



| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Development89 | Retention of house granted under P.D. 1717 to include alterations to rear elevation and site boundary. |
| Location | Drumass, Inniskeen , County Monaghan |
| Planning Authority | Monaghan County Council |
| Planning Authority Reg. Ref. | 2560253 |
| Applicant(s) | Mary Lynch |
| Type of Application | Permission |
| Planning Authority Decision | Refuse Permission |
| Type of Appeal | First Party Normal Planning Appeal |
| Appellant(s) | Mary Lynch |
| Observer(s) | None |
| Date of Site Inspection | 26 th March 2026 |
| Inspector | Aisling MacNamara |

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located in an unzoned rural area at Drumass, Inniskeen in Co. Monaghan, c.1km to the east of Inniskeen village and c.9.7km to the east of Carrickmacross. The site is accessed off a local secondary road L8640. There is a narrow single lane cul-de-sac roadway bounding the site to the northwest. The southeastern boundary adjoins an existing single dwelling. There are other dwellings located in the vicinity.
- 1.2. The site comprises an unfinished two storey dwelling. The structure has been substantially commenced on the site and constructed to wall plate level. An entrance from the public road has been constructed near the southeast corner of the site with roadside boundary marked by post and wire fence with planting along the fence to site side.

2.0 Proposed Development

Permission is sought for:

- the retention of a house granted under 1717 constructed to wall plate level including steel structure for first floor and roof
- completion of the house to include alterations to the rear elevation
- alterations to the site boundary and landscape plan
- relocation of the entrance
- associated site works

The floor area of proposed works is 261sqm.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By order dated 15th August 2025, the planning authority made the decision to refuse permission for one reason:

1. *Policy RASP 1 of the Monaghan County Development Plan 2025-2031 states that proposals for new accesses or the intensification of use of an existing*

access shall comply with Sections 15.23 to 15.23.8 of the Monaghan County Development Plan 2025-2031. The visibility splays for the proposed access of 70 metres to the near edge of the public road in both directions from a point in the centre of the access 2.4 metres back from the edge of the public road cannot be achieved and maintained without works being carried out on lands outside the control of the applicant, for which no legal agreement is in place with the relevant owners of the lands to enable the applicant to do so. Consequently, the applicant has not satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the local secondary road in terms of road safety and entrance visibility splays. Therefore, the proposed development, if permitted, would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard, would be contrary to the Monaghan County Development Plan 2025-2031, and thus would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The Case Planners report of 12/08/2025 recommends further information.
- Further information requested on 15/08/2025 in relation to one item – Planning authority has concerns regarding accuracy of submitted drawings showing visibility splays and achievability in practice (particularly in vertical plane). Clarify accuracy based on an up to date topographical survey. Invited to mark out the required visibility splays of 70m (in both directions) from point in the centre of the entrance 2.4m from road edge at height of 1.05m to 2.0m above ground level and to an object height of 1.05m to 2.0m.
- Response to FI request received on 05/12/2025.
- Case Planners report of 18/12/2025 recommends refusal of permission.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Environmental Health Officer's Report 14/07/2025 – No objection subject to conditions.

3.2.3. Prescribed bodies

None

3.2.4. Third Party Observations

One observation received from the resident of the adjoining house to the southeast raising concerns in relation to overshadowing, overlooking, height of structure, proximity to boundary, non compliance with permission, adequacy of sightlines.

4.0 Planning History

The following is the planning history of the site:

PA 23/60216 (ABP 319417) - Martin and Sheila Lynch - Refuse Jan 2025 – permission for retention of one and one half storey house granted under P.D. 1717 constructed to wall plate level including steel structure to support first floor and roof and the completion of the house, 8.581 metres high, to include alterations to the rear elevation, alterations to the site boundary and landscape plan and all associated site works.

One refusal reason: *“It is considered that the proposed entrance would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard because of the additional traffic movements the development would generate on this local secondary road at a point where sightlines are restricted to the south-east direction and cannot be achieved in the absence of the necessary third-party consents. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.”*

PA 19/318 (ABP305984) – Martin and Sheila Lynch - Refused April 2020 - permission for a change of house type to that previously granted under planning ref. no. 17/17, revised boundaries, domestic garage / artist studio ancillary to revised dwelling and the repositioning of the dwelling on the site.

