Inspector's Report

PL-500485-KE-25

Development	Construction of 22 dwellings with all associated site works
Location	Gingerstown Park, Caragh, Naas, Co. Kildare.
Planning Authority	Kildare County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2461392
Applicant(s)	JJMS Properties Ltd
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	JJMS Properties Ltd
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	16th March 2026
Inspector	Elaine Power

Table of Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description 3

2.0 Proposed Development 3

3.0 Planning Authority Decision 4

4.0 Relevant Planning History 8

5.0 Policy Context 9

6.0 The Appeal 13

7.0 Assessment 16

8.0 AA Screening 23

9.0 Water Framework Directive 23

10.0 Recommendation 24

11.0 Reasons and Considerations 24

Appendix 1: EIA Pre-Screening

Appendix 2: EIA Screening Determination

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The appeal site is a greenfield site located at the southern edge of Caragh village, Co. Kildare. It is bound to the north by greenfield lands, to the south by the Hueston to Cork railway line, to the east by Gingerstown Park residential estate and to the west by the R409.

1.2. The appeal site has a stated area of 0.65 ha. There is an existing road in the northern portion of the site running from Gingerstown Park residential estate and the R409 and a wayleave is indicated over this portion of the site. The road is currently blocked with boulders at the site eastern boundary with the residential estate and with metal fencing at its western boundary with the R409. There are utility boxes located in the northern portion of the site. The sites northern, southern and western boundaries generally comprise mature trees and hedgerows. The eastern boundary comprises the internal access road associated with the Gingerstown Park residential estate.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The proposed development comprises the construction of 22 no. residential units with vehicular access from Gingerstown Park and additional pedestrian access from the R409. The scheme was redesigned by way of significant further information and was readvertised.

2.2. The key development statistics of the scheme submitted by way of further information are outlined below.

	Proposed
Site Area	0.65ha
No. of Units	22 no.
Unit mix	6 no. houses, 8 no. duplex units and 8 no. apartments 1 no. (4.5%) 1-bed, 7 no. (32%) 2-beds, 9 no. (41%) 3-beds and 5 no. (22.5%) 4-beds.
Density	33.8 upa
Height	3 storeys
Dual / Triple Aspect	100%
Other Uses	None
Communal Open Space	216sqm

Public Open Space	1,630sqm (24.8% of the site)
Car Parking	31 no.
Bicycle Parking	48 no.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission was refused for the following reason:

> *Policy IN P4 of the Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029 seeks to ensure adequate surface water drainage systems are in place which meet the requirements of the EU Water Framework Directive and the River Basin Management Plan in order to promote the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems. The proposed development includes proposals for an underground surface water attenuation tank located within the area of public open space provision. These proposals run counter to Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029 Objective IN O24 which seeks to only consider underground retention solutions when all other options have been exhausted and furthermore that underground tanks and storage systems will not be accepted under public open space, as part of a SuDS solution. To this end, the development, as proposed, would injure the residential amenities of property in the vicinity, would militate against the provision of nature based sustainable urban drainage systems as part of all new developments would set an undesirable precedent for future developments of this nature and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planners Report dated 21st February 2025 noted the sites residential zoning objective. However, the report concludes that there are too many deficiencies in the proposed development design and recommends that 12 no items of further information be sought. The request for further information is summarised below.

Planning and Urban Design

1. Address the concerns raised regarding the design approach and submit revised proposals including revised house design and layout.
2. The proposed design and layout are deficient, and a full redesign should be considered.
3. The quantum of private and public open space is substandard. A revised design is required.

Land Ownership

4. Justify encroachment into lands that are fenced off to secure the railway line that comprises trees and hedgerows and submit details of land ownership.

Public Open Space

5. Submit a revised design incorporating quality open space in accordance with Development Plan standards.
6. Address Objective BIO26 which aims to prevent, in the first instance, the removal of hedgerows to facilitate development and where their removal is unavoidable this must be clearly and satisfactorily demonstrated *to* the Planning Authority.
7. Address the concerns of the Parks Department relating to the quantity and quality of open space and boundary treatment and path surfacing details. Submit an Arboriculture Assessment.

Part V

8. Submit a fully completed Part V form.

Roads Section

9. A revised plan indicating EV charging points, details of surface water management and swept path analysis for a fire tender and refuse truck.
10. Submit a Construction Traffic Management Plan having regard to the Iarnród Eireann Infrastructure submission. Submit an Acoustic Design Statement.

Water Services

11. Address the concerns of the Water Services Department relating to surface water management.

12. Address the submission from Iarnród Eireann.

The Planners Report dated 17th November 2026 noted that the applicant attempted to address the issues raised and that the design and layout was significantly improved since the initial proposal. However, due to statutory time constraints, clarification of further information could not be sought to address issues raised on the foot of the further information response, particularly regarding SUDS, nature-based solutions and quality open space. The report recommended that permission be refused for the reason outlined above.

In addition to the reason for refusal the report included an additional note which states that insufficient detail was received with the further information response to enable a thorough and robust assessment of the Taking in Charge elements of the proposal and of the tree survey, landscaping and play spaces proposed. The submitted landscape plan has a number of issues including:

- Over resilience on exterior bicycle stands,
- Bin and bike stores located on open space,
- Street species resilience and lack of clarity of design of tree pits,
- Proposed paving surfaces to comply with standard requirements of bound surfacing, (e.g. concrete, tarmac),
- Overhead Gazebo features not suitable for to be taking in charge.

The design of the development failed to comply with Section 15.6.6 of the Development Plan. In the event of a future application, the above issues should be addressed at design stage.

*3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports***

Environmental Health Officer: Report dated 24th January 2025 states that the proposed development is acceptable subject to standard conditions.

