



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-322621-25

Development

Permission for a 2-storey over part basement maisonette. Includes redesigned pedestrian and vehicular entrances formed within the existing boundary wall.

Location

Site to the rear of 120 Rathfarnham Road, Terenure, Dublin D6W Y159

Planning Authority

Dublin City Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

3097/25

Applicant(s)

Michael and Eimear O'Doherty.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse Permission

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant(s)

Michael and Eimear O'Doherty.

Observer(s)

Frank and Mary Darcy

Padraig & Ciara Corrigan

Date of Site Inspection

17-07-2025.

Inspector

Adam Kearney

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject 0.012 Ha site is to the rear of an existing two-storey detached house at 120 Rathfarnham Road with side frontage onto Westbourne Road. The site is bounded to the east by No. 28 Westbourne Road (existing two-storey house with side garage) to the south by the rear garden of No. 122 Rathfarnham Road and to the west by the rear garden of the aforementioned 120 Rathfarnham Road which is under the ownership of the applicant and where access is via a gated vehicular entrance from Westbourne Road.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Applicants are seeking to construct a 2-storey over basement maisonette to the rear of their existing dwelling that fronts onto Rathfarnham Road. The proposal includes ground and first floor outdoor terraces and a basement courtyard, redesigned pedestrian and vehicular entrances formed within the existing boundary wall fronting Westbourne Road

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.2. Refuse Permission

3.2.1. Reasons

- 3.2.2. Reason 1: Having regard to the constrained nature of the site, the proposed development, by reason of the location of the main area of private open space to the front of the proposed new dwelling, below street level and facing north, and the location of Bedroom 2 below street level and also with a north facing aspect, the proposal would result in a poor standard of residential amenity to the proposed new dwelling, which would be contrary to the provisions of Section 15.11 , 15.13.3 and 15.13.4 of the current Dublin City Development Plan (2022-2028). The proposed development would constitute a substandard form of development which would seriously injure the amenities of the area, and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Reason 2: Having regard to the constrained nature of the site. the design of the proposed new dwelling and the inadequate separation from the rear elevation of No. 120 Rathfarnham Road, the proposed new dwelling would be out of keeping with the pattern and character of development in the area, and would result in an overbearing impact when viewed from the rear of No. 120 and from its rear garden, and from the rear garden of No. 122 Rathfarnham Road. The proposal would therefore be seriously injurious to the residential and visual amenities of the surrounding area and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.3. Planning Authority Reports

3.3.1. Planning Reports

3.3.2. The area planner's report

- Agreed with the principle of development of development given the Z1 Zoning
- Inaccuracies in Drawings (overstating the site area),
- Compliance with Standards (sub threshold plot ratio and substandard sub threshold open space),
- Impact on Residential and Visual Amenity and Access (concerns about overbearing nature and the structure being out of keeping),
- Movement and Parking (nonstandard parking space and proposed entrance at 5.6m wider than the stipulated standard of 4m for two dwellings sharing an access),

The planner ultimately recommended refusal and the PA decided to Refuse Permission

3.3.3. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Division: Report received recommending further information.
- Transportation: Report received recommending further information, primary concern regards sizing of parking space.

3.4. **Prescribed Bodies**

None

3.5. **Third Party Observations**

Two third party observations received from Observers to Appeal

4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. **Subject Site** - Planning Reference: 2573/06 - Permission granted for demolition of existing side garage, existing piers and widening of existing vehicular entrance from 3m to 4m with new stone piers and installation of new electro-automated hardwood panelled entrance gates for vehicular access, removal of existing pedestrian wrought iron gate with installation of hardwood panelled entrances gates for pedestrian access, hardwood fencing and wrought-iron railings to be erected to existing boundary wall to match existing at 120 Rathfarnham Road

4.2. **Adjacent** - Planning Reference: 3170/24 - Permission granted for retention of retaining wall consisting of gabion cages on a sloping bank on lands zoned Z9 in the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 to the south of No. 124 Rathfarnham Road, which was constructed on foot of permission reference ABP-306149-19 (Reg. Ref. 3316/19), and for completion of partially constructed outdoor steps, landscaping works and all ancillary site development works, on an overall site of 0.912ha.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **National Planning Framework**

Objective 7 – Deliver at least 40% of all new homes nationally, within the built-up footprint of existing settlements and ensure compact and sequential patterns of growth.

