



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-323723-25

Development	Construction of a first-floor side extension, the conversion of the existing hipped roof to an open gable roof, and the construction of a dormer window to the rear of the house.
Location	23 Villa Park Gardens, Navan Road, Dublin 7
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB2630/25
Applicant(s)	Tony & Amanda McDonagh
Type of Application	Planning permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Conal Mac Cumhail
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	24 th October 2025
Inspector	Niall Haverty

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site, which has a stated site area of 0.045 ha, is located at 23 Villa Park Gardens, a mid-20th century residential estate located between the Navan Road (to the north) and Blackhorse Avenue (to the south) in Dublin 7.
- 1.2. The site is located on the outside bend of a corner of the estate and is occupied by a two storey semi-detached house with a hipped roof and single storey side, rear and front extensions. The front elevation faces east, with the rear garden backing onto the pitches of the Belvedere Sports Ground to the west. The house also has a projecting side dormer window (i.e. on the northern hip of the roof), with a window facing northwards. The front garden is substantially paved over to provide off-street car parking.
- 1.3. A terrace of four houses is located immediately to the north of the appeal site, while the front (east) elevation of the house faces the side elevation of a house on the opposite side of the street, which appears to be an infill house built in a side garden.
- 1.4. Many of the houses within Villa Park Gardens have been extended and altered in various ways, but they typically comprise rendered or dashed exteriors with brick elements and hipped tiled roofs.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development is described as follows:
 - The construction of a first-floor side extension with a flat roof;
 - the conversion of the existing hipped roof to an open gable;
 - the construction of a dormer window to the rear of the house; and
 - interior alterations & refurbishment along with all associated site works.
- 2.2. The existing house has a stated gross floor space of 131 sq m and the stated gross floor space of the proposed works is 33.2 sq m.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. The Planning Authority decided to grant permission, subject to 12 No. conditions. The following summarised conditions are noted:

- C2: s.48 development contribution.
- C3: Amendments:
 - The roof extension shall be a half hipped or Dutch gable roof. The rear facing roof light shall be reduced in size or omitted
 - The proposed side facing circular gable window (which may also be provided in squarer form or be omitted as required) shall be finished with obscure glazing and permanently maintained as such.
 - The depth of the zinc fascia to the first floor side extension shall be kept as small as possible.
- C4: The dormer's elevations, along with any fascia/soffits, window frames glazing bars and rainwater goods shall be finished in dark colour to blend and not white uPVC.
- C5: Attic space shall not be used for human habitation unless it complies with the current Building Regulations.
- C9 – C11 relate to matters of construction management.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The site is zoned Z1, under which residential development, including extensions to existing dwellings, is permitted in principle.
- The proposed development will be assessed against Appendix 18 of the Development Plan.
- First floor extension:

- Maintaining the existing set back from the primary building and the flat roof profile of the first floor side extension will minimise potential visual terracing with its neighbour. The depth of the zinc fascia should be kept to a minimum.
- Third party concerns in relation to the shared building line with the neighbouring property are noted. Guttering and any other associated site works are required to be retained within the red line boundary, in the event of a grant of permission, this matter shall be dealt with by the standard drainage conditions.
- The extension extends back as far as the original rear building line and will not significantly impact on loss of light to either neighbouring dwelling. With regards loss of sunlight to the rear amenity space of the neighbouring dwelling to the north, it is not considered that the proposed would have an undue impact, given the depth of the extension and the west facing orientation of the adjoining gardens.
- Alterations to roof profile:
 - Section 4.0 of Appendix 18 addresses changes to a roof profile and the criteria that the application will be assessed against. A number of dwellings within the estate have recently applied for permission relating to change of hip end to gable end and were conditioned to provide a half hip / Dutch gable end.
 - Roof alteration would negatively alter symmetry and appearance of the set piece semi-detached arrangement, visually alter the streetscape and set an undesirable precedent. The preferred option would be to provide a half hipped or Dutch gable roof with the proposed dormer set inside it to retain the basic hipped roof profile which is prevalent in the area.
 - No objection to the rear facing dormer. Taking into account the concerns in relation to a full gable end it is still considered with a mini hipped/ Dutch style profile sufficient quantities of the roof profile will remain visible. The proposed circular gable window shall be conditioned to be finished with obscure glazing. The applicant may need to relocate / reduce the proposed rear rooflight to accommodate the Dutch gable end profile.