Roads, Transportation and Public Safety Department: Report dated 14th February 2025 recommended that further information be sought regarding (1) EV charging points, surface water management and swept path analysis, (2) submit a Construction Management Plan and (3) submit an Acoustic Design Statement.

Report dated 15th October 2025 raised no objection subject to conditions.

Development Control Section: Report dated 2nd January 2025 states that the applicant is required to liaise with Kildare County Council to ensure that the design of the development will facilitate the taking in charge of core services such as drainage, lighting and parking. The report also recommends standard conditions.

Report dated 13th November 2025 recommended a condition requiring the applicant to submit a taking in charge map.

Parks Section, Transport, Mobility and Open Spaces: Report dated 7th January 2025 notes that the landscape design refers to a tree survey, details of which have not been submitted. The report recommended that further information be sought regarding (1) submit an Arboriculture Assessment (2) consideration of public open space, (3) identify boundaries and land ownership and proposed boundary treatments and (3) details of path and walkway treatments.

Report dated 23rd October 2025 notes the response to the request for further information and recommends that permission be refused as a landscaping plan was not submitted with the application in accordance with Section 15.6.6 of the Development Plan and does not comply with Kildare County Council's SUDS Guidance Document, specifically Section 10.7.

Environment Section: Reports dated 22nd January 2025 and 4th November 2025 raised no objection subject to conditions.

Chief Fire Officer: Report dated 7th February 2025 raised no objection subject to a standard condition.

Water Services Department: Report dated 8th January 2025 recommended that further information be sought with regard to surface water management proposals as the proposed system is not compatible with the Objectives set out in Section 6.6 (Surface Water / Drainage) of the Development Plan.

Report dated 12th November 2025 recommended that permission be refused based on inadequate design in relation to sustainable drainage. The proposed development does not comply with objective IN 024.

Strategic Projects and Public Realm Team: Report dated 3rd November 2025 raised concerns regarding (1) the overall quantum and spatial distribution of open space, (2) lighting proposals, (3) a public realm management strategy is required and (4) careful consideration of SUDS features to ensure safety, usability and durability.

Area Engineer: Handwritten note stating the site notice was in place on the 11th November 2025.

Kildare National Roads Office (KNR): No comment.

Unauthorised Development: Handwritten note stating there is no unauthorised development on the site.

Housing: The Planners report states that the Housing Department requested further information. However, this report is not on the file.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

Irish Rail: The submission dated 9th January 2025 provide a number of observations which prioritise railway operational safety and request that they be incorporated into a condition.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

A total of five observations were received by the planning authority to the original application and the re-advertised proposed development. The concerns raised related to the design and layout, height, density, quantum of car parking, visual appearance, connectivity, boundary treatments and anti-social behaviour.

4.0 Relevant Planning History

Appeal Site

00/429: permission was granted in 2021 for the construction of 88 no. houses. This development was not carried out. However, the existing road within the site appears to have been constructed as part of this development.

Surrounding Sites

ABP-319646-24, 23/60182: Permission was granted in 2025 for the construction of 36 no. residential units and two ground floor office / retail units at a site located c. 500m north of the appeal site.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Kildare County Development Plan 2023 - 2029

Caragh is designated a Village under the county settlement hierarchy. Volume 2, Part 2 (Villages & Rural Settlements) of the Development Plan sets out a development strategy for villages. The following general policies and objectives are considered relevant:

- ***V GP 1*** Facilitate local housing demands together with the provision of local and community services / facilities and local employment opportunities throughout the villages and rural settlements in accordance with the principles of proper planning and sustainable development.
- ***V GP 2*** Facilitate sustainable population growth in the identified villages with growth levels of up to 25% over the Plan period.
- ***V GO 5*** Ensure an appropriate mix of dwelling units are provided in the village/settlement to cater for a range of household sizes.
- ***V GO 6*** Ensure that serviced site proposals include general design principles for individual plots (plot ratio, building heights, building orientation, private open space, palette of building materials, boundary details and parking).

Map V2-3.5 sets out the zoning objectives for Caragh. The vast majority of the appeal site is zoned C: New Residential with the associated land use objective *to provide for new residential development*. The existing road in the northwest portion of the site is zoned B Existing / Infill residential with the associated land use objective *to protect and improve existing residential amenity, to provide for appropriate infill residential development and to provide for new and improved ancillary services.*

The western portion of the site is located within a Flood Risk Area.

Section 3.11 of Volume 2 notes that the population of Caragh was 962 in 2016, with 263 no. houses. There is adequate water supply to meet the current demands and the future planned growth over the life of this Plan. There is capacity within the Upper Liffey Valley Regional Sewerage Scheme (Osberstown).

The following objectives are considered relevant.

- V CA2: Ensure new development complements and enhances the village scape and uses quality building materials.

- V CA7: Upgrade the extent of the R409 within the development boundary of Caragh village. Improvements will include realignment, widening, improved pedestrian facilities, drainage, public lighting and traffic calming

Chapter 2 Core Strategy and Settlement Strategy, Chapter 3 Housing, Chapter 6 Infrastructure and Environmental Services, Chapter 14 Urban Design, Placemaking and Regeneration and Chapter 15 Development Management Standards of the development plan are all considered relevant. The following policies and objectives of the development plan are also considered relevant:

- ***HO P5***: Promote residential densities appropriate to its location and surrounding context.
- ***HO O6***: Ensure a balance between the protection of existing residential amenities, the established character of the area and the need to provide for sustainable residential development is achieved in all new developments.
- ***HO P7*** Encourage the establishment of sustainable residential communities by ensuring a wide variety of housing typologies and tenures is provided throughout the county.
- ***HO O16*** Promote the provision of high-quality apartments within sustainable neighbourhoods by achieving suitable levels of amenity within individual apartments, and within each apartment development, and ensuring that suitable social infrastructure and other support facilities are available in the neighbourhood. Apartment development must be designed in accordance with the provisions of Sections 15.2, 15.3 and 15.4 (Chapter 15), where relevant, to ensure a high standard of amenity for future residents.
- ***HO O18*** Support high-quality design in new housing and to promote housing that is attractive, safe, and adaptable to the needs of existing and future households. Kildare County Council will support innovative construction methods to deliver sustainable and adaptable housing.
- ***UD O1:*** Require a high standard of urban design to be integrated into the design and layout all new development and ensure compliance with the principles of healthy placemaking by providing increased opportunities for physical activities, social interaction and active travel, through the development of compact, permeable

neighbourhoods which feature high-quality pedestrian and cyclist connectivity, accessible to a range of local services and amenities.

- ***BI P6*** Recognise the important contribution trees and hedgerows make to the county biodiversity resource climate mitigation, resilience and adaptation.
- ***IN O23*** Require new developments to reduce the generation of storm water run- off and ensure all storm water generated is disposed of on-site OR attenuated and treated prior to discharge to an approved water system, with consideration for the following:
    - The infiltration into the ground through the provision of porous pavement such as permeable paving, swales, and detention basins.
    - The holding of water in storage areas through the construction of green roofs, rainwater harvesting, detention basins, ponds, and wetlands.
    - The slow-down in the movement of water.
- ***IN O24*** Only consider underground retention solutions when all other options have been exhausted. Underground tanks and storage systems will not be accepted under public open space, as part of a SuDS solution.

5.2. ***Eastern and Midland Regional Assembly – Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) 2019 - 2031***

The RSES is underpinned by key principles that reflect the three pillars of sustainability: Social, Environmental and Economic, and expressed in a manner which best reflects the challenges and opportunities of the Region. It is a key principle of the strategy to promote people's quality of life through the creation of healthy and attractive places to live, work, visit and study in.

The followings RPOs are of particular relevance:

RPO 5.4: Future development of strategic residential development areas within the Dublin Metropolitan Area shall provide for higher densities and qualitative standards set out in the 'Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas'. 'Sustainable Urban Housing; Design Standards for New Apartment' Guidelines, and Draft 'Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities'.

5.3. ***National Planning Framework First Revision (2025)***

The National Planning Framework is a high-level strategic plan for shaping the future growth and development of the county to 2040. It is a framework to guide public and private investment, to create and promote opportunities for our people, and to protect and enhance our environment - from our villages to our cities, and everything around and in between.

It states that the major policy emphasis on renewing and developing existing settlements established under the NPF 2018 will be continued, rather than allowing the continual expansion and sprawl of cities and towns out into the countryside, at the expense of town centres and smaller villages. It includes revised figures of 50,000 units per annum in the years to 2040. The NPF was revised to allow planning for an additional 50,000 people in Ireland between 2022 and 2040.

5.4. ***Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines***

Having considered the nature of the proposal, the receiving environment, the documentation on file, including the submissions from the planning authority, I am of the opinion that the directly relevant Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines are as follows.

- Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2025 (the 'Apartment Guidelines').
- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024.
- Urban Development and Building Height, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2018) (the 'Building Height Guidelines').
- The Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines, 2009.
- Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Guidelines, 2007.

5.5. ***Other***

- Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS December 2013) (as updated) (Including Interim Advice note Covid-19 May 2020).

5.6. **Natural Heritage Designations**

The appeal site is not located within or immediately adjacent to a designated site. The closest designated sites are as follows.

- Liffey at Osberstown (001395) pNHA located c. 1.8km east of the appeal site.
- Grand Canal (002104) c. 2.8km northeast of the appeal site.
- Moulds Bog pNHA (000395) and Moulds Bog SAC (002331), c. 4.5km southwest of the appeal site.
- Ballynafagh Lake SAC (001387) c. 5.6km northwest of the appeal site
- Ballynafagh Bog SAC (000391) c. 7m northwest of the appeal site.

I refer the Commission to Section 8 below.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

This is a first party appeal against the Planning Authority's decision to refuse permission. The appeal describes the site location, the proposed development, the policy context and includes five appendices the Planning Authority's Decision, the Planners Report second report, revised drainage proposals and an updated landscape design. The appeal incudes revised landscaping and drainage drawings.

The main planning grounds of the appeal are summarised below.

Design Approach

- Permission was granted under Reg. Ref. 00429 for 88 houses on the appeal site.
- The site is zoned for new residential development.
- A revised site layout is attached with Appendix C.
- Public open space is in excess of Development Plan standards and enhances the sites amenity value and creates a green link to the existing residential development at Gingerstown Park.
- The Planning Authority raised no objection to the proposed density.
- The external stairs provide a powerful and purposeful interface between the dwellings and the public realm, creating a clear, legible and welcoming entrance. The connection encourages active use of the street edge, passive surveillance.
- The stairs also offer an opportunity for high-quality architectural detailing and landscaping, reinforcing a sense of place at this gateway location.

- The elevational change provides improved privacy and outlook for the units while maintaining an active relationship with the public realm.
- The balconies fronting onto the R409 are set back beneath the pitch of the roof to reduce the visual impact and create a sheltered, usable space.
- The mix of inset and projecting balconies helps to avoid a uniform façade, provides visual interest to the village approach and maintains a high standard of design.
- Bins are located adjacent to the railway buffer. This space functions as a communal service zone and is not classified as public open space.
- Bike stores have been relocated away from the area of public open space.