One refusal reason: *It is considered that, by reason of its scale, form, height, bulk, design and fenestration with excessive glazed areas in particular to the front elevation, the proposed two-storey house would not enhance or reflect the traditional*

vernacular. It would not integrate well into the countryside and would be visually obtrusive in this open rural area which is in general characterised by more traditional rural housing. The proposed house would, therefore, be contrary to the Design Guidelines for Rural Housing, as set out in Table 15.4, to Policies RHP 1 and HSP16 of the Monaghan County Development Plan 2019 to 2025 and to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

PA 17/17 - Marion Mulligan - Grant April 2017 - Permission for 1 & 1/2 storey type dwelling house, a wastewater treatment system, a new site entrance and all associated site works.

Condition 2 states that the line of the recessed entrance and associated northern and eastern boundary shall be planted with a double staggered row of trees and native hedgerow.

Condition 5 sets out requirements in relation to the design and construction of the entrance, roadside boundary and drainage. It states that prior to works visibility splays of 80m to nearside road edge in each direction be provided from point in the centre of the entrance 3m from the road edge at height of between 1.05m and 2m above ground level. The visibility splays shall be retained and kept clear.

PA 15/446 – Grant Feb 2016 - Permission for 1.5 storey dwelling, wastewater treatment system, a new site entrance and all associated site works.

PA 12/283 – Grant – permission for change of house type from that previously granted planning permission under planning reference number 11/17 and all associated site development works

PA 11/17 – Grant – permission to erect a dormer dwelling house, waste water treatment system and associated works

PA 10/11 – Grant – outline permission for dwelling house, domestic garage, wastewater treatment system and percolation area, entrance walls and piers and all associated site works.

The following is the planning history of the adjoining site to the southeast:

PA97/572- Grant – permission to erect a bungalow, septic tank and garage.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Monaghan County Development Plan 2025-2031

Chapter 2 Core Strategy

2.12 Rural Settlement Strategy

Site is located in category 2 Remaining Rural Areas. This area comprises all other rural areas outside of the settlements and the rural areas under strong urban influence.

RSO 3 To maintain population levels in the remaining rural areas by accommodating appropriate rural development and to consolidate the existing town and village structure.

RSP 8 To facilitate rural housing in the remaining rural areas subject to the relevant planning policies as set out in Chapter 15, Development Management Standards of the Monaghan County Development Plan 2025-2031.

Chapter 15 Development Management Standards

Rural Character Policy RCP 1 Proposals for a dwelling and ancillary development in the rural area shall comply with Section 15.9.1 of the Monaghan County Development Plan 2025-2031.

Rural Housing Siting and Design Policy RSDP 1 Proposals for rural housing shall generally comply with Section 15.9.2 and Table 15.3 of the Monaghan County Development Plan 2025-2031.

Rural Accesses Policy RRP 1 Proposals for all new rural accesses shall comply with Section 15.22.3 in Chapter 15 of the Monaghan County Development Plan 2025-2031.

15.22.3 All Rural Accesses The location and design of a rural access can have a significant visual impact on the countryside. Proposals for all new rural accesses shall comply with the following: a) Be positioned to minimise loss of hedgerow/trees. b) Where possible follow alongside existing boundaries/hedgerows. c) Follow the

natural contours of the site and avoid sweeping driveways. d) Use existing lanes where practical.

Landscaping and Boundary Treatment Policy LCP 1 Proposals for landscaping and boundary treatments shall comply with Section 15.22.4 of the Monaghan County Development Plan 2025-2031.

On-Site Wastewater Treatment Policy WWTP 1 Proposals for all on-site wastewater treatment systems shall comply with Section 15.22.5 of the Monaghan County Development Plan 2025-2031.

RASP 1 Proposals for new accesses or the intensification of use of an existing access shall comply with Section 15.23 to 15.23.8 of the Monaghan County Development Plan 2025-2031.

