



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

**PL-501099-CC-26**

---

<b>Development</b>	Construction of an extension to the front, side and rear of the dwelling, removal of a pitched roof and demolition of detached garage and all associated site works.
<b>Location</b>	Eversleigh, Hettyfield, Douglas, Cork
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Cork City Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	2544331
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Rose Hudson
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant Permission
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Tom King
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	13-05-2026
<b>Inspector</b>	Adam Kearney.

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

The subject site is located at Hettyfield, Douglas within an suburban residential area approximately 5 kilometres south of Cork city centre. The site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling with associated outbuildings, including a domestic garage and shed. The site is bound to the south by a public road with vehicular access, and there are residential properties adjoining to the north, east and west. The rear garden of the dwelling extends to the north, with the appellant's property directly adjoining the site along the shared northern boundary. The site is situated within an established suburban residential area characterised by two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings, many of which are of hipped roof design and likely constructed in the 1950's and 1960's. The site is broadly at the same level as the public road along its southern frontage.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The Permission is sought for alterations and extensions to the existing two-storey detached dwelling. The scope of works comprises: (1) Part two-storey/part single-storey flat roof extensions to the front, to both sides and to the rear of the existing dwelling; (2) Elevational alterations including removal of chimneys and replacement of the pitched roof over the front bay windows with a flat roof; (3) Demolition of an existing detached garage to the side of the dwelling; (4) Widening of the existing vehicular entrance to 3 metres; and (5) All other associated site works. The existing dwelling has a stated internal floor area of approximately 121 square metres across two storeys (ground floor: 60.9 sqm; first floor: 60.1 sqm).
- 2.2. The proposed extensions would add approximately 170 square metres of internal floor area, comprising, at ground floor level, a utility/plant room, lobby, kitchen, dining, living, home gym/hobbies room, bathroom and fifth bedroom, and at first floor level, four bedrooms, bathroom, reading room and ancillary accommodation. The total floor area of the extended dwelling would be approximately 291 square metres.
- 2.3. The application was the subject of a Request for Further Information (RFI) by the Planning Authority. The original proposal included two-storey flat roof extensions extending beyond the gable walls of the existing dwelling on both sides. In response to the RFI, the applicant submitted revised drawings on 10th February 2026 omitting

the first-floor element beyond the western gable and revising the roof form of the two-storey extensions from flat roof to hipped roof design. The description of development refers to the application as lodged; the permission as granted relates to the amended drawings of 10th February 2026.

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

3.1. Cork City Council granted permission by Order dated the 9th of March 2026, subject to twelve conditions

#### **3.2. Planning Authority Report Summary**

3.2.1. There are two planners reports on file. The first report, dated 26th January 2026 and prepared by the Executive Planner, recommended a Request for Further Information. Concerns were raised regarding the overall scale, design and layout of the proposed two-storey flat roof extension, in particular the portion of the extension extending beyond the western gable wall of the existing dwelling, and the use of a flat roof design considered unsympathetic to the existing hipped roof character of the dwelling and the prevailing hipped roof pattern of the surrounding residential area. The applicant was requested to omit the first-floor element beyond the western gable and to revise the roof form of the two-storey extensions to hipped roof design.

A response to the RFI was submitted on 10th February 2026. A second planner's report, dated 5th March 2026 and prepared by the Acting Senior Executive Planner, assessed the response and determined that both points raised in the RFI had been satisfactorily addressed. A grant of permission was recommended on the basis that the amended proposal is appropriate in scale given the size of the site and its surrounding grounds.

#### **3.2.2. Other Technical Reports**

3.3. Drainage Report (dated 4th December 2025) confirmed no objection to the proposed development subject to conditions relating to drainage separation, on-site storm water retention and compliance with the Water Services Act 2007.

3.4. Environment Report (dated 8th December 2025) confirmed no objection to the proposed development subject to conditions relating to construction management,

waste segregation and disposal, noise management and wildlife protection during construction.

3.5. Urban Roads & Street Design Report (dated 14th January 2026) confirmed no objection to the proposed development subject to a condition requiring repair of any damage to existing roads, footpaths and services at the developer's expense.

### 3.6. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.7. Irish Water was consulted. No report was received and no other prescribed body submissions were received.

### 3.8. **Third Party Observations**

3.9. A third-party submission was received from Donal Anderson Architect, on behalf of Tom King of "Charlbury", Hettyfield, Douglas, Cork, whose property directly adjoins the subject site to the north. The submission raised concerns regarding: the overall scale, bulk and massing of the development and its overbearing appearance; the presence of overlooking north-facing windows on the proposed rear extension at a distance of 1.8 metres from the northern boundary; heights of proposed windows and distances to boundary not being clearly shown in the submitted drawings; the need for protection measures for an existing boundary fence during construction; and a lack of sectional and contextual information.

