



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501362-DS-26

Development	Single storey house
Location	Rear of 4 to 16 St. Brendan's Cottages, Irishtown, Dublin 4
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1487/26
Applicant	JP Dairy Development Ltd
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse permission
Type of Appeal	First Party v. decision
Appellant	JP Dairy Development Ltd
Observers	Yes
Date of Site Inspection	28 July 2026
Inspector	B. Wyse

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The development site is located to the rear of St. Brendan's Cottages and the adjacent The Square in Irishtown, Dublin 4. It has a stated area of 0.023has and comprises the central section of a larger site outlined blue on the site layout plan and all within the applicant's ownership. This larger site is elongated and extends the full length of the rear of St. Brendan's Cottages and includes two extended areas with access gates, one mid-terrace between No.s 6 and 7 St. Brendan's Cottages and one at the north eastern end of the terrace, beside No.16 St. Brendan's Cottages. The overall site appears to have previously accommodated a number of sheds and similar structures but has largely been cleared.
- 1.2. St. Brendan's Cottages originally comprised small, single storey terrace houses with small rear yards. Several have been extended at ground and first floor levels to the rear, including in some cases raising the roof ridge levels. Many of the extensions extend to the common boundary with the application site.
- 1.3. Adjacent houses in The Square include three two storey units and one single storey unit.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development is a single storey, two-bedroom house on a site formed from the sub-division of sites for Units 1 and 3 approved under PA Ref. 3961/24, ABP Ref. 321310-24. Access would be from between 6 and 7 St. Brendan's Cottages shared with Unit 1.
- 2.2. Similar to those approved units the house would occupy the full width of the site. It would comprise two main elements, one housing the main living/dining/kitchen area and bathroom and the other the two bedrooms. These two elements would include gable ended pitched roofs, finished in metal cladding, running the long axis of the site. In between there would be two small courtyards and a flat roofed linking corridor. There would also be a small front garden.
- 2.3. Application documentation includes a Design Statement and a Flood Risk Assessment.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The decision to refuse permission refers to the following reason:

The proposed development for single storey residential dwelling on a constrained site and taking into consideration its proximity to adjoining property boundaries, results in an overbearing impact on adjacent properties. Furthermore, concern is noted at the level of light and outlook provided to the bedroom 1, given the window faces onto a small restricted courtyard, and as such would provide for a substandard level of accommodation. It is therefore considered the development would seriously injure the amenities of residents to existing and permitted property in the vicinity, would devalue property in the vicinity and would create an undesirable precedent for similar type development in the locality. Therefore, the proposed development is considered to be contrary to the Z1 and Z2 zoning objectives for the site and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

Basis for planning authority decision. Includes:

- *Whilst it is acknowledged the height of the unit has been reduced, the overall design would still result in a sizable building being placed in this tight plot. At 5.5m high the building would be considered overbearing, particularly to the properties which still have small gardens along St. Brendan's Cottages. Taking into account the size of the proposed unit and its proximity to the north eastern and north western boundaries, it is considered the unit would represent overdevelopment within this constrained site and would have an overbearing impact on the adjoining properties.*
- No requirement for appropriate assessment or environmental impact assessment.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Drainage Division

Further information requested in relation to:

- The need to reconsider the bedroom finished floor levels and to demonstrate that they have been appropriately set in accordance with DCC Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).
- Details of locations on site for storage of demountable flood barriers.

Transportation Planning Division

No objection to there being no car parking proposed to serve the dwelling and no objection overall subject to a standard condition.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Eireann – Recommends standard conditions.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Six submissions received that raised similar issues to those raised in the observation submissions on the appeal (see Section 7.3 below).

4.0 Planning History

PA Ref. 3961/24, ABP Ref. 321310-24

This is the June 2025 decision in relation to the previous proposal for the development of the larger/overall site (and as referenced in the public notices for the current proposal). The application was for three two storey, two bedroom houses. The split decision granted permission for Units 1 and 3 and refused permission for Unit 2. The reason for refusing Unit 2 states as follows:

Having regard to the 'Z1' and 'Z2' zoning objective for the site and its setting, Section 15.13.3 and Section 15.13.4 of the Dublin City Development Plan, 2022-2028; the pattern of development in the area and the nature, scale and extent of the proposed development, it is considered that Unit number 2, by reason of its positioning to site boundaries of adjoining properties, and its overall built form and design scale, would seriously injure the residential amenities of adjoining properties by reason of visual

obtrusion, overlooking and overshadowing. It is also considered that this unit would represent significant overdevelopment of this constrained site.

The permission granted for Units 1 and 3 also referred to the demolition of three vacant shed units on the site.