Surface Water Management

- The reason for refusal is addressed in Appendix D and could have been addressed by way of condition.
- Additional SUDS proposals are submitted with the appeal.
- The original layout submitted includes a swale along the access road. The new layout is a major change. The swale was removed and public open space provided.
- The proposed scheme includes permeable paving and an underground attenuation tank, under the playground. It is noted that the PA will only accept underground retention systems when all other options have been exhausted and not under public open space area.
- Green, roofs and swales are not possible. Swales and detention basins would negatively impact on the amenity of the open space. There is not enough room at the side of the road to accommodate swales. A small swale is provided at the northeast corner of the site. Rainwater harvesting is impractical for such a small development. Tree pits, pervious pavements and rain gardens (planters) are proposed.
- Having evaluated all options an oversized pipe under the road and public open space is considered reasonable.
- Surface water calculations are submitted with Appendix D.

Landscaping / Taking in Charge

- The concerns raised regarding landscaping proposal sand taking in charge are addressed in Appendix E. Revised drawings have been submitted in this regard.
- The landscaping proposals address the reason for refusal, provides high-quality, functional open space, integrates nature-based SUDS and protects and enhances the existing landscape and ecological features.
- The landscape drawings clearly demonstrate that the public open space structure is capable of accommodating above ground, nature-based SUDS measure including rain gardens, bio-retention swales and SUDS tree pits. No underground attenuation is proposed within the public open space.
- Existing trees and hedgerows are to be retained together with root protection areas.
- Limited hedgerow removal to facilitate access is clearly defined and is mitigated by replacement planting.
- The open spaces are designed to ensure suitability for future Taking in Charge, with non-adoptable features removed or revised and robust, durable material provided throughout the scheme.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority confirm its decision and refers the Commission to the Planners Report and various technical department reports in relation to the assessment of the proposed development.

6.3. Observations

None

6.4. Further Responses

Applicants Response to Request for Further Information.

The Commission requested that the applicant submit Schedule 7A information to enable the Commission to undertake a formal EIA Screening determination. An EIA Screening Report was submitted on the 28th August 2026.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having examined the appeal details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority and inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development.
- Design Approach.
- Reason for Refusal.

7.2. In the interest of clarity my assessment relates to the scheme that was submitted by way of further information.

7.3. ***Principle of Development***

7.3.1. The appeal site is located at the southern end of the village of Caragh. The site is predominately a greenfield, with a road located within the northern portion of the site. The documentation submitted with the application indicates that the road was constructed in the early 2000's as part of a previously approved residential development that was not constructed. The road is not in use and is currently blocked at its junction with Gingerstown Park by boulders and at its junction with the R408 by a fence.

7.3.2. The vast majority of the appeal site is zoned C: New Residential with the associated land use objective *to provide for new residential development*. The existing road in the northwest portion of the site is zoned B Existing / Infill residential with the associated land use objective *to protect and improve existing residential amenity, to provide for appropriate infill residential development and to provide for new and improved ancillary services.* Residential uses are permitted in principle on the appeal site.

7.4. ***Design Approach***

7.4.1. The settlement of Caragh is characterised by low density residential estates on either side of the R409. The village core is located at the northern end of the settlement, c. 350m from the appeal site and contains limited commercial and retail uses, a national school and a church. Objective V CA2 of Volume 2 of the Development Plan aims to ensure new

development complements and enhances the village scape and uses quality building materials.

7.4.2. Based on the stated site area of 0.65ha and the proposed number of units (22 no.) the scheme has a density of 33.8 uph. Objective HO P5 of the Development Plan aims to promote residential densities appropriate to its location and surrounding context. Variation no. 3 of the Kildare County Development Plan was adopted in April 2026 and amends the recommended density standards for settlements within Kildare to reflect the ranges set out in the Compact Settlement Guidelines. The Compact Settlement Guidelines do not set out density ranges for rural towns and villages (>1,500 population). However, it is a policy of the guidelines that development is tailored to the scale, form and character of the settlement and the capacity of services and infrastructure and that the density should respond in a positive way to the established context. Having regard to the site's location within the village of Caragh, the distance (6.5km) to high frequency and high-capacity public transport at Salins / Naas train station and the established pattern of development within the village, I am satisfied that the proposed density is acceptable and in accordance with Objective HO P5 of the Development Plan and the provisions of the Compact Settlement Guidelines.

7.4.3. The proposed development comprises 22 no. residential units. The 6 no. houses comprise a terrace of 4 no. dwellings which are bookended by detached dwellings. The 4 no. terrace houses front directly onto Gingerstown Park, and the detached houses have a north / south orientation fronting onto the proposed public open space and access road. Car parking for all the houses is provided within a central courtyard to the rear of the houses. Access to the houses from the car parking spaces is via the rear private open space.

7.4.4. The L-shaped apartment block comprises 8 no. ground floor apartments with 8 no. duplex units above. Car parking for the apartments and duplex units is also provided within the central courtyard. The apartments are accessed from the site's western boundary with the R408 and the northern boundary adjacent to the area of public open space.

7.4.5. Vehicular access to the site is proposed via the existing internal Gingerstown Park access road with additional pedestrian access directly from the R409.

7.4.6. The apartment building and the 2 no. detached houses are 3-storey in height. The end of terrace houses are 2 and half storey in height and the 2 no. mid terrace houses are 2-storeys. The houses have a maximum height of 10.6m, and apartment building has a maximum height of 10.9m. Photomontages were submitted with the response to the request

for additional information which provide a reasonable representation of how the proposed development would appear. It is noted that the predominate building height in the village is 2-storeys. However, I have no objection to the proposed height of scheme and consider it acceptable at this location.

7.4.7. The housing quality assessment submitted by way of further information on indicate that all residential units reach and exceed the minimum requirements set out in the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Guidelines, 2007 and the Apartment Standards, 2025.