15.23.1 Visibility Splays Agreement

15.23.2 Minimum Visibility Standards for Non-Urban Roads

15.23.4 Visibility Arrangements at the Access

Figure 15.3 Visibility Splays for Access on the Outside of Bend

15.23.5 Forward and Rear Visibility on the Priority Road

15.23.6 Other Visibility Requirements

15.23.7 Location of Accesses

15.23.8 Access Details

5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

There are no sites designated for natural heritage at the site or in the immediate vicinity of the site. The closest designated site is Drumcah, Toprass And Cortial Loughs pNHA c 1.2km from the site.

6.0 **EIA Screening**

The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this

report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal has been received from the applicant. The grounds of appeal are as follows:

The appeal relates to retention of works carried out under 17/17. The works stopped because of Covid 19.

Council served enforcement relating to unauthorised development on the site on 01/09/2023. At this time house was constructed to wall plate level with steel support and roof was in place.

The applicants were not aware that it was open to them to apply for extension of duration of planning permission.

The applicants applied to retain and complete the development under 2360216 – refused on appeal for traffic hazard issues. Copy of permitted works for visibility splay and hedge cutting agreement under 17/17 submitted.

The owners of the adjoining property have not constructed their entrance in accordance with condition 2(a) of 97/572. Council notified applicants of the owners of the adjoining house in 1998 that the entrance was not in compliance with the conditions of the permission. The entrance is still not in compliance. It is incumbent on Council to ensure conditions are complied with and to issue enforcement notice. Had the owners of the house to the east complied with their planning permission a third party consent would not be required for the applicant to achieve sightlines. Their non compliance raises traffic hazard issues.

It is inappropriate to refuse permission and require the demolition of the works already in place given the circumstances and given housing crisis, grounds of sustainability and waste of resources.

Statement from applicant Mary Lynch included.

The appeal submission includes:

Copy of decision to refuse under 25/60253

Copy of ABP decision 319417

Copy of hedge cutting agreement relating to 17/17

Copy of permission 97/572

Copy of drawing 25-12-10 proposed site layout

Copy of 25-12-11 proposed part site layout

Statement attached by Mary Lynch – outlines background to case and timeline of works on site, aggrieved by Councils failure to enforce non compliance with permission on neighbours land, seeking ACP assistance to rectify matter.

7.2. **Planning Authority Response**

None

7.3. **Observations**

7.4. None

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all submissions received in relation to the appeal and inspected the site and having regard to relevant local policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are as follows:

- principle of development
- entrance and traffic safety
- other issues

8.2. **Principle of development**

8.2.1. The proposed development is for the retention and completion of a rural house granted permission under PA17/17. Works under this permission were commenced however stopped during Covid and the permission lapsed.

- 8.2.2. Under 23/60216, the applicants sought permission to retain the works carried out and for permission for works to complete the house with alterations. That application was decided by An Bord Pleanála with decision to refuse permission due to substandard sightlines at the constructed entrance and associated traffic hazard.
- 8.2.3. The current subject proposal is the same as that considered under 23/60216, however the entrance is now to be relocated. The current applicant is different to that of the former applicants.
- 8.2.4. Since the decision under ABP319417 a new Monaghan County Development Plan (CDP) 2025-2031 has been adopted.
- 8.2.5. The site is within a rural area where the objective under RSO3 and RSP8 of the CDP is to maintain population levels by accommodating appropriate rural development. The planning authority have raised no issue with the principle of giving the current applicant permission to retain and complete the construction of the house.
- 8.2.6. Having regard to the site history whereby the principle of constructing a house on the site has been deemed acceptable and to the rural housing objective in the CDP to maintain population levels in the rural area, I am satisfied that in principle it is acceptable for the current applicant to complete the partially constructed house on the site.