PA Ref. 5282/22, ABP Ref. 315876-23

This is an April 2024 refusal of permission for a proposal for three two-storey two bedroom houses on the larger/overall site. The reason for refusal states:

The proposed dwellings 1 and 2 are designed so as to have a first-floor bedroom window in each unit facing east. These windows would lie 0.8 metres from the private amenity space of proposed dwellings 2 and 3 respectively. Notwithstanding proposals to enclose the east boundary of dwellings 1 and 2 by 1.5-metre-high obscure glazing, undue overlooking would arise onto these private amenity spaces which is not considered acceptable for the enjoyment of future occupants of dwellings 2 and 3. The Board noted the Planning Inspector's recommended condition to increase the height of the obscure glazing to prevent such overlooking occurrence. While this would serve to address the overlooking issue of concern, it would also lead to a resultant poor and unacceptable outlook for future occupants of these dwellings where the view out of the bedrooms on the east elevation would be directly facing onto a high obscure glazed privacy screen. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the Z1 and Z2 zoning objectives for the site and to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

PA Ref. 3621/22

This is a 2022 refusal of permission for four two storey houses on the overall site (reduced to three units at further information stage). Reasons for refusal included reference to overdevelopment, overlooking and overshadowing.

PA Ref. E0181/26

This is a current enforcement file relating to alleged demolition on the site.

Immediately Adjacent

PA Ref. 1260/17, ABP Ref. 248898

This is a 2017 permission for a single storey house at The Square (now No.8d).

This is a 2014 permission to retain a rear dormer and to construct a first floor rear extension at No.9 St. Brendan's Cottages.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028

Zoning

Most of the site is zoned Z1 – To protect, provide and improve residential amenities.

The portion of the site located between No.s 6 and 7 St. Brendan's Cottages is zoned Z2 – To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas.

The Z2 zoning also applies to St. Brendan's Cottages generally.

Section 15.13.4 Backland Housing

Backland development is generally defined as development of land that lies to the rear of an existing property or building line. Dublin City Council will allow for the provision of comprehensive backland development where the opportunity exists. Backland housing can comprise of larger scale redevelopment with an overall site access; mews dwellings with access from a rear laneway or detached habitable dwellings to the rear of existing housing with independent vehicular access.

Developments with street presence are generally governed by clear set out rules established by the urban order of an existing streetscape. Backland development, however, requires more innovation and reinterpretation to enable comprehensive development of these spaces.

Consideration of access and servicing and the interrelationship between overlooking, privacy, aspect and daylight / sunlight are paramount to the success and acceptability of new development in backland conditions.

Where there is potential to provide backland development at more than one site/property in a particular area, the Planning Authority will seek to encourage the amalgamation of adjoining sites/properties in order to provide for a more comprehensive backland development, this should be discussed at pre-planning stage. Piecemeal backland development with multiple vehicular access points will not be encouraged. See Appendix 5 for further details on vehicular access.

Applications for backland housing should consider the following:

- *Compliance with relevant residential design standards in relation to unit size, room size, private open space etc.*

- *Provision of adequate separation distances to ensure privacy is maintained and overlooking is minimised.*
- *That safe and secure access for car parking and service and maintenance vehicles is provided.*
- *The scale, form and massing of the existing properties and interrelationship with the proposed backland development.*
- *The impacts on the either the amenity of the existing properties in terms of daylight, sunlight, visual impact etc. or on the amenity obtained with the unit itself.*
- *The materials and finishes proposed with regard to existing character of the area.*
- *A proposed backland dwelling shall be located not less than 15 metres from the rear façade of the existing dwelling, and with a minimum rear garden depth of 7 metres.*
- *A relaxation in rear garden length, may be acceptable, once sufficient open space provided to serve the proposed dwelling and the applicant can demonstrate that the proposed backland dwelling will not impact negatively on adjoining residential amenity.*

All applications for infill developments will be assessed on a case by case basis. In certain instances, Dublin City Council may permit relaxation of some standards to promote densification and urban consolidation in specific areas. The applicant must demonstrate high quality urban design and a comprehensive understanding of the site and the specific constraints to justify the proposal.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

None relevant.

6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

- 6.1. 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 EIA screening or EIA.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The applicants response to the planning authority decision is to propose a number of design modifications for the house. The main elements of the redesign can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed house would be one-bedroom.
- Two internal courtyards replaced by a single larger courtyard.
- Zinc clad pitched roof replaced with a near flat zinc clad roof to reduce overall height. Roof ridge height is reduced from 7.02m to 6.54m and the height nearest the boundary with St. Brendan's Cottages is reduced from 5.5m to 4.69m.
- Clarification that access to the proposed house would be over the passageway between No.s 5 and 6 St. Brendan's Cottages, wholly in the ownership of the applicant. The access would remain in the ownership of Unit 1 with a pedestrian right-of way to the proposed house. It is proposed that the right-of-way would be delineated on the paving.
- In response to concerns raised by the City Council Drainage Division the bedroom floor level is raised 860mm above the original proposal so as to be above the flood risk level and thereby satisfy the Dublin City Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment criteria for a 1000 year flood event. Permanently fixed, swinging flood barriers would be fitted to the front door, the door from the living room to the courtyard and the doors from the living room to the garden. An Engineers report is attached.