- There will be no loss to the existing private amenity space. Garden shed and external insulation for which no planning permission can be discerned are noted. The current application does not include these elements and as such are not considered.
- Dormer extension and roof alterations do not impinge on residential or visual amenities of the area or result in undue overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing impacts on neighbouring properties.
- The development overall is considered acceptable subject to conditions.
- Having regard to the location, nature and scale of the development and the distance from the nearest European site(s), it is considered that the proposed development, either individually or in combination with any other plans or projects, would have no significant impacts on any European sites and a Stage 2 AA is not required.
- There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development and the need for EIA can be excluded at preliminary examination. Screening determination not required.
- The proposed development would not materially contravene the policies and objectives of the Development Plan and would accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Engineering Department – Drainage Division: No objection subject to conditions.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.3.1. None.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

3.4.1. One third party observation was made by the appellant. The issues raised are generally as per the appeal, as well as issues of potential overhanging of the

boundary line and overlooking from the proposed circular window on the northern gable.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Appeal Site

- **Reg. Ref. WEB2021/23:** Permission granted in March 2024 for the construction of a first floor side extension with a pitched roof to match existing and the construction of a dormer window to the rear of the house, including internal alterations and refurbishment along with all associated siteworks.
Condition No. 3 required the side extension to have a hipped roof.
- **Reg. Ref. 2523/15:** Permission granted for conversion of attic to storage including dormer window to the side.
- **Reg. Ref. 2900/11:** Permission granted for conversion of attic space with construction of dormer window at rear and side with obscure glazing, hipped tiled roof to match existing. Bay window with tiled hipped at front, extended porch and extended playroom at front and associated elevational changes. Condition 2 required the dormer structure at the side to be omitted and the hipped roof form be retained.
- **Reg. Ref. 2800/06:** Permission granted for construction of a first-floor side extension with a pitched roof to match existing & the construction of a dormer window to the rear of the house, including internal alterations and refurbishment along with all associated siteworks.

4.2. Surrounding Area

- **Reg. Ref. WEB1691/25:** Permission granted at 52 Villa Park Gardens for conversion of existing ground floor garage with single storey extension to front; construction of single storey flat roof extension to rear with flush glaze type roof lights and projecting canopy; first floor extension to side over former garage with dutch type hipped roof and velux type windows to front and rear;

first floor extension to rear with flat roof; conversion of attic with dormer to rear; associated internal alterations, drainage and external works.

- **Reg. Ref. WEB2654/24:** Planning permission for an attic conversion, including erection of a dormer to the main roof to the rear, construction of a single storey extension to the rear of the existing semi-detached house, comprising a utility room in the new extension, new stairs, storage room and bathroom to the attic space. Alterations to the existing house front elevation including change in the main roof profile, installation of two rooflights to the main roof and demolition of the existing brick chimney. All to be constructed behind existing boundary walls.

Condition 2(a) required the roof extension to be a half hipped or Dutch gable roof.

- **Reg. Ref. WEB2117/22:** Permission granted at 15 Villa Park Gardens for the conversion of an attic into an office and eaves storage with a rear facing flat roof dormer being constructed by means of building out the existing hipped roof into a proposed gable roof. The development will also consist of the partial demolition of a front garden wall (c. 3.2m), to allow for the creation of new vehicular access to front, and all associated site works.

Condition 2(a) required the roof extension to be a half hipped or Dutch gable roof.

- **Reg. Ref. WEB2036/22:** Split decision on an application at 87 Villa Park Gardens for retention of alterations to the permitted single-storey pitched-roof extension to the rear of the existing dwelling house including the reduction in the size of the family room, the construction of an adjoining flat-roof shed and the creation of an internal courtyard; alterations to the permitted two-storey pitched roof extension to the side of the existing dwelling house to remove the 1m wide hipped gable and construct a full gable roof; and all associated site, drainage and structural works.

Permission was refused for the retention of the roof alteration from a hipped roof to a gable roof.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028

- 5.1.1. The appeal site and surrounding residential area are zoned Z1 'To protect, provide and improve residential amenities'.
- 5.1.2. Section 15.11 of the Development Plan states that "for guidance and standards relating to ancillary residential accommodation including: residential extensions, detached habitable rooms, porches, alterations at roof level/attics/dormers /additional floors [...] see Appendix 18".
- 5.1.3. The following sections of Appendix 18 of the Development Plan, entitled 'Ancillary Residential Accommodation' are noted:
- Section 1.0: Residential extensions.
 - Section 4.0: Alterations at roof level / attics / dormers / additional floors.
 - Section 5.0: Attic conversions / dormer windows.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.2.1. The site is not within or close to any sites with a natural heritage designation.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. A third party appeal was lodged by Conal Mac Cumhail of 25 Villa Park Gardens, the house immediately to the north of the appeal site. It can be summarised as follows:
- Concerns regarding loss of light to the rear of appellant's property due to the sizable extension proposed.
 - Notwithstanding the condition requiring a half-hipped or dutch gable roof, the appellant is concerned there will be a large amount of light blocked to the rear of his property.