Objective 8 - Deliver at least half (50%) of all new homes that are targeted in the five Cities and suburbs of Dublin, Cork, Limerick, Galway and Waterford, within their existing built-up footprints and ensure compact and sequential patterns of growth.

5.2. Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028

- 5.2.1. The Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 came into effect on 14th December 2022. The site is in an area zoned Z1 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods, with the objective 'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities'.
- 5.2.2. Section 2.3 Settlement Strategy - Compact growth will be promoted throughout the city through appropriate infill development and consolidation of brownfield sites and targeted growth along key transport corridors.
- 5.2.3. Policy QHSN6 Urban Consolidation To promote and support residential consolidation and sustainable intensification through the consideration of applications for infill development, backland development, mews development, reuse/adaption of existing housing stock and use of upper floors, subject to the provision of good quality accommodation.
- 5.2.4. Policy QHSN10 Urban Density To promote residential development at sustainable densities throughout the city in accordance with the core strategy, particularly on vacant and/or underutilised sites, having regard to the need for high standards of urban design and architecture and to successfully integrate with the character of the surrounding area.
- 5.2.5. Section 15.11 – Defensible Space/Design of Open Space/Screening

Section 15.13.3 – sets out standards for Infill/Side Garden Housing Developments

Section 15.13.4 – Defines and sets out standards for Backland Housing

Section 4.3.1 of Appendix 5 – Car Parking Design Standard

5.3. S28 Guidelines

- 5.4. ***Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities: Design Guidelines***, Department of the Environment, Heritage, and Local Government, (2007)

5.5. ***Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities***, Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, (2024)

5.6. ***Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments*** (2025)

6.0 Natural Heritage Designations

6.1. There are no Natura 2000 sites within the boundary of the appeal site nor are there any Natura 2000 sites directly abutting the appeal site it or within the immediate context of the site. The closest sites and those within the zone of influence of the proposed development are:

- South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) – c. 5km to the east.
- South Dublin Bay & River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code 004024) - c. 5km to the east.

7.0 EIA Screening

7.1. The proposed development is for a single infill detached dwelling to the rear of an existing dwelling in an established urban area. Schedule 5, Part 2, Section 10(b)(i) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, lists the “Construction of more than 500 dwelling units’ as a Class of Development for the purposes of Part 10. As such, the proposed development is sub-threshold for the purposes of EIA. Having regard to the nature of this sub-threshold development, and the location of the site removed from sensitive locations or features it can be reasonably concluded that the proposed development would not be likely to have any real likelihood of significant effects on the environment either by itself or in conjunction with other developments. As such, no EIAR or screening for assessment is required. (See attached Appendix 1 Form 1 Pre-screening and Appendix 2 Form 2 Preliminary Examination).

8.0 The Appeal

8.1. First Party Grounds of Appeal

Summary of Main Points

- Questions the PA assertion that the site is constrained and asserts that 120m is sufficient site area to accommodate a dwelling
- The proposal is in line with the Z1 zoning
- The proposal is in line with national and regional planning objectives
- Flexibility is required in planning assessments to allow the delivery of infill housing
- Identifies DCC policy and S28 guidelines that encourage flexibility in the pursuit of compact and infill development
- Questions why the PA were not flexible with regard to the open space proposed for this infill development
- The cumulative open space provided inclusive of basement courtyard are innovative
- Rear garden area is retained to the rear of existing dwelling
- The dwelling will present as 2 storeys and with a flat roof and will be significantly lower than the nearest existing dwelling at 26 Westbourne Road and so will not be overbearing
- Will not present any significant environmental or traffic issues
- PA did not request FI to allow consideration of design concerns
- The proposal complies with Sections 15.11, 15.13.3 and 15.13.4 of the Development Plan and details how the proposal is compliant in terms of design standards, open space and the impact on adjoining properties
- Clarifies that the terrace will be louvred on all sides