Referencing the revised design the main points of argument advanced are as follows:

- The original ridge on 4-16 St. Brendan's Cottages is 6.74m while a number of the cottages have first floor extensions and an increased ridge height of 7.47m.
- The proposed house is further masked because a number of the St. Brendan's Cottages have extensions over their rear gardens and adjoining the boundary wall of the proposed house.
- The proposed sloping portion of the roof is set back from the boundary to facilitate rainwater gutters within the curtilage of the proposed house.

- The proposal would comply with all relevant policies, objectives and standards for backland development as provided for in guidelines at Section 15.13.4 of the city development plan and those in relevant Section 28 guidelines.

The submission includes revised drawings.

7.2. **Planning Authority Response**

The Commission should uphold the planning authority decision. In the event of a grant of permission a Section 48 development contribution would apply.

7.3. **Observations**

Three observation submissions are lodged by adjacent residents. The main points raised may be summarised as follows:

7.3.1. Sarah Coffey and Darragh Redmond, 6 St. Brendan's Cottages

- The application is reintroducing what has been previously refused by both Dublin City Council and An Bord Pleanala.
- Planning enforcement issues arise as the full site has been demolished, not just the removal of corrugated roofs.
- Until the conditions and investigation is completed in regard to ABP Ref. 321310-24 it is requested that the appeal be rejected.

7.3.2. Cristini Marini, 7 St. Brendan's Cottages

- The application effectively reintroduces what has been previously refused by both Dublin City Council and An Bord Pleanala.
- The roof of the proposed single storey house is higher than the maximum height of No.10 St. Brendan's.
- The proposal would heavily impact the amount of light entering the front windows at ground and first floor levels of the observer's house, adding further to the effects from the approved Unit 1.
- Concerns arise in relation to demolition works already undertaken on the site.

7.3.3. Margaret O’Riordan, 10 St. Brendan’s Cottages

- Support for the planning authority decision.
- The shed, now demolished, that stood on the site had no impact in terms of overshadowing or overlooking, on the observer’s house (photograph enclosed).
- The proposal would block the light to the observers bedroom.
- The proposed house, located to the north and west of the observer’s, would clearly cause overshadowing. It would also affect the observers courtyard (drawing and photograph enclosed).
- The height and orientation of the proposed bedroom windows would allow a direct line of sight into the observer’s upstairs bedroom.
- The proposal would also devalue the observer’s property.

8.0 **Assessment**

- 8.1. The main issues in this appeal are those raised in the planning authority reason for refusal and I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise.
- 8.2. The issues focus on the potential impact of the proposed house on the residential amenities of adjacent properties and on the standard of accommodation within the house itself.
- 8.3. The primary change in this application from the previous decision under PA Ref. 3961/234, ABP Ref. 321310, and which granted permission for Units 1 and 3 and omitted Unit 2, is that it now proposes Unit 2 as a single storey unit instead of two storeys, noting that the approved units 1 and 2 are two storey.
- 8.4. This change, in and of itself, reduces the height and bulk of the proposed house to a considerable degree. By reference to the original design as submitted in the application, and the section drawings submitted with the application and the appeal, the maximum height of the proposed house to roof ridge level would be 5.5m, or 7.02m OD/SD. This is over 1m lower than the previously proposed two storey unit and the permitted Units 1 and 3. It is almost 5m lower than the adjacent 8c The Square

and only about 300mm higher than the original ridge height of St. Brendan's Cottages. It is almost 500mm lower than the raised roofs of many of those cottages.