- Traffic safety concerns during the construction phase, due to the limited on-street parking, lack of rear access to the site and its location on a bend.
Concerns regarding skips, builders' vans and building materials impacting on the safe movement of traffic.

6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. None.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

6.3.1. The Planning Authority request that their decision be upheld and that a section 48 development contribution condition be attached, if permission is granted.

6.4. Observations

6.4.1. None.

6.5. Further Responses

6.5.1. None.

7.0 Environmental Impact Assessment

7.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Appendix 1 of report.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Having examined the appeal and all other documentation on file, having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant policy context, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are as follows:

- Design and layout.

- Impact on residential amenity.
- Construction traffic.

8.2. Design and Layout

- 8.2.1. The proposed first floor side extension is indicated as providing a bedroom and en-suite bathroom. The extension, being built over the existing side extension, is set back c. 1.3m from the front elevation of the main house, which is consistent with Development Plan guidance for side extensions (as detailed in Section 1.3 of Appendix 18). The proposed extension also has a flat roof which will lessen its potential for overbearing impacts on the neighbouring property. The combination of the set-back and the flat roof has the effect of making the proposed side extension suitably subordinate to the main structure of the house. The finishes of the side extension are generally render, which will be consistent with the existing house, as well as the use of zinc for fascias and parapet capping and to frame the rear window of the extension. This will be consistent with, and complement, the zinc cladding proposed for the dormer window to the rear roof profile. I note that no windows are proposed on the side (northern) elevation of the first floor extension and thus no overlooking issues arise. The window of the proposed en-suite in the extension is not identified as having opaque glazing, and I recommend that this be required by way of condition. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposed side extension is suitably harmonious with the existing house and that it will integrate into the streetscape.
- 8.2.2. With regard to the issue of potential oversailing which was raised in the observation on the application, I note that the proposed side extension is entirely within the red line boundary and has a parapet along the northern property boundary, thus negating the need for guttering on this elevation.
- 8.2.3. I consider that the proposed dormer window on the rear roof profile is fully consistent with the advice contained in Section 5.0 of Appendix 18, being set below the ridge line, not extending across the entire width of the roof, not being overly dominant and being set back from the property boundary. The use of zinc cladding for the dormer will complement the use of the same material on the parapet capping and fascias of the proposed side extension. I am satisfied that the proposed rear dormer is

acceptable in terms of its design and that it will not be injurious to visual and residential amenities in the area.

8.2.4. With regard to the proposed change of the hipped roof to a gable-end roof, the Planning Authority considered that this would negatively alter the symmetry and appearance of the semi-detached houses, visually alter the streetscape and set an undesirable precedent given that the majority of houses in the area have hipped roofs.

8.2.5. I note section 4.0 of Appendix 18 of the Development Plan, which states that:

“The roofline of a building is one of its most dominant features and it is important that any proposal to change the shape, pitch or cladding of a roof is carefully considered. [...]

The following criteria will be considered in assessing alterations at roof level:

- Careful consideration and special regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.
- Existing roof variations on the streetscape.
- Distance/ contrast/ visibility of proposed roof end.
- Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures, and prominence.”

8.2.6. I noted on my site inspection that a number of houses within the Villa Park Gardens estate feature gable ended roofs, either on the main structure, or on two storey side extensions. There is an eclectic mix of extension types in the area and I do not consider that the principle of converting the roof type is necessarily problematic in this particular context. However, many of the other houses where gable ended roofs have been constructed are terraced, whereas the subject house is semi-detached. Such roof modifications are more visually coherent and respectful of building character in terraces, where they replicate and continue the roof structure of the mid-terrace houses.

8.2.7. I consider that the Planning Authority’s condition requiring a Dutch gable or half hipped approach represents a reasonable compromise between improving the

applicant's residential amenity by means of facilitating greater usable floor space at attic level, while protecting the visual amenities of the area by maintaining a degree of coherence in this semi-detached pair of houses which are located in a prominent location within the estate due to their corner positioning. I recommend that the PA condition be included, should the Commission be minded to grant permission.

8.2.8. While the PA considered that the circular window on the side (northern) elevation and the rooflight on the rear roof slope should be reduced or omitted, I recommend that they be omitted as the use of a Dutch gable or half hipped roof will affect their positioning and any attempt to reconfigure them is likely to result in an unsatisfactory solution from a visual amenity perspective. I note that they only provide natural lighting to the attic stairwell and not to a habitable room.