- Counters the PA perspective that the proposal would '*not be in keeping with the streetscape and character of the surrounding area*' and cites DCC Policy 15.13.3 with regard to support for innovative and modern design approaches

8.2. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority in correspondence dated the 10/6/2025 requested that the Bord uphold their decision to Refuse Permission.

- The Planning Department also requested that if permission is granted that the following condition(s) be applied:
- A condition requiring the payment of a Section 48 development contribution.
- A naming & numbering condition.

8.3. Observation - Frank & Mary Darcy

- Fully agree with the reasons for refusal outlined but disappointed 26 Westbourne Rd was not specifically mentioned in terms of 'overbearing impact'
- Proposal would overlook back garden and compromise privacy
- Would block light from two important windows (bathroom and stairwell)
- Would reach the height of the gutters at 6.1m, 2.1m above existing garage
- Contravenes building line of Rathfarnham Road houses
- Out of character
- Adds more cars and noise to pleasant residential area
- The development would devalue their property
- No evidence of infilled property nearby
- House would be 5m away from our important windows

8.4. **Observation – Padraig and Ciara Corrigan**

- Fully endorse the decision of the Local Authority and ask the Planning Board to refuse this appeal.
- Development Plan points out that such development will only be permitted subject to appropriate qualitative safeguards in relation to protecting the amenity of adjoining residential developments
- Have not demonstrated sufficiently that the current proposal does not negatively impact residential amenity and in particular, on our property at 122 Rathfarnham Road
- Proposal not compliant with Section 15.13.4 Backland Housing
- The proposed development aims to build flush to the boundary wall and the proposed development and also to a height of 6200mm above ground level with a balcony and 3 rear windows overlooking
- The 5 windows on the north facing elevation of the existing property will now look onto the gable end of the new build just over 5m away
- There was no shadow study and lighting analysis included with the submission and it is submitted that the existing property will be severely overshadowed. Any natural light and morning sunlight will be inhibited
- References three previously decided ABP files for similar type proposals that were refused.

9.0 **Assessment**

9.1. I have visited the site and reviewed the original application and appeal documents and consider the primary issues in this instance to be

- Principle of development
- Development/Quality Standards & Impact on Neighbouring Amenity
- Parking and Traffic
- Other Matters

9.2. Principle of Development

- 9.2.1. The plot is in an established suburban area of Dublin City with a Z1 designation that allows for consideration of appropriately designed infill development.

9.3. Development/Quality Standards & Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

- 9.3.1. The PA referenced Sections 15.11, 15.13.3 and 15.13.4 of the CDP that set parameters/criteria for infill/side garden/ Buckland development, in their refusal they maintain the dwelling as proposed contravenes these policies.
- 9.3.2. The area planner questioned the site layout red line area and opined that same may have been mis-stated and as a result the plot ratio offered was deemed incorrect and not within acceptable parameters. I measured the site layout and floor plan and am satisfied that the site red line area measures in excess of 120m² and also that the residual POS to the rear of 120 Rathfarnham Road is significantly greater than 50m² standard required for that house type
- 9.3.3. In terms of dwelling size, according to the plans and particulars submitted with the application, the room sizes and storage for a two bedroom dwelling are in excess of minimum standards with a proposed overall floor area of 138m² where the minimum standard for a 2 bedroom dwelling is 80m² as per Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities 2007.
- 9.3.4. Private Open Space (POS) for the proposed dwelling is comprised of 3 separate areas that cumulatively amount to 35m². While I understand the PA considers the quantum of POS to be acceptable in that it surpasses the 30m² for the stated house type as per the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines in the (2024) they express concerns about the north facing basement courtyard with an area of 16m².
- 9.3.5. I consider the basement courtyard space albeit north facing and submerged to be an acceptable area of open space. There is also a further 20m² of POS with more favourable aspect included in the proposal. Furthermore, the area of open space

provided here surpasses the minimum area of private and communal open space for a similar 2 bedroom (4 person) apartment and for which this proposal could also be deemed a qualifying structure in many respects.