7.4.8. I have some concerns regarding the design and layout of the scheme. It is my view that the layout submitted by way of further information results in a scheme that is dominated by surface level car parking, with a lack of visual connectivity between the houses and the apartment building, and the houses and the car parking area which in my view results in a substandard layout. It is noted that the original layout for the site included back-to-back housing on the eastern portion of the site which in my opinion is a more appropriate design solution for the sites suburban / village context. However, the original layout did not provide for high quality or sufficient quantity of public open space and did not provide for an appropriate street frontage onto the R409 and, therefore, is not considered an appropriate design solution for the appeal site. In my opinion, the alterations required to the original layout would result in a significant amendment to the scheme. Therefore, it is not appropriate to amend the original layout by way of condition.

7.4.9. The proposed scheme has a contemporary design approach. The houses incorporate gable ended pitched roofs with additional pitched roof features on the front elevation. They are predominately finished in brick with elements of metal cladding. The elevation treatment of the apartment building has a vertical emphasis with each apartment and duplex unit having its own door and a pitched roof. This design approach breaks up the mass of the block. The ground and first floor level have a brick finish, and the second-floor level and pitched roofs have a metal clad finish. It is noted that original scheme had a more traditional design approach, which was reflective of the character of the surrounding area. It is acknowledged that the scheme was re-designed in response to concerns raised by the Planning Authority in the request for further information. However, given the limited number of houses and the suburban / village context, it is my opinion that the use of multiple pitched elements on the roof profiles of the proposed houses is visually incongruous and out of character with the area and would negatively impact on the visually amenity of the village. In addition, the use

of metal clad finish at second and roof level within the apartment building, in combination with the proximity of these units to the R409, results in an incongruous feature that the southern approach to the village which would be out of character with the established pattern of development which is, in my view, contrary to Objective V CA2 of Volume 2 of the Development Plan which seeks to ensure new development complements and enhances the village scape and uses quality building materials.

7.4.10. The 8 no. duplex units at first and second floor level are all own door units, which are accessed by stairs from ground floor level. The stairs to six of the duplex units are located internally within the scheme, adjacent to the car parking area. The stairs to the corner units (units 16 and 18) are adjacent to the R409 and are set back c. 1.3m from the proposed public footpath. The Planning Authority's report raised concerns that the provision of a steep external staircase from the public footpath to the first-floor duplex units is not the most appropriate treatment of the public realm at this gateway location into Caragh village.

7.4.11. In the appeal the applicant states that the external stairs on to the R409 provides a powerful and purposeful interface between the dwellings and the public realm, creating a clear, legible and welcoming entrance. The connection encourages active use of the street edge, passive surveillance. The stairs also offer an opportunity for high-quality architectural detailing and landscaping, reinforcing a sense of place at this gateway location. While the justification of the applicant is noted given the sites location at the southern edge of a village and the established pattern of development I agree with the concerns of the Planning Authority and consider that the use of stairs, in close proximity to the public footpath, is not an appropriate design solution in this instance and would result in a visually incongruous feature within the village context.

7.4.12. The apartment building is set back a minimum of c. 1.2m from the proposed new 2m wide footpath at the site's boundary with the R409. Given the proximity of bedroom windows in ground floor apartments (no. 19 and 21) to the public footpath and the R409, I have concerns regarding the impact on residential amenity of future occupants from a lack of privacy and noise and nuisance.

7.4.13. Private open space for the apartments is provided in the form of ground floor terraces. Private open space for the duplex units is generally provided in the form of projecting balconies at first floor level. The corner units are also provided with inset balconies at second floor level, fronting onto the R409. The Planners Report considers that it would be preferable

for all of the units fronting onto the R409 to contain inset balconies. In the appeal the applicant notes that the mix of inset and projecting balconies helps to avoid a uniform façade, provides visual interest to the village approach and maintains a high standard of design. Having regard to the relatively limited size of the development and the village context, and in combination with the proposed materials, roof profiles of the houses, and projecting staircase at the site boundary with the R409, I agree with the concerns of the Planning Authority and consider that a simpler more unified design approach to the balconies would be more appropriate at this location.

7.4.14. Section 15.6.6 of the Development Plan requires a minimum of 15% of the site area be provided as public open space in new residential schemes. The proposed scheme incorporates a 1,630sqm area of public open space at the site's northern boundary, which equates to c. 25% of the site area. This area includes a play space and the retention of mature trees and vegetation, which is welcomed. It is noted that the revised drawings submitted with the appeal include a bioswale within the area of public open space to aid with surface water management within the site I have no objection in principle to the quantity or quality of proposed public open space, including the provision of a swale within the public open space.

7.4.15. The original site layout provided a vehicular link to a greenfield site to the north of the site. Submissions were received by the Planning Authority from the landowner of the adjacent site stating that a planning application is currently being prepared to develop this site and connectivity between the two sites is welcomed. However, the revised layout which provides for public open space along the sites northern boundary does not include connectivity to the adjacent site. If permission is being contemplated it is considered appropriate that a condition be attached requiring a pedestrian link through the area of public open space to provide potential future connectivity to the adjacent site.

7.4.16. The Apartment Guidelines (2025) require communal open space for apartment developments of 5sqm per 1-bed, 6sqm per 2-bed (3 person) and 7sqm per 2- bed (4 person). The proposed apartment building generates a requirement for 126sqm of communal open space. The site layout plan submitted by way of further information indicates that communal open space would be provided in three locations with a total area of c. 217sqm. The revised landscape drawing submitted with the appeal indicates a reduction in the total area of communal open space to c. 127sqm. As per the drawing submitted with the

appeal an area of c. 41sqm is proposed at the site's northwestern boundary, adjacent to the R409 and apartment 15. An area of c. 49.1sqm at the site southern boundary adjacent to apartment 21 and an area of c. 36.9sqm in the central portion of the site adjacent to apartments 9 and 11 and the car parking area.