## 4.0 **Planning History**

4.1. None on Subject Property

### 4.2. **Adjoining Property**

25/43581: Permission granted for demolition of a single-storey rear and side extension, chimney and conservatory to the rear of an existing dwelling, and construction of a two-storey extension and ground floor canopy to the rear and side.

16/37094: Permission granted for a new dwellinghouse and associated site works including a new vehicular entrance from the public road.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028

The subject site is zoned ‘ZO 01 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods’ under the Cork City Development Plan 2022–2028, with the objective to protect and provide for residential uses and amenities, local services and community, institutional, educational and civic uses.

#### **Objective 11.1 – Sustainable Residential Development**

Residential developments shall be sustainable and create high quality places which contribute to placemaking, prioritise walking, cycling and public transport, deliver a quality of life which residents and visitors are entitled to expect, provide community and support facilities, protect green and blue infrastructure and biodiversity, and enhance and protect the built and natural heritage.

#### **Objective 11.3 – Housing Quality and Standards**

Housing developments should be of a high-quality design, providing adequately sized rooms with comfortable and functional layouts. Developments should maximise dual-aspect provision, provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to new and surrounding dwellings, and meet minimum spatial standards.

#### **Objective 11.5 – Private Amenity Space for Houses**

Houses should provide a private garden or terrace of adequate size and proportions for the size of house proposed. Private open space should aim to be at least 48 square metres. Flexibility is permitted where good quality, useable open space can be demonstrated on site.

#### **Section 11.100 – Separation, Overlooking and Overbearance**

Privacy and overlooking are important for quality of life. Levels of privacy will gradually diminish as urban densities increase above 25 dwellings per hectare, which will be taken into account in assessing planning applications.

## **Section 11.145 – Residential Entrances and Parking in Front Gardens**

Where permitted, vehicle entrances should generally not exceed 3 metres in width. Hard surfaces must be permeable and inward-opening gates should be provided. Other walls, gates and railings are to be made good.

### **5.2. S28 Guidelines**

5.3. Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).

5.4. SPPR 1 – Separation Distances: It is a specific planning policy requirement that a separation distance of at least 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses, duplex units and apartment units above ground floor level shall be maintained when considering a planning application for residential development. Separation distances below 16 metres may be acceptable in circumstances where there are no opposing windows serving habitable rooms and where suitable privacy measures have been designed into the scheme to prevent undue overlooking of habitable rooms and private amenity spaces. There shall be no specified minimum separation distance at ground floor level or to the

## **6.0 Natural Heritage Designations**

6.1. None in the immediate vicinity. The nearest relevant European sites are the Cork Harbour SPA (site code 004030) and the Great Island Channel cSAC (site code 001058).

## **7.0 EIA Screening**

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

## 8.0 The Appeal

### 8.1. Third Party Appeal

- 8.1.1. The appellant has no objection in principle to the redevelopment of the subject property. Matters of scale, bulk and styling raised in the original submission to the Planning Authority were addressed to a degree through the planning process, with amendments conditioned on the Notification of Decision to grant dated 9th March 2026.
- 8.1.2. A significant aspect of the original submission to the Planning Authority has been overlooked. Specifically, the location and aspect of two north-facing windows on the new single-storey rear extension, which is dimensioned at 1.8 metres from the northern boundary. The window cill is noted at 1.625 metres above finished floor level. It is contended that this will allow overlooking and loss of privacy to the appellant's rear garden space at standing height, contrary to good design practice and council policy in relation to the protection of private open space.
- 8.1.3. Reference is made to the amended proposed elevations as granted following the RFI, with the relevant north-facing windows on the single-storey rear extension highlighted. It is noted that separate reference was made to north-facing windows on the main two-storey extensions, which the planner considered mainly serve bathrooms indicated with frosted glass; however, the single-storey rear extension windows were not separately addressed.
- 8.1.4. No section details with site levels or contextual sections referenced to adjacent properties were provided with the application, and no clarification was offered by the applicant during the RFI process to alleviate the appellant's concerns regarding overlooking from the single-storey rear extension windows.
- 8.1.5. The appeal requests that An Coimisiún Pleanála deliberate on the development and this particular issue.