- 9.3.6. In terms of the quality standards for internal and open space I am satisfied that the proposed dwelling is acceptable and specifically in regard to the bedroom in the basement I am satisfied that its size coupled with the access to a courtyard will provide adequate daylight and residential amenity.
- 9.3.7. In terms of overlooking and respect for neighbouring amenity the dwelling proposed is comprised of 2 floors over basement. As such the first floor is the only level with potential for overlooking. There are no window openings proposed to overlook the existing dwelling at No. 120 Rathfarnham Road or the adjacent dwelling at 26 Westbourne Road. While I understand the reservations expressed by the occupants of No. 26 I consider the impact to the 2 existing windows to non-habitable rooms (hallway and bathroom) on their west facing gable will be negligible in term of daylight loss and therefore will not impact their residential amenity. In terms of the private open space of 26 Westbourne Road and both 120 and 122 Rathfarnham Road I consider the opaque glass screen to the first-floor terrace area will be sufficient to protect their privacy albeit I would consider a screen height of 1.8m fully enveloping the terrace to be more appropriate.
- 9.3.8. The PA cited in the reasons for refusal that they consider the proposal would be overbearing when viewed from the rear of No. 120. While the separation distance will be circa 5.4m between the rear wall of 120 to the gable of the proposed dwelling, in mitigation the proposed structure is two storey with a flat roof and the overall height will be significantly less than 120 Rathfarnham Road and the other adjacent properties.
- 9.3.9. I am satisfied that the dwelling as proposed is compliant with the Development Standards set out under Sections 15.11, 15.13.3 and 15.13.4 of the Dublin City Development Plan and the Quality Standards as set out in the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities: Design Guidelines, Department of the Environment, Heritage, and Local Government, (2007).

9.4. **Parking and Traffic**

- 9.4.1. The transportation section expressed concerns around the size of the parking area and that 4.9m width would not accommodate 2 no. cars. The 4.9m width shown is only marginally under (100mm) the standard width required of 5m and is acceptable for an infill urban site. In terms of the 5.6m wide entrance gate I am satisfied that the proposed gate that will facilitate two dwellings side by side with access is acceptable and that the CDP stipulation around 4m relates to a singular access to 2 no. dwellings.

9.5. **Other Matters**

- 9.5.1. There are other issues raised from 3rd parties not already addressed heretofore
- 9.5.2. The Building Line is not in line with other Rathfarnham Road dwellings – the proposed dwelling will become a separate Westbourne Road fronting property and will generally be in line with Westbourne Road dwellings and therefore acceptable .
- 9.5.3. Proposed dwelling would devalue property – I do not see any reason why the proposed dwelling once constructed in compliance with conditions would detract from neighbouring dwellings or serve to impact existing property values. Westbourne Road as already mentioned is a low density cul de sac in an existing suburban area and the addition of an extra dwelling will not have any impact on the overall character of the area.
- 9.5.4. Not compliant with Backland housing – the proposed dwelling, while technically straddling many site development typologies, can in essence be referred to as an urban ‘infill site’ with independent access. There has been a genuine focus in the design so as not to overlook 3rd party properties and as such subject to conditions is deemed an acceptable design approach.
- 9.5.5. **No Shadow Analysis –**
- The property at 26 Westbourne road has a large south facing rear garden and will not be impacted by the inclusion of a modest structure side gable to its west as the two existing windows are serving non habitable space

- 122 Rathfarnham Road is south of 120 Rathfarnham Road with an east facing rear garden and where the property proposed will be to the north of the garden area. There will be no overshadowing of their property.
- In terms of the applicants own property at 120 Rathfarnham Road there will likely be minimal but negligible shadowing of the residual rear garden space in the late morning period during winter season given the suns low trajectory at this time of year but 120 Rathfarnham Road also benefits from a large side and elevated front garden area that are enclosed and currently function as additional private open space to serve this dwelling.

