



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501278-DR-26

Development	Single storey extensions to side and front of house with associated works.
Location	39 Castle Park, Monkstown, Dublin, A94X752
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D26B/0092/WEB
Applicant(s)	Ciaran O'Grady
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Darach McEvoy
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	13 th July 2026
Inspector	Barry Diamond

Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision.....	3
4.0	Planning History	5
5.0	Policy Context.....	6
6.0	EIA Screening.....	8
7.0	The Appeal	8
8.0	Assessment.....	8
9.0	AA Screening.....	13
10.0	Water Framework Directive	13
11.0	Recommendation	15
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	15
13.0	Conditions	15

Appendix 1 –EIA Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site is circa 0.1ha and comprises an existing single storey dwelling and detached car port which is set to the side of the dwelling. The dwelling is set back from the Castle Park Road by 30 metres and has large private garden areas to both the front and rear of the dwelling.
- 1.2. The dwelling has a gabled roof, with the gable orientated towards the road. There is a long horizontal skylight on the apex of the roof which runs for a considerable distance and raises the maximum height of the dwelling to 4.65 metres, however, the main body of the dwelling has a ridge height of 4.1 metres. The dwelling is principally finished in roughcast render, although some wood panelling is evident on the front elevation.
- 1.3. A 2 metre high hedge secures the majority of the site's perimeter, including the road frontage, however, a 2 metre high wall extends along a portion of the northwestern and southeastern side elevations of the dwelling and separates the site from the side elevations of Nos. 38 and 40 Castle Park.
- 1.4. The site is located within a residential cul-de-sac which has a mixture of dwelling types. The dwellings along the northeastern side of the Castle Road are primarily screened from view by mature hedgerows and in-curtilage vegetation.
- 1.5. The application site is partially within the zone of archaeological potential for Archaeological Monument No. 023-014 which is located 40 metres to the northwest and includes Monkstown Castle which is also a Protected Structure (RPS No. 1042).

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises a number of different elements including:
 - Demolition of the existing car port and the erection of a single storey extension to the side of the dwelling with roof lights over;
 - A single storey extension to the front elevation with rooflights over new and existing roof, with a canopied area to the front;
 - Changes internally to allow new design and alterations to the fenestration on all elevations;
 - Maintain connection to public sewerage and surface water; and

- All ancillary site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

On the 9th April 2026 the Planning Authority issued a decision to grant planning permission subject to conditions.

3.1.1. Conditions

2. The entire dwelling shall be used as a single dwelling unit and shall not be subdivided in any manner or used as two or more separate habitable units.

Reason: To prevent unauthorised development.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the planner reflects the decision to grant planning permission. It includes the following points:

- There are no windows to the southeastern elevation of the front extension so there is no overlooking of No. 38 Castle Park;
- There is only one single bathroom window finished in obscure glazing on the northwestern elevation of the side extension where it abuts No. 40 which limits any overlooking;
- It is considered that the proposed contemporary development would not detract from the existing streetscape;
- Given the set back from the road and the single storey nature of the extensions, there will be no overshadowing or overbearing impacts;
- The alterations to the fenestration on all elevations of the existing dwelling are considered minor in nature;
- The property will maintain a minimum driveway length of 6 metres in accordance with Section 12.3.7.1 (iv) of the Development Plan; and
- The proposal does not lead to any significant concerns in relation to Appropriate Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No consultation of prescribed bodies was carried out by the Planning Authority, however, as part of the appeal it was considered necessary to carry out consultation with the following relevant bodies:

- An Taisce – No response received.
- The Heritage Council - No response received.
- Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage – No objections.

4.0 Planning History

Site

No relevant history.

Setting

D19A/0021 - Permission was granted in March 2019 for the demolition/removal of section of existing (single storey) extension to the rear, the construction of (single storey) extensions to the rear, the construction of (single storey) extension to the front. The infilling existing (internal/open) porch to the (north-west) side and the alterations to existing window opes and of/addition of new window/external door opes to the front and (south-east) side elevations, all to existing (single storey) detached house at 32 Castle Park, Monkstown, Co Dublin.

D14B/0233 - Permission was granted in October 2014 for the development consisting of works to the single storey dwelling; demolition of shed and chimney stack to front; construction of single storey extensions to the front and rear; refurbishment works to roof to include construction of 8 no. roof lights and 2 no. clerestory windows; changes to front, sides and rear elevations, refurbishment and internal amendments to the existing house; all associated landscaping to front and rear gardens, drainage and site development works at 31 Castle Park, Monkstown, Co Dublin.

