contend that the proposal would not harm or impact on the amenity of the school. I acknowledge the area planners concerns with respect to the location of the proposed 18m high dual operator pole in relative proximity to the schools. In this regard, I refer the Board to Viewpoint 1 of the Photomontage report submitted with the initial application. While the 18m high dual operator pole is clearly visible, in my opinion it would not be visually obtrusive given its set back and as such would be acceptable.
- 7.4.7 Regarding the dwelling to the south-east of the site, I do have concerns relating to the impact of the structure on the visual amenities of this residential property. The

proposed 18m high dual operator pole would be set back c. 5m from the rear boundary of the property and c.38m from the side elevation of the dwelling.

7.4.8 While I accept that there is a tree buffer between the subject site and the site to the south-east, this tree buffer would only screen c.11m of the proposed 18m high dual operator pole. The upper 7m would not be screened. I refer the Board to drawing No. DN-2769-01-PD-03 which provides details in this regard.

7.4.9 Given the importance of ICT infrastructure, I acknowledge that a degree of flexibility is required in relation to the location of such infrastructure. However, in this case, I am of the opinion that the height of the proposed development in combination with its proximity to the site boundary would lead to a development which presents as an overly dominant feature that would constitute an overbearing feature in this setting. I note that the photomontage report does not include any viewpoint from this perspective which would have been helpful in this assessment.

7.4.10 In my opinion, the proposal would fail to achieve compliance with **Objective IUO48** of the *Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029* which seeks *inter alia* to support broadband connectivity within the County whilst protecting the amenities of urban and rural areas.

7.4.11 Given the importance of ICT infrastructure and the shape of the overall green area, the Board may consider relocating the proposed ICT infrastructure. However, in my opinion, any alteration in the location of the mast would be a material alteration which would be more appropriately assessed under a revised planning application, and which would allow third party consideration of any revised impacts arising.

7.5 Transport

7.5.1 In addition to this, I acknowledge that a proposed route of the GDA Cycle Network runs along Raheny Close. The report of Transportation Planning Section of Fingal County Council has requested that any cabinets associated with the proposed development be set back a minimum of 4.5m from the road edge to ensure that the proposal would not preclude any future upgrade of the road and active travel infrastructure. Should the Board be of a mind to grant planning permission, I recommend that a condition to address this matter be included.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1 I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The proposed development is located within an existing residential area in Lusk, Co. Dublin. The proposal comprises of a telecommunications mast and associated works.
- 8.2 The subject site is located over 2.1km from the Rogerstown Estuary SAC, Rogerstown Estuary SPA and the Rogerstown Estuary pNHA. There is no direct connection to any European (Natura 2000) sites, however, I note that a watercourse (Palmerstown River) is approx. 33m north of the appeal site, this river flows south and east to the estuary but there is no direct connection thereto.
- 8.3 While I note the location of the river and its connection to the Natura sites, I am satisfied that there would be no operational emissions to the European sites. However, should the Board be of a mind to grant planning permission then standard conditions would be required to ensure there would be no emissions to the river during the construction phase. Given the limited scale of the of construction I am satisfied that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise.
- 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. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The small scale of the proposal; and
 - The lack of any operational emissions to the European sites; and
 - The inclusions of appropriate construction phase conditions.
- 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

9.1 I recommend that planning permission should be refused for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures Guidelines for Planning Authorities issued by the Department of Housing, Planning and Local Government in 1996 (as updated by Circular Letter PL 07/12), the *Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029*, including Objectives **IUO48**, the height, scale and location of the proposed development in close proximity to the boundary of the dwelling to the south-east of the site, it is considered that the proposed development would be visually obtrusive and seriously injure the visual and residential amenities of the residential property to the south-east of the site. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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.

Ronan Murphy
Planning Inspector

2 May 2025

Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-321784-25
--	----------------------

Proposed Development Summary	Section 254 license for the installation of an 18m dual operator pole, associated equipment together with ground-based equipment cabinets and all associated site development works for wireless data and broadband services.		
Development Address	Raheny Close, Lusk, (ITM E 722177 N: 754714), Co. Dublin		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	
		No	X
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			
No	X		
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes		N/A not a class	
No		N/A not a class	Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes		N/A not a class	

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

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____