## 8.2. First Party Appeal Response

- 8.2.1. The planner did not overlook the appellant's original observation; the points raised therein are included and addressed in Section 9 of the planner's report.
- 8.2.2. In relation to the two north-facing ground-floor windows on the single-storey rear extension, the cill height is 1.625 metres and the head height is 2.30 metres above finished floor level. The top of the boundary fence directly facing these windows is 2.05 metres above finished floor level, which is above the window cill height. As a result, there would be no overlooking into the appellant's rear garden at standing height from the proposed extension at ground floor level.
- 8.2.3. Photographic evidence is submitted, taken from within the subject site looking towards the appellant's property, demonstrating that the ground level of the subject site is at a lower level than that of the adjoining site to the north along the boundary line, as evidenced by the base of the fence being raised well above the ground level of the subject site. This level differential further reduces the potential for overlooking.
- 8.2.4. In relation to the first-floor north-facing windows on the two-storey rear extension, the planner directly addressed these in Section 11 of the report under the sub-heading Residential Amenity and concluded, given the proposed distance from the northern boundary to the proposed first-floor windows, that these would not give rise to direct overlooking and would not constitute a negative residential amenity impact.
- 8.2.5. The distance between the proposed rear-facing first-floor windows and the appellant's rear-facing first-floor windows is approximately 30 metres, well in excess of the 22-metre standard referenced under previous Cork City Development Plans and of the 16-metre SPPR 1 requirement under the 2024 Compact Settlements Guidelines.
- 8.2.6. The proposed first-floor rear-facing windows are 9 metres from the northern boundary – the same distance as the neighbouring dwelling to the east (Eircode T12 CCA2, granted under Ref. 16/37094) has to the facing boundary and to the rear first-floor windows of the neighbouring property in the same direction.

8.2.7. It is requested that An Coimisiun dismiss the appeal and confirm the grant of permission.

### 8.3. **Planning Authority Response**

No further response was received from the Planning Authority

## 9.0 **AA Screening**

I have considered the project in light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The nearest designated European sites are the Cork Harbour Special Protection Area (SPA) (Site Code 004030) and the Great Island Channel candidate Special Area of Conservation (cSAC) (Site Code 001058). No nature conservation concerns in relation to European sites were raised in the planning application or appeal.

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

- The nature and scale of the development, comprising domestic extensions and alterations to an existing suburban dwelling.
- The urban location of the site and the separation distance and intervening lands from the nearest European sites.
- Taking into account the screening determination of the PA.

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 Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 is not required.

## 10.0 **Water Framework Directive**

10.1. There are no watercourses in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. The proposed development comprises domestic extensions to an existing dwelling and the

demolition of small garage. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal. I have assessed the proposed development and considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status.

10.2. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater bodies, for the following reasons:

- The nature and scale of the works, small domestic extensions in a serviced urban location;
- The urban location of the site in a fully serviced residential area;
- The distance from the nearest waterbodies and the absence of any direct hydrological connections.

10.3. I conclude on the basis of objective information that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

## 11.0 **Assessment**

### 11.1. **Overview**

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

- Principle of the development
- Design, scale and character
- Residential amenity – overlooking and privacy

## **11.2. Principle of the development**

- 11.2.1. The subject site comprises an existing residential property located within lands zoned 'ZO 01 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods' under the Cork City Development Plan 2022 - 2028, where the objective is to protect and provide for residential uses and amenities. The proposed development involves the extension and alteration of an existing dwelling on a residentially zoned site. I am satisfied that the principle of the proposed domestic extension is acceptable at this location and is consistent with the established residential use, the zoning objective and the relevant policy framework.
- 11.2.2. I note that the appellant does not object to the principle of the redevelopment. The substantive grounds of appeal are confined to the specific question of the north-facing ground-floor windows on the single-storey rear extension and their proximity to the northern boundary. I therefore address this matter in detail below.

## **11.3. Design, Scale and Character**

- 11.3.1. The original application proposed two-storey flat roof extensions extending beyond the gable walls of the existing dwelling on both sides. The PA's assessment was that the flat roof design and the extent of the two-storey element beyond the western gable were unsympathetic to the existing hipped roof character of the dwelling and to the prevailing character of the surrounding streetscape, where hipped roof design predominates. These concerns were raised by way of RFI and addressed by the applicant in revised drawings submitted 10th February 2026.
- 11.3.2. Having regard to the amended drawings, I am satisfied that the revised scheme is more coherent in design terms with the existing dwelling and with the pattern of development in the surrounding residential area. The hipped roof form of the extensions responds appropriately to the existing hipped roof of the dwelling and to the predominant roof character of the area. I am satisfied that the revised design, scale and layout of the proposed development, as conditioned, is acceptable and consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