7.4.17. It is acknowledged that the quantity of communal open space is in accordance with the provisions of the Apartment Guidelines, 2025 and it is also noted that there is a significant portion of public open space provided within the scheme. However, I have concerns that the proposed areas of communal open space are incidental to the scheme and would not result in high-quality usable open space, I have particular concerns regarding the limited size of each space, and their proximity to private open space associated with ground floor apartments and public walkways. I have concerns regarding a potential negative impact on the amenity of the ground floor terraces. It is also unclear how these spaces would be segregated from the scheme and clearly designated as communal open space.

7.4.18. In conclusion, it is considered that the proposed design approach, which results in a layout that is dominate by surface car parking, with poor quality communal open space, a lack of connectivity to the adjacent future development site to the north, and the proposed contemporary design approach which includes a variety of roof profiles and balconies, protruding access steps and metal cladding at the sites boundary with the R409 are, in my opinion, visually incongruous at this village location and out of character with the established pattern of development. Therefore, the proposed development is considered to be contrary to Objective V CA2 of Volume 2 of the Development Plan which seeks to ensure new development complements and enhances the village scape and uses quality building materials. It is recommended that permission be refused on this basis.

7.4.19. Permission was not refused by the Planning Authority regarding the design approach. However, the Planning Authority did raise concerns regarding the design of the scheme during the application stage and specific design concerns were raised again in the Planners Report in response to the request for further information. However, the Commission may consider this to be a new issue.

7.5. *Reason for Refusal*

7.5.1. The Planning Authority's reason for refusal considered that the proposed development did not comply with Policy IN P4 of the Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029 which seeks to ensure adequate surface water drainage systems are in place which meet the

requirements of the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) and the River Basin Management Plan in order to promote the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems.

7.5.2. Section 6.5 of the Development Plan notes that the WFD provides the overarching set of arrangements governing the management of water quality across Europe while the management of water quality is centred on regions, through the implementation of the River Basin Management Plan (RBMP). Compliance with the WFD is addressed in Section 10 below and I am satisfied that the proposed development would not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the protection, maintenance and improvement of water body status. Therefore, I am satisfied that the proposed development would be consistent with the provisions of Policy IN P4.

7.5.3. The reason for refusal also considered that the proposed development, which includes an underground surface water attenuation tank under the area of public open space does not comply with Objective IN O24 of the Development Plan which seeks to only consider underground retention solutions when all other options have been exhausted and states that underground tanks and storage systems will not be accepted under public open space, as part of a SuDS solution.

7.5.4. Appendix D of the appeal is an Engineering Report which assessed all potential SuDSs measures to optimise surface water drainage within the site and includes surface water calculations for the site. The calculations indicate that when SUDS measures, including rain planters, rain gardens, permeable paving, tree pits and bioswales are incorporated into the scheme there is still a volume of surface water to be attenuated within the site. Therefore, it is proposed to provide attenuation within an oversized surface water pipe, with a capacity of 145.8m^3 under the road and the area of public open space. Ultimately surface water would discharge from the site to the stormwater sewer a maximum discharge rate of 2l/s. I am satisfied that the applicant has fully considered all SuDS and Nature Based Solutions to manage surface water within the site and given the sites zoning objective and relatively limited size that the provision of an underground attenuation solution is acceptable in this instance and in accordance with Objective IN O24. However, the development, which includes underground storage systems would not be taken in charge by Kildare County Council.

7.5.5. It is noted that the Landscaping proposals provided in Appendix E of the appeal states that no underground attenuation is proposed within the public open space and that the

landscaping proposals have been refined to ensure suitability for taking in charge. If permission is being contemplated it is considered appropriate that a condition be attached requiring final details of all surface water management systems within the appeal site and the areas to be taken in charge be agreed with the Planning Authority.

8.0 AA Screening

8.1. I have considered the appeal in light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

8.2. The proposed development is located within the village of Caragh and is not located within or immediately adjacent to any designated site. The nearest designated site is Moulds Bog SAC (002331), located c. 4.5km southwest of the appeal site.

8.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the proposed development I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment as it could not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The location of the development in a serviced urban area.
- The nature and extent of the proposed development.
- The distance to the nearest European Site.
- The lack of a direct hydrological of ecological pathway to a European Site.

8.4. 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.

8.5. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 is not required.

9.0 Water Framework Directive

9.1. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive.

9.2. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, it is concluded that the proposal will not result in any risk of deterioration in the status of any

water body, including surface waters (rivers and lakes), groundwater, transitional waters, or coastal waters. This applies to both qualitative and quantitative status, and in respect of temporary and permanent effects.

9.3. In addition, the proposed development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the protection, maintenance, and improvement of water body status, as required under the Directive.

9.4. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

10.0 Recommendation

It is recommended that permission be refused for the following reasons and considerations.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. It is considered that the proposed design approach results in a layout that is dominated by surface car parking, with poor quality communal open space, a lack of connectivity to the adjacent site to the north and the elevational and roof treatments, in combination with projecting steps and balconies and contemporary external materials at the sites boundary with the public footpath at the R409, results in a visually incongruous scheme at this village location that would be out of character with the established pattern of development and contrary to Objective V CA2 of Volume 2 of the Kildare County Development Plan 2023 – 2029 which seeks to ensure new development complements and enhances the village scape and uses quality building materials.