8.2.9. The proposed use of the attic level is identified as a guest room and WC. The PA included a condition requiring that "the attic space shall not be used for human habitation unless it complies with the current Building Regulations", in order to provide for an adequate standard of development. Noting that the dimensioned floor to ceiling height is 2.35m in the vicinity of the dormer and that the roof structure of the dormer, as illustrated, appears relatively thin, I agree with the imposition of this condition.

8.3. Impact on Residential Amenity

8.3.1. The appellant's dwelling is due north of the appeal site and therefore will already experience a degree of overshadowing from the existing house. I consider that there is likely to be a minimal increase in overshadowing from the proposed development, given the existing relationship and orientation between the two houses, the separation distance between them and the flat roofed nature of the proposed side extension. Any marginal increase in overshadowing would be entirely consistent with what is to be expected given the relatively dense suburban character of the area, where neighbouring properties will unavoidably overshadow each other at varying times of day. The appellant's private amenity space is likely to continue to benefit from a high level of daylight and sunlight, given its western orientation, length and positioning overlooking the playing pitches to the west.

- 8.3.2. Similarly, I do not consider that any significant residential amenity issues arise with regard to overlooking or overbearing impacts, given the relatively modest scale of the proposed extensions and the relative orientation of the applicants' and appellant's houses.

8.4. Construction Traffic

- 8.4.1. The impact of construction traffic and construction material storage on traffic and road safety was raised in the appeal.
- 8.4.2. I note that there is off-street parking at the appeal site for 2 No. vehicles and that on-street parking is unregulated on both sides of the road directly in front of the appeal site.
- 8.4.3. The scale of the proposed development, comprising an extension to an existing house, is relatively minor and is not likely to generate a significant volume of construction traffic or require the storage of large volumes of construction materials. In particular, I note that the extension will be at first floor level and roof level, thus ensuring that no excavations or extensive groundworks are likely to be required.
- 8.4.4. The construction phase will be inherently temporary and short-term in duration given the scale of the proposed works and, noting that residential extensions are extremely common projects in such suburban areas, there is no reasonable basis to conclude that the proposed development would result in the creation of a traffic hazard or obstruction of road users.
- 8.4.5. However, given the relatively narrow street width and noting that numerous houses, including the appellant's house, do not have off-street parking, I recommend a suitable condition prohibiting the storage of construction materials on the road/footpath.

9.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of s.177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.2. The appeal site is located in a serviced suburban area in Dublin 7 and the proposed development comprises an extension and other works to an existing house.

- 9.3. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.4. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Nature of the works: e.g. small scale and nature of the development.
 - Location in a suburban area at a remove from the nearest European site and with a lack of potential connections.
- 9.5. I conclude, 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.
- 9.6. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The appeal site is located in a serviced suburban area in Dublin 7, a considerable distance from any surface water feature. The proposed development comprises an extension and other works to an existing house.
- 10.2. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.3. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. 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 surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Nature of works: e.g. small scale and nature of the development.
 - Location-distance from nearest Water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections.

10.4. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that planning permission is granted for the reasons and considerations set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1. Having regard to the nature of the proposed development and the pattern of development in the area, I consider that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or property in the vicinity and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The proposed development shall be amended as follows:
 - (a) The proposed roof conversion shall be to a half-hipped or Dutch gable roof.
 - (b) The proposed circular window on the northern elevation and the proposed rooflight on the rear roof slope shall be omitted.

(c) The glazing for the proposed en-suite window on the western elevation of the first floor side extension shall be manufactured opaque or frosted glass and shall be permanently maintained. The application of film to the surface of clear glass is not acceptable.

Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

3. The attic space shall not be used for human habitation unless it complies with the current Building Regulations.

Reason: To provide for an adequate standard of development.

4. The external finishes of the proposed extension (including roof tiles) shall harmonise with those of the existing dwelling in respect of colour and texture.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

5. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of: Mondays to Fridays - 7.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m, Saturday - 8.00 a.m. to 2.00 p.m. and not at all on Sundays and public holidays.

Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.

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

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

7. The developer shall prevent any mud, dirt, debris or building material being carried onto or placed on the public road or adjoining property as a result of the site construction works and repair any damage to the public road arising from carrying out the works. Storage of construction materials is not permitted on the public road/footway unless agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the area and in the interests of road safety.

8. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

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.

Niall Haverty
Senior Planning Inspector

28th October 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-323723-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a first-floor side extension, the conversion of the existing hipped roof to an open gable roof, and the construction of a dormer window to the rear of the house.
Development Address	23 Villa Park Gardens, Navan Road, Dublin 7
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.	
EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.	
No Screening required.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.	
EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.	
Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____