D06B/0892 - Permission was granted in November 2006 to replace demolished sections of an existing house previously indicated as retained under Ref. D05B/0640 with new construction replicating demolished structures, including minor alterations to increase size of master bedroom and bedroom 1 to rear of 37 Castle Park, Monkstown, Co. Dublin.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The relevant Development Plan is the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028. The site is zoned 'A' with the objective to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities. Residential development, including alterations to existing dwellings, is permitted in principle under this zoning.

Chapter 3 Climate Action

Section 3.4 Achieving Sustainable Planning Outcomes

Section 3.4.1.3 Policy Objective CA7: Construction Materials.

Chapter 4 Neighbourhood – People, Homes and Place

Section 4.3.1.2 Policy Objective PHP19 – Existing Housing Stock – Adaptation

Section 4.3.1.3 Policy Objective PHP20 – Protection of Existing Residential Amenity

Chapter 11 Heritage and Conservation

Section 11.3.1.1 Policy Objective HER1: Protection of Archaeological Heritage - It is a Policy Objective to protect archaeological sites, National Monuments (and their settings), which have been identified in the Record of Monuments and Places and, where feasible, appropriate and applicable to promote access to and signposting of such sites and monuments.

Section 11.4.1.2 Policy Objective HER8: Work to Protected Structures - Ensure that any development proposals to Protected Structures, their curtilage and setting shall have regard to the 'Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities.

Chapter 12 (Development Management)

Section 12.3.7.1 Extensions to Dwellings

- (i) Front extensions, at both ground and first level will be considered acceptable in principle subject to scale, design, and impact on visual and residential amenities. A break in the front building line will be acceptable, over two floors to the front elevation, subject to scale and design however a significant break in the building line should be resisted unless the design can demonstrate to the Planning Authority that the proposal will not impact on the visual or residential amenities of directly adjoining dwellings. Excessive scale should be avoided.
- (iii) Ground floor side extensions will be evaluated against proximity to boundaries, size, and visual harmony with existing (especially front elevation) and impacts on adjoining residential amenity.
- Roof alterations/expansions to main roof profiles - changing the hip-end roof of a semi-detached house to a gable/ 'A' frame end or 'half-hip' for example – will be assessed against a number of criteria including:
 - Careful consideration and special regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjacent structures.
 - Existing roof variations on the streetscape.
 - Distance/contrast/visibility of proposed roof end.
 - Harmony with the rest of the structure, adjacent structures, and prominence

Section 12.4.5.1 - Parking Zones

Section 12.4.5.2 - Application of Standards

Section 12.8.7 - Private Amenity Standards – Quality Standards.

Section 12.8.7.2 - Boundaries.

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

The appeal site is not located on or within proximity to any designated Natura 2000 site. The subject site is situated c. 0.75km to the south of the South Dublin Bay SAC (site code SAC 000210) and the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (site code SPA 004024).

6.0 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. No requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of my report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The appellants (No. 38 Castle Drive) grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The front extension of 6.3 metres is not a big problem in itself;
- The main roof of the dwelling will extend over the full length of the front extension (6.3 metres) at a height of 4.4 metres which will have a visually overbearing impact beside the front door/porch/front patio area of No. 38;
- The roof area over the front extension has a vaulted roof which should be replaced with a flat roof.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

The grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which, in the opinion of the Planning Authority, would justify a change of attitude to the proposed development.

7.3. Observations

None

8.0 Assessment

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

- Principle of Development

- Design & Layout
- Residential Amenity
- Other Matters

8.2 Principle of Development

8.2.1 The site is located on lands which are subject to 'Existing Residential (A)' under the Development Plan, the objective of which is "to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities." I also note that the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 is supportive of residential extensions. In this regard Section 12.3.7.1 'Extensions to Dwellings' supports applications to amend existing dwelling units to reconfigure and extend existing dwellings subject to specific safeguards. I consider that the principle of a residential extension is acceptable subject to issues of design, neighbour amenity and other relevant factors.

8.3 Design

- 8.3.1 The application site contains an existing low level single storey dwelling with a ridge height of 4.1 metres although there is a long horizontal roof light which extends along the ridge line of the dwelling and increases this section of the roof to 4.65 metres. There is a detached carport to the side of the dwelling which is set back from the main building line of the dwelling and abuts the boundary with No. 40 Castle Park.
- 8.3.2 The proposed development contains three main elements, the demolition of the existing car port and the erection of a side annex, the erection of a front extension and amendments to the fenestration of the main dwelling.
- 8.3.3 The amendments to the existing fenestration of the main dwelling are relatively minor works and include the reduction, enlargement and movement of some of the existing openings. In my view these works would have little impact on the overall design and appearance of the existing dwelling and would be in accordance with Section 12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan.
- 8.3.4 The proposed side annex is to be erected behind the front building line of the existing dwelling and measures 13.4 metres by 4.7 metres and 4.4 metres in height. The annex includes a hallway, a bathroom, bedroom and a sitting room area. The ridge height of the proposed extension does not exceed the highest part of the ridge line of the existing dwelling and appears subordinate to the main dwelling, however,

the angle of the roof pitch is steeper than the existing dwelling. There is one large angled window and a new entrance door with a zinc canopy on the front elevation of the proposed side annex.