#### 11.4. Residential Amenity – Overlooking and Privacy

- 11.4.1. The central concern raised in this appeal relates to two north-facing windows proposed on the single-storey rear extension, which is located approximately 1.8 metres from the northern boundary with the appellant's property. The appellant contends that these windows will allow overlooking of their rear garden at standing height. Having inspected the site and considered all submissions, I note the following material factors:
- 11.4.2. The cill height of the two north-facing ground-floor windows on the single-storey rear extension is 1.625 metres above finished floor level, with a head height of 2.30 metres. The top of the existing boundary fence directly opposite these windows is noted at 2.05 metres above finished floor level. The fence therefore sits above the window cill height, providing a degree of screening to the lower portion of the windows from the appellant's side.
- 11.4.3. Site inspection and photographic evidence submitted with the applicant's response confirm that the finished ground level of the subject site is marginally lower than that of the adjoining property to the north along the shared boundary. This level differential increases the effective height of the boundary fence as experienced from within the subject site and correspondingly reduces the potential for overlooking into the appellant's garden at ground level.
- 11.4.4. Having regard to the floor plan drawings, the north-facing windows on the single-storey rear extension serve ancillary accommodation. A review of the proposed floor plans confirms that the rooms in question serve a bathroom and scullery/utility function rather than principal habitable rooms such as bedrooms or living rooms.
- 11.4.5. There is no indication from any party that the boundary fence shown in the photographic evidence will be removed or reduced in height as part of the proposed development.
- 11.4.6. Taking all of the above factors into consideration the boundary fence height exceeding the window cill level, the level difference between the two sites operating

in the appellant's favour, and the ancillary nature of the accommodation served by the windows, I am satisfied that the proposed north-facing ground-floor windows on the single-storey rear extension would not give rise to direct overlooking of the appellant's rear garden at standing height to a degree that would constitute a significant adverse amenity impact. I consider that the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential amenity of the appellant's property in this regard.

- 11.4.7. In relation to the first floor north-facing windows on the two-storey rear extension, I note that these were assessed by the planner in the second planning report. The proposed first-floor rear windows are located approximately 9 metres from the northern boundary. The opposing rear-facing first-floor windows of the appellant's property are approximately 30 metres from those of the proposed extension. This substantially exceeds the 16-metre minimum separation required under SPPR 1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines 2024. I concur with the planner's assessment that these windows would not give rise to direct overlooking and would not constitute a negative residential amenity impact.
- 11.4.8. I have also had regard to the appellant's original submission concerns regarding the overall scale, bulk and massing of the development and the absence of sectional information. These matters were addressed through the RFI process and are reflected in the conditions attached to the permission, which require development to be carried out in accordance with the amended drawings of 10th February 2026. I am satisfied that these matters were appropriately dealt with.
- 11.4.9. In conclusion, having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, the amended design, the physical characteristics of the site and shared boundary, and the applicable policy framework, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area. I consider the proposed development to be in accordance with Section 11.100 of the Cork City Development Plan 2022 -2028 and with SPPR 1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines 2024.

## 12.0 Recommendation

12.1. I recommend that permission be Granted for the proposed development

## 13.0 Reason and Considerations

13.1. Having regard to the nature of development proposed involving extensions and refurbishment of an existing dwelling, the location and the context of the site and the surrounding area, the policies and objectives of the Cork City Development Plan 2022 -2028 and the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024, it is considered that the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area or give rise to unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy to adjoining properties. The proposed development is therefore in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 14.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The proposed development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 10/02/2026 except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the proposed development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of clarity</p>
2.	<p>The extensions and the existing dwelling combined shall be confined solely to residential use as a single private dwelling unit and shall not be sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interests of residential amenity.</p>

3.	<p>All external finishes (including roof tiles/slates, render finish and windows) shall be strictly as proposed in the drawings submitted to the Planning Authority and as amended on 10th February 2026, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interests of visual amenity.</p>
4.	<p>The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> in the interest of public health.</p>
5.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between 0800 to 1900 hours Mondays to Fridays inclusive and 0800 to 1400 on Saturdays, and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> in order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
6.	<p>Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall submit details of a Construction Management Plan for the written agreement of the planning authority. The plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the proposed development, including traffic management, working hours, noise and dust management, and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste. The proposed development shall be carried out in accordance with the written agreed details.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In order to ensure a satisfactory standard of development, in the interest of residential amenity and public safety.</p>
7.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public Infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by</p>

<p>or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to the commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer, or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiun Pleanala to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission</p>
--

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

---

Adam Kearney

Planning Inspector

22<sup>nd</sup> of May 2026

**Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening**

<b>Case Reference</b>	PL-501099-CC-26
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Construction of an extension to the front, side and rear of the dwelling, removal of a pitched roof and demolition of detached garage and all associated site works.
<b>Development Address</b>	Eversleigh, Hettyfield, Douglas, Cork
<b>IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX /OR LEAVE BLANK</b>	
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>  (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.
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in <b>Part 1</b> .  <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q	

**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)**

**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

No

**Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)**

**Inspector:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_