10.0 AA Screening

I have considered the proposed development of an infill detached dwelling in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act as amended. The subject site is not located within or adjacent to a European site. The closest European Sites, part of the Natura 2000 Network is South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) – c. 5km to the east

Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have an appreciable effect on a European site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale of the development.
- The location of the development in a serviced urban area

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.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that planning permission be Granted

11.2. Reasons and Considerations

11.3. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, including the zoning objective for the site, and the established pattern of development in the area, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would represent an acceptable form of compact development on an infill site, would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenities of adjoining properties or future occupants of the proposed dwelling, would not endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard, and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The proposed 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 proposed 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 glass screen proposed at first floor level shall be revised to 1.8m above first floor level, of Opaque and non-Shatter construction and shall fully envelop the first floor terrace. Plans and elevations illustrating this revision to be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to commencement</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of orderly development and to avoid overlooking</p>
3.	<p>The attenuation and disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.</p>

	Reason: in the interest of public health.
4.	<p>Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreement (s) with Uisce Eireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network.</p> <p>Reason: in the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.</p>
5.	<p>Proposals for a naming/numbering scheme for the dwelling shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to the occupation of the dwelling. The use of 'Rathfarnham Road' or a derivative of same shall not be used.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of urban legibility and to avoid address conflicts</p>
6.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between 0700 to 1900 hours Mondays to Fridays inclusive and 0800 to 1400 on Saturdays, and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: in order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
7.	<p>Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall submit details of a Construction Management Plan for the written agreement of the planning authority. The plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the proposed development and with special emphasis on basement, including traffic management, working hours, noise and dust management, and off-site disposal of construction waste. The proposed development shall be carried out in accordance with the written agreed details.</p> <p>Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory standard of development, in the interest of residential amenity and public safety.</p>

8.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public Infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to the 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 Coimisiun Pleanala 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.

Adam Kearney

Planning Inspector

28th July 2025

Appendix 1

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-322621-25		
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a two storey over basement detached dwelling to the rear of an existing dwelling		
Development Address	Site to the rear of 120 Rathfarnham Road, Terenure, Dublin D6W Y159		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	✓
		No	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?			
Yes	✓	The development is of a Class (Class 10(b)(i)) – Schedule 2	Proceed to Q3.
No			No further action required
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			EIA Mandatory EIAR required

No	✓	The relevant threshold for Class 10(b)(i) is the 'Construction of more than 500 dwelling units'	Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes	✓	At 1 no. dwelling unit the proposed development is substantially below the threshold	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)

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

Inspector: Adam Kearney

Date: 28-07-2025

Appendix 2

FORM 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference Number	ABP-322621-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a two storey over basement detached dwelling to the rear of an existing dwelling
Development Address	Site to the rear of 120 Rathfarnham Road, Terenure, Dublin D6W Y159
<p>The Board carried out a preliminary examination [ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development regulations 2001, as amended] of at least the nature, size or location of the proposed development, having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations.</p> <p>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</p>	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	The development is the construction of a two storey over basement detached dwelling in an urban area predominantly residential, it does not require any significant demolition works and does not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of	The application site comprises a vacant urban plot to the rear of an existing dwelling in a suburban area. It is removed from sensitive natural habitats and designated sites inclusive of any archaeological features or monuments

natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	or protected structures. I do not consider that there is potential for the proposed development to negatively affect environmental sensitivities in the area	
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	The site is in a suburban built up location with predominantly low rise residential dwellings. An additional single dwelling is not likely to give rise to any significant impacts locally. Construction impacts will be short term and can be mitigated and managed.	
Conclusion		
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA	Yes or No
. There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	. EIA is not required.	NO

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)