8.3. Entrance and traffic safety

- 8.3.1. Under 17/17 permission was granted for a rural house with works including entrance near the southeastern corner of the site. The permission included a condition for 80m sightlines to the nearside edge of the road taken from 3m point back. The entrance was constructed with boundary setback. The documentation submitted with the application included a hedge cutting agreement between the then applicant and the owners of the adjoining property to the southeast signed 2017.
- 8.3.2. Under 23/60216 (ABP 319417) permission was sought by former applicants to retain the constructed entrance. This was refused permission. This was refused permission because sightlines to the southeast are restricted and there is an absence of third party consents to carry out the necessary works. The Inspectors report indicates that there is an absence of an accurate site layout plan showing sightlines of 70m in both directions at setback of 2.4m and there is an absence of an

updated legal agreement from the adjoining third party consenting to the necessary works.

- 8.3.3. Under the current subject proposal it is now proposed to relocate the entrance slightly towards the southeast. From site inspection, it is evident that sightlines are restricted to the southeast, blocked by fence post and the hedge along the decorative brick splay on the adjoining property.
- 8.3.4. Objective RASP1 of the CDP states that new accesses shall comply with section 15.23 to 15.23.8 of the CDP. Section 15.23.2 sets out minimum visibility standards for non urban roads. Table 15.4 indicates that local secondary roads require a y sight distance of 70m to the nearside of the carriageway from 2.4m setback over eye height/ object height of 1.05-2m.
- 8.3.5. The Council requested at further information stage that the applicant show sightlines of 70m from 2.4m back. The applicant was requested to clarify the accuracy of the submitted plans and submit an up to date topographical survey. In response, the applicant submitted a detailed topographical survey drawing 23-15-09 showing the existing entrance on the site, the proposed relocated entrance on the site, the existing entrance constructed on the adjoining site and the entrance required under 97/572 on the adjoining site. The drawing shows the road and roadside boundary. The drawing shows a sightline of 70m to the nearside edge of the road from 2.4m setback which is obstructed by the existing wall and hedging at the adjoining entrance outside of the red site boundary. Therefore the proposal does not achieve the required minimum visibility standards.
- 8.3.6. Section 15.23.2 of the CDP states the following:
- The standards set out in Table 15.4 may be reduced where it is satisfactorily demonstrated by way of a site-specific survey and accompanying report completed by a suitably qualified, competent technical professional, that a reduced standard would be appropriate and safe. In these circumstances the required 'Y' distance shall be calculated on the basis of the 85% percentile speeds on the applicable road.*
- 8.3.7. There is no site specific survey and accompanying report by suitably qualified competent technical professional from which relaxed standards can be considered.

- 8.3.8. I note the TII Geometric Design of Junctions sets out a different set of visibility standards. It states that a 'y' visibility standard of 70m is required for design speed of 50km/h and 90m for design speed of 60km/h. Accesses onto lightly trafficked roads may be taken at the relaxed standard of 2m and visibility must be achieved from above 1.05m. It is not clear that the proposed relocated entrance would be in accordance with the TII standards.
- 8.3.9. I note the copy of the submitted land registry agreement submitted under 17/17 between the former applicant and the owner of the adjoining lands for the removal/ cutting / trimming/ lowering of the hedge, verge and other obstructions for 80mx3mx105mm relating to 17/17 permission. The agreement is stamped by solicitor and states that the grantor consents to registration of the agreement against the title. I am not clear that the agreement is registered. There is no updated solicitors letter or agreement between the current applicant and adjoining landowner to confirm that works for the required sightlines can be undertaken.
- 8.3.10. Having regard to the above, namely the road access provisions of the CDP in RASP1, section 15.23.2 and table 15.4 including the submitted site survey drawing and my observation of works on site, I do not consider that the entrance location and design is acceptable due to failure to show that satisfactory sightlines can be provided in accordance the minimum standards and as such the proposal to complete the house for residential use would result in hazardous traffic turning movements on the public road. Refusal recommended.
- 8.3.11. I note the information shown on the submitted layout showing the differences between the existing constructed and required entrance and boundary under 97/572 on the adjoining lands. Any issues regarding the enforcement of development is a matter for the planning authority and is outside of the remit of the Commission.