8.3.5 The proposed front annex extends 6.35 metres from the front of the existing dwelling and has a height of 4.1 metres which mirrors the ridge height and roof profile of the existing dwelling. The front elevation is noted as having a brick finish and timber cladding with two large window openings.

8.3.6 Although there are aspects of the design (roof pitch, window openings and materials) which do not readily harmonise with the design of the existing dwelling, I am of the view that there are limited views of the existing dwelling due to the roadside and intervening vegetation along with the set back from the public road. In this context I consider that the design of the proposed side and front annexes is acceptable.

8.3.7 The proposed front annex extends 6.35 metres from the front of the existing dwelling and during the processing of the planning application the breaching of the front building line along Castle Park was raised as a concern by third parties. It was stated that the breaching of the building line would impact on the uniform character of the area.

8.3.8 The application site is set in a row of dwellings to the northeastern side of Castle Park. In my view, when viewed from along Castle Park the various dwellings are set back off the road at varying distances, with No. 40 being 35 metres from the public road and No. 37 being 16 metres. In addition, views of the dwellings are restricted due to existing roadside hedging and intervening vegetation including trees and shrubbery set within the front garden areas. In my opinion, when viewed from the public road, there is no uniform building line to the northeastern side of Castle Park and the position of the proposed front annex forward of the existing dwelling would not harm the character of the area.

8.3.10 The extensions to the dwelling, along with the internal reconfiguration will increase the number of bedrooms from three to five overall. Section 12.8.3.3 of the Development Plan states that the private open space for a dwelling with four or more bedrooms is 75 sqm. Following the completion of the proposed development, there will remain in excess of 300sqm useable amenity space to the rear of the dwelling which I consider to be acceptable.

8.4 Residential Amenity

- 8.4.1 There are a number of changes to the fenestration of the existing dwelling which are relatively minor. Along the southeastern elevation, one window is to be substantially reduced, while another bathroom window is to be blocked up with a new window of similar size to be constructed. Neither of these would increase the level of overlooking given that there is a two metre high boundary wall partially defining the boundary with No. 38 Castle Park while the gable elevation of No. 38 forms the remainder of the boundary and there are no opposing windows.
- 8.4.2 To the rear of the dwelling, it is proposed to remove one window and replace it with a set of patio doors. There are no dwellings to the rear which have opposing windows and there are two metre high hedges defining the rear boundaries. I consider that there will be no adverse impacts from overlooking from any of the changes to the fenestration of the existing dwelling.
- 8.4.3 The proposed side annex contains one window on its northwestern elevation where it abuts No. 40 Castle Park, however, this is indicated to be a bathroom window and is to be finished in opaque glazing. In addition, there is a two metre high wall along with a high hedge separating the site from No. 40 along its southeastern elevation. Given the single storey nature of the extension, the existing boundary treatment and the obscure glazed window, I consider that there is no overlooking from the side extension. I am also of the opinion that given the existing boundary treatment and the impact from the existing car port, that the proposed extension, which is set off the boundary, would not add to the impact of overshadowing or dominance on No. 40 Castle Park.
- 8.4.4 There are no windows on the southeastern elevation of the front extension where it abuts No. 38 Castle Park and there are no concerns with overlooking from the proposed front extension.
- 8.4.5 The third party (No. 38 Castle Park) raised concerns with the overbearing nature of the proposed extension and indicated that the extension should be reduced to a flat roof beside the front door/porch/front patio area of No. 38.
- 8.4.6 The existing front door/porch area of No. 38 is already set behind the rear building line of the appeal dwelling which has an eaves height of 3.3 metres and a ridge height of 4.1 metres. The proposed extension will maintain the same eaves and ridge heights as the existing dwelling along the southeastern elevation, however, it

will extend the southeastern elevation by a further 6.35 metres. Separating the application site and the third party's property (No.38) is a 2 metre high hedge and the proposed extension is to have a setback of 0.865 metres off the shared boundary.

8.4.7 Given the low elevation nature of the proposed front annex which mirrors the height of the existing dwelling along this section of the boundary, I am of the opinion that the proposed extension will not have any more domineering impact than the existing dwelling on the front porch area of No. 38 Castle Park. In addition, given that the extension is positioned to the northwest of No.38 and given the intervening boundary treatment I consider that the proposed front annex will not have any significant impact in terms of overshadowing.