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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

_____

Elaine Power

Senior Planning Inspector

1st October 2026

Appendix 1: EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500485-KE-25
Proposed Development Summary	The construction of 22 no. residential units.
Development Address	Gingerstown Park, Caragh, Naas, Co. Kildare.
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2. ☐ No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified **in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.**	
☒ 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?	
☐ 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.**	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. **EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required**	
☒ 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)**	Part 2, Schedule 5, Class 10 Infrastructure Projects – (b) (i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units. (iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere. The number of housing units proposed in this instance is 22 which is significantly below the 500-unit threshold. The site area is c. 0.65 ha gross is also significantly below the 10ha threshold for urban development in other parts of a built-up area that's not a business district. 15: Any project listed in this Part which does not exceed a quantity, area or other limit specified in this Part in respect of the relevant class of development, but which would be likely to have significant

	effects on the environment, having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule
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 ☒	Schedule 7a was submitted by way of additional information.
No ☐	

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 2: EIA Screening Determination

A. Case Details		
An Coimisiún Pleanála Case Reference	**PL-500485-KE-25**	
Sub-threshold - development class referred to under Schedule 5 of Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) or Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994	Part 2, Schedule 5, Class 10 Infrastructure Projects – (b) (ii) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units. (iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere. Clas 15 of Part 2, Schedule 5 relates to any project listed in this Part which does not exceed a quantity, area or other limit specified in this Part in respect of the relevant class of development, but which would be likely to have significant effects on the environment, having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7.	
	Yes / No / NA	**Comment (if relevant)**
1. Was a Screening Determination carried out by the PA?	Yes	The Planning Authority's EIA Screening concluded that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. EIA is not required.
2. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?	Yes	Schedule 7A information was submitted by way of further information.

3. Has an AA screening report or NIS been submitted?	No	An Appropriate Assessment Screening Report was not submitted. Givern the nature and scale of the proposed development and the distance to the nearest designated site, there is no requirement to proceed to Stage 2 of the Appropriate Assessment process; and the preparation of an NIS is not required.
4. Is a IED/ IPC or Waste Licence (or review of licence) required from the EPA? If YES has the EPA commented on the need for an EIAR?	No	Having regard to the nature of the proposed development an IED/ IPC or Waste Licence (or review of licence) is not required from the EPA.
5. Have any other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment which have a significant bearing on the project been carried out pursuant to other relevant Directives – for example SEA	Yes	• The EIA Screening Report had regard to European Union Directive 2011/92/EU as amended by Directive 2014/52/EU, European Communities (Waste Directive) Regulations 2011, the Water Framework Directive. • The Preliminary Construction Management Plan had regard to the European Communities (Waste Directive) Regulations 2011. • The SEA for the Kildare County Development Plan 2023 – 2029. • It is noted that the proposed development is not especially vulnerable to risk of major accidents as there are no substances to be stored as part of the proposed development that would be controlled under the Seveso Directive 82/501/EEC, Directive 96/82/EC, Directive 2012/18/EU.

B. Examination	Yes / No / uncertain	Briefly describe the nature and extent and Mitigation Measures (where relevant) (having regard to the probability, magnitude (including population size affected), complexity, duration, frequency, intensity, and reversibility of impact) Mitigation measures –Where relevant specify features or measures proposed by the applicant to avoid or prevent a significant effect.	Is this likely to result in significant effects on the environment? Yes/ No/ Uncertain
1. Characteristics of proposed development (including demolition, construction, operation, or decommissioning)			
1.1 Is the project significantly different in character or scale to the existing surrounding or environment?	No	The proposed development comprises the construction of 22 no. residential units on zoned and serviced lands within the boundary of Caragh Village. From an environmental perspective the character and scale of the proposed development is consistent with the surrounding pattern of development.	No
1.2 Will construction, operation, decommissioning or demolition works cause physical changes to the locality (topography, land use, waterbodies)?	Yes	The proposed development is located within the established urban area on a greenfield site. The proposed development would result in a change of land use from a vacant greenfield site to a residential development. There would be no change to the topography of the site or any watercourse or feature within or within the vicinity of the site.	No

1.3 Will construction or operation of the project use natural resources such as land, soil, water, materials/minerals or energy, especially resources which are non-renewable or in short supply?	No	Construction materials will be typical of such urban development sites. The construction and operation of the proposed development will not result in any significant loss of natural resources or local biodiversity.	No
1.4 Will the project involve the use, storage, transport, handling or production of substance which would be harmful to human health or the environment?	Yes	Construction activities will require the use of potentially harmful materials, such as fuels and other such substances. Such use will be typical of construction sites. Any impacts would be local and temporary in nature and implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan will satisfactorily mitigate potential impacts. No operational impacts in this regard are anticipated.	No
1.5 Will the project produce solid waste, release pollutants or any hazardous / toxic / noxious substances?	Yes	No significant risk identified. Construction activities will require the use of potentially harmful materials, such as fuels and other such substances and give rise to waste for disposal. Such use will be typical of construction sites. Noise and dust emissions during construction are likely. Such construction impacts would be local and temporary in nature and implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan will satisfactorily mitigate potential impacts. Significant operational impacts are not anticipated.	No
1.6 Will the project lead to risks of contamination of land or water from releases of pollutants onto the ground or into surface waters, groundwater, coastal waters or the sea?	No	Operation of the standard measures listed in the EIA Screening report and the Preliminary Construction Management Plan, will satisfactorily mitigate emissions from spillages during construction	No