8.4. **Other issues**

- 8.4.1. The proposed house design is as per that proposed under 2360216, ABP319417. The proposed house is a 261sqm two storey house with maximum ground to ridge height of 8.6m of traditional gable fronted design, glazing to rear and finished in slate and plaster. The house is positioned at a central location on the site, setback from boundaries. The proposal generally complies with the guidelines set out in table 15.3 in relation to siting and design. I am satisfied that the design and siting of the house

is acceptable for this rural area and that it will integrate into the rural area without having any significant adverse impact on the visual amenities of the surrounding area.

- 8.4.2. Having regard to the height, design, layout, orientation and setback from boundaries, I do not consider that the proposal would result in any significant adverse impacts on adjoining properties in terms of overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing effects.
- 8.4.3. The house is to be serviced by new private well and wastewater is to on site package sewage treatment system and soil polishing filter in accordance with EPA Code of Practice. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has submitted a report indicating no objection to the proposal. Surface water is to be disposed of on site to soakpit.
- 8.4.4. Should permission be granted, it is recommended that standard conditions be attached for the installation of the on site system in accordance with EPA standards, surface water drainage to the Council's requirements and also in relation to landscaping, roadside boundary and finishes.

9.0 AA Screening

I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located 9.7km from Dundalk Bay SPA and 11km from Dundalk Bay SAC.

The proposal comprises the retention and completion of a rural house including on site disposal of effluent to EPA Code of Practice standards, on site disposal of surface water and well water supply.

There are no hydrological or ecological pathways between the proposed development and the Natura 2000 site network.

Having regard to 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:

- the small scale and domestic nature of the proposed development,

- the distance to the European site network,
- the lack of hydrological or ecological pathways between the development and the European site network.

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.

Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment under S177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

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, together with relevant guidance published by the Environmental Protection Agency (Ireland), including applicable codes of practice for the protection of water quality.

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.

The proposed development has been designed in accordance with EPA codes of practice and best practice guidance, ensuring that appropriate measures are incorporated to prevent pollution, control runoff, and protect both surface water and groundwater receptors.

Furthermore, the development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the maintenance or attainment of Good Ecological Status/Potential and Good Chemical Status, as required under the Directive.

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

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend refusal of permission.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. It is considered that the proposed entrance would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard because of the additional traffic movements the development would generate on this local secondary road at a point where sightlines are restricted to the south east direction and cannot be achieved in the absence of the necessary third party consents. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.”

Aisling Mac Namara
Planning Inspector

5th May 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

| | |
|---|--|
| Case Reference | 500710 |
| Proposed Development Summary | Retention and completion of house |
| Development Address | Drumass, Inniskeen, Co.Monaghan |
| 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? (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) | <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. | State the Class here |
| <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 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 checked="" 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) | Schedule 5, Part 2, 10 (b) (i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units |

| | |
|---|--|
| 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: _____

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

| | |
|--|---|
| Case Reference | 500710 |
| Proposed Development Summary | As above |
| Development Address | As above |
| This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith. | |
| <p>Characteristics of proposed development</p> <p>(In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed use is compatible with the permitted development on the site. - Modest size and intensity of development - Localised impact on natural resources - Foul disposal on site to EPA CoP standards, on site soakpits - Modest production of waste - No significant risk of pollution or nuisance - No significant risk of accidents / disasters to human health |
| <p>Location of development</p> <p>(The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rural area - Local ecology only on site. - No built heritage - No surface water features - No sites designated for natural heritage within the range of the site. - Landscape can absorb development |
| <p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</p> <p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p> | <p>Having regard to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Modest scale and intensity of the development proposal, - lack of significant environmental sensitivities on the subject site, - the design of the proposal which incorporates water services drainage infrastructure designed to prevent environmental pollution - absence of significant in combination effects, <p>there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.</p> |
| Conclusion | |

| Likelihood of Significant Effects | Conclusion in respect of EIA |
|--|------------------------------|
| <p>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p> <p>x</p> | <p>EIA is not required.</p> |

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

DP/ADP: _____ **Date:** _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)