8.4.8 The existing boundaries to the site, including existing walls and hedgerows have a significant role in mitigating some of the impacts. The proposed site plan does not show the existing boundary treatment and therefore I consider it necessary to impose a condition requiring the retention of the existing boundary hedge along the boundary with No. 38 Castle Park.

8.5 Other Matters

8.5.1 As indicated by zoning Map 03 (Land Zoning Map) of the Development Plan the application site is partially within the zone of Archaeological Potential for Archaeological Monument No. 023-014 which includes; Castle Tower House (023-014001), Gatehouse (023-014002) and Bawn (023-014003) with Monkstown Castle also being a Protected Structure (RPS No. 1042). In addition, the site lies close to but outside of the zone of Archaeological Monument No. 023-013 which includes a Church (023-013001), Graveyard (023-013002), Charnel House (023-013003). These monuments are subject to statutory protection in the Record of Monuments and Places established under Section 12 of the National Monuments (Amendment) Act 1930- 2014.

8.5.2 No consultation was carried out by the Planning Authority during the processing of the planning application, however, it was considered necessary as part of the appeal consideration to consult with An Taisce, the Heritage Council and the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage. A response was received from the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage which indicated that given the proposed development is relatively small in scale and unlikely to have an archaeological impact. No other responses were received.

- 8.5.3 Policy Objective HER 1 refers to the impact of development on the setting of a archaeological sites/monument and Policy Objective HER 8 refers to the impact of development on the setting of a Protected Structure. While the application site lies close to the monuments and protected structure (40 metres to the northwest), the site does not lie within the curtilage of the protected structure or monument. Although Monkstown Castle can be viewed from the application due to its height, I am of the opinion that the proposed development would not affect any public views of Monkstown Castle nor would it affect the setting of any monument or protected structure and is acceptable.
- 8.5.4 In my opinion given the previous development of the site, the relative minor nature of the and the response of the consultee I am of the opinion that no archaeological mitigation is required for the proposed development.
- 8.5.5 The application site is located partially within Zone 2 and partially within Zone 3 parking areas as defined by supplementary Map T2 of the Development Plan with Table 12.5 indicating that a standard of two parking spaces are required for a house with three or more bedrooms in both parking zones. I consider that there is sufficient areas of hardstanding within the site to accommodate two car parking spaces.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1 I have considered the development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located at 39 Castle Park, Monkstown, Dublin, A94X752 no relevant designated sites are close by.
- 9.2 The proposed development comprises a single storey extensions to side and front of house with associated works. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal. 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 European Site.
- 9.3 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Small scale and nature of the development;
 - Distance from nearest European site and lack of connections; and
 - The screening decision of the Planning Authority.

- 9.4 I conclude that 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 (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1 The subject site is located at 39 Castle Park, Monkstown, Dublin, A94X752 which is 0.45km metres south of the nearest water body.
- 10.2 The proposed development comprises a single storey extensions to side and front of house with associated works. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.3 I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Nature of works e.g. small scale and nature of the development; and
 - Distance from nearest water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections.
- 10.4 I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

That planning permission be granted for the reasons and considerations set out below and subject to the conditions set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the design, appearance of the proposed side and front extensions to the dwelling along with the changes to the fenestration of the existing dwelling, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions below, the development proposed would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area or residential amenities of property's in the vicinity and would not adversely impact on the character of the area. The proposed development, therefore, would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged and received by the Planning Authority on the 16th day of February 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 development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars. Reason: In the interest of clarity.
2.	The existing dwelling and extension shall be used as a single dwelling unit apart from such use as may be exempted development for the purposes of the Planning and Development Regulations. Reason: In the interests of clarity and to ensure the proper and sustainable development of the area.
3.	The existing boundary treatments along the boundary with No. 38 Castle Park shall be retained at a minimum height of 1.8 metres. Reason: In the interest of visual and residential amenity.

4.	The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority. Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interests of sustainable drainage
5.	a) All necessary measures shall be taken by the applicant to prevent any spillage or deposition of clay, dust, rubble or other debris, whether arising from vehicle wheels or otherwise, on the adjoining and/or adjacent public road and footpath network during the course of the construction works. b) Any damage to roads, footpaths or other public property caused by the development shall be made good to the satisfaction of the District Engineer. Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and proper control of development.
6.	The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme. Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

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

Barry Diamond
Planning Inspector

18th August 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501278-DR-26
Proposed Development Summary	Single storey extensions to side and front of house with associated works
Development Address	39 Castle Park, Monkstown, Dublin, A94X752
	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)	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. ☐ 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)?	
☐ 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)	

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 ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

This page is intentionally blank.