		and operation. The operational development will connect to mains services and discharge surface waters only after passing through interceptors and SUDS.	
1.7 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes	There is potential for construction activity to give rise to noise and vibration emissions. Such emissions will be localised and short term in nature, and their impacts would be suitably mitigated by the operation of standard measures listed in the Construction Management Plan.	No
1.8 Will there be any risks to human health, for example due to water contamination or air pollution?	Yes	Construction activity is likely to give rise to dust emissions. Such construction impacts would be temporary and localised in nature and the application of standard measures within the Construction Management Plan would satisfactorily address potential risks on human health. No significant operational impacts are anticipated.	No
1.9 Will there be any risk of major accidents that could affect human health or the environment?	No	No significant risk is predicted. Any risk arising from the construction phase would be highly localised and temporary in nature. The site is not at risk of flooding. There are no Seveso / COMAH sites in the vicinity of this location	No
1.10 Will the project affect the social environment (population, employment)	Yes	The development of this site would result in an increase in employment opportunities during the construction phase and would increase the population of the area. The development would provide	No

		housing that would serve towards meeting an anticipated demand in the area.	
1.11 Is the project part of a wider large scale change that could result in cumulative effects on the environment?	No	No. This is a stand-alone development, comprising development of a greenfield site and is not part of a wider large scale change. Other developments in the wider area are not considered to give rise to significant cumulative effects.	No
2. Location of proposed development			
2.1 Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining or have the potential to impact on any of the following: **- European site (SAC/ SPA/ pSAC/ pSPA)** **- NHA/ pNHA** **- Designated Nature Reserve** **- Designated refuge for flora or fauna** **- Place, site or feature of ecological interest, the preservation/conservation/ protection of which is an objective of a development plan/ LAP/ draft plan or variation of a plan**	No	No European sites located within or within close proximity to the site. The nearest designated site is Moulds Bog SAC (002331), c. 4.5km southwest of the appeal site. This site is not located on, in or adjacent to any ecologically sensitive site and does not have the potential to impact any such sites. This site does not host any species of conservation interest.	No
2.2 Could any protected, important or sensitive species of flora or fauna which use areas on or around the site, for example: for breeding, nesting, foraging, resting, over-wintering, or migration, be affected by the project?	No	The proposed development is located on a greenfield site in the urban area of Caragh. The scheme as been designed to retain and protect trees and hedgerows where possible. Overall, the scheme has a net gain in canopy cover. The development of the site would not result in significant impacts to protected, important or sensitive species.	No

2.3 Are there any other features of landscape, historic, archaeological, or cultural importance that could be affected?	No	No such features arise at this urban site. The nearest recorded monument are Caragh Graveyard (KD018-011002-) and Caragh Church (KD018-011001-), c. 500m from the appeal site.	No
2.4 Are there any areas on/around the location which contain important, high quality or scarce resources which could be affected by the project, for example: forestry, agriculture, water/coastal, fisheries, minerals?	No	No such features arise at this urban site.	No
2.5 Are there any water resources including surface waters, for example: rivers, lakes/ponds, coastal or groundwaters which could be affected by the project, particularly in terms of their volume and flood risk?	No	There are no waterbodies within or immediately adjacent to the appeal site. The north western portion of the site is identified as being within an area that requires a flood risk assessment as part of any proposed development. A Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment was submitted with the application indicates that the appeal site is located within Flood Zone C. The development will implement SUDS measures to attenuate and control surface water run-off. The development would not increase risk of flooding to downstream areas as surface water run off would be limited to greenfield rates of a maximum of 2l/s.	No
2.6 Is the location susceptible to subsidence, landslides or erosion?	No	No risks identified at this urban location.	No
2.7 Are there any key transport routes(eg National primary Roads) on or around the location which are susceptible to congestion or	No	The site is bound to the west by the R409. Access to the site is via the existing Gingerstown Park residential estate road. Given the nature	No

which cause environmental problems, which could be affected by the project?		and scale of the proposed development no significant contribution to traffic congestion is anticipated.	
2.8 Are there existing sensitive land uses or community facilities (such as hospitals, schools etc) which could be affected by the project?	No	The site is located c. 350m from a national school. However, there is no negative impact anticipated as a result of the proposed development.	No
3. Any other factors that should be considered which could lead to environmental impacts			
3.1 Cumulative Effects: Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulative effects during the construction/ operation phase?	No	No existing or permitted developments have been identified in the immediate vicinity that would give rise to significant cumulative environmental effects with the subject project.	No
3.2 Transboundary Effects: Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects?	No	No	No
3.3 Are there any other relevant considerations?	No	No	No
C. Conclusion			
No real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	☒	EIAR Not Required	
	☐	EIAR Required	
D. Main Reasons and Considerations			
Having regard to • The nature and scale of the proposed development, which is significantly below the threshold in respect of classes 10(b)(i), 10(b)(iv) and 15 of Part 2 to Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended),			

- The location of the proposed development on lands predominately zoned within the Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029 as C: New Residential with the associated land use objective *to provide for new residential development*. The existing road in the north west portion of the site is zoned B Existing / Infill residential with the associated land use objective *to protect and improve existing residential amenity, to provide for appropriate infill residential development and to provide for new and improved ancillary services.* The development plan was subject to a strategic environmental assessment in accordance with the SEA Directive (2001/42/EEC).
- The urban nature of the existing site and the pattern of development in the surrounding area,
- The availability of mains water and wastewater services to serve the proposed development,
- The location of the development outside of any sensitive location specified in Article 299(C)(1)(a)(v) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended),
- The guidance set out in the 'Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Guidance for Consent Authorities regarding Sub-threshold Development', issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government (2003),
- The criteria set out in Schedule 7 and Schedule 7A of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended,
- The results of other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment submitted by the applicant including the Engineering Report and site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, and
- The features and measures proposed by the applicant that are envisaged to avoid or prevent what might otherwise be significant effects on the environment, including measures identified in the preliminary Construction Management Plan, the Resource and Waste Management Plan.

It is considered that the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment and that the preparation and submission of an environmental impact assessment report would not, therefore, be required.

Inspector _____ **Date _____**

Approved (DP/ADP) _____ **Date _____**