- 8.5. Given that the proposed house is now single storey and taking account of the proposed roof profile, with its highest point at the centre of the site and the roof planes sloping down to the site boundaries, I find it difficult to agree with the planning authority that the proposed house would have an overbearing impact on the adjacent properties. In relation to 8c The Square the house for the most part would abutt the much larger blank gable wall with only relatively short projections beyond to the front and back of that property. In relation to St. Brendan's Cottages the proposed roof ridge would be a some distance, about 3m, from the common boundary and the roof slope would significantly mitigate any sense of additional enclosure. It would also ensure that any shadowing effects are minimised – such effects being unlikely to be significant in any event given the relative orientation of the properties where the proposed house would be due north west of the cottages. It is also worth noting that all the nearest cottages have substantial rear extensions, many at ground and first floor levels and extending over all or nearly all of their former small rear yards and abutting the common boundary with the application site. Their occupants visual experience of the proposed house, therefore, would be limited and only partial, in many cases only from their upper floor accommodation. As it is single storey only potential overlooking from the proposed house does not arise either.
- 8.6. I do not consider that the concerns raised by the Observers in relation to these matters can be substantiated. It follows that I do not consider that the proposal would give rise to serious injury to residential amenity in the area or to devaluation of property.
- 8.7. It should be noted that, while the site is clearly constrained, a reference that is made in previous planning decisions, concerns with other metrics (apart from overbearance, overshadowing or overlooking) that might point to overdevelopment, again previously mentioned, such as plot ratio, site coverage, amount of private open space etc., do not arise in this case and are not referenced in the planning authority decision. In fact it could be argued that the proposed development, in conjunction with Units 1 and 3 as already permitted, would substantially replicate the established tight knit pattern of development in this area.

- 8.8. As indicated the assessment above is on the basis of the proposed house design as originally submitted with the application. In the appeal the applicants propose a number of modifications (see Section 7.1 above). These modifications are, in my view, within scope and can be accepted should the Commission decide to do so.
- 8.9. The main external modification is to the roof profile in order to reduce its overall height. Over both the main elements of the building the roof profiles would be changed to a hipped arrangement with a maximum ridge height of 6.54m or approximately 500mm lower than originally proposed. It follows from my assessment above that I do not consider this modification to be necessary. Either roof profile, in my view, would be satisfactory in terms of impacts on adjacent properties. A condition could be attached allowing for either design in the event of a grant of permission.
- 8.10. The second modification addresses the concern raised by the planning authority in relation to the standard of amenity that would be available to the proposed bedroom 1. The small courtyard was considered to offer insufficient daylight and a poor outlook. In response the proposal now is to change the house to a one bedroom unit with a single larger internal courtyard. I am satisfied that this is a satisfactory solution.
- 8.11. Further modifications include the raising of the bedroom floor level to ensure compliance with the Dublin City Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the provision of permanently fixed swinging flood barriers. These proposals are to address the issues raised by the planning authority Drainage Division (see Section 3.2.2 above). This matter can be suitably addressed by condition in the event of a grant of permission.
- 8.12. In addition, clarification is provided as to how the proposed access arrangements would work. As before there would be a common access with Unit 1, the access remaining in the ownership of Unit 1 but with a pedestrian right of way across it for Unit 2 and delineated on the ground.
- 8.13. The enforcement issues raised in the Observer submissions in relation to the previous permission are for the planning authority to deal with and it appears that an enforcement file has been opened. They are outside the scope of this appeal.
- 8.14. In conclusion, I consider that the appeal should be upheld and that the proposed development is in compliance with Section 15.13.4 of the development plan in relation

to backland development and which acknowledges that in such situations innovation in design is required and that some standards may be relaxed in order to achieve urban densification and consolidation. In reaching this conclusion I have also had regard to the Z1 and Z2 zonings of the site and the immediate area.

9.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

- 9.1. Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project within an established and serviced urban area, and taking account of the screening determination of the planning authority, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.
- 9.2. 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. Appropriate Assessment, therefore, is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. 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.
- 10.2. Having considered the nature, small scale and location of the project in a serviced urban area, 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.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend that permission be granted subject to conditions.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to Section 15.13.4 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 in relation to backland development, to the Z1 and Z2 zoning objectives of the site and the surrounding area, and to the established pattern of development in the general vicinity, it is considered, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, that the proposed development, comprising a single storey one bedroom house, would not injure the residential amenities or character of the area and would provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by An Coimisiun Pleanala on the 18th day of May 2026, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The roof design of the house may be either as proposed in the original application to the planning authority or as modified in the appeal An Coimisiun Pleanala.

Reason: In the interest of clarity and to recognise that the Coimisiun considers that neither design would injure the amenities of adjacent properties.

3. Prior to the commencement of the development, the developer shall submit details of the flood mitigation measures for the written agreement of the planning authority.

Reason: To ensure compliance with the relevant Dublin City Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment criteria and in the interest of public health.

4. Otherwise, apart from any departures specifically authorised by this permission, the development shall comply with the conditions of the parent permission [PA Ref. 3961/24, ABP Ref. 321310-24 (Schedule 1)].

Reason: In the interest of clarity and to ensure that the overall development is carried out, as applicable, in accordance with this permission and the previous 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.

B. Wyse
Planning Inspector

7 August 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501362-DS-26
Proposed Development Summary	One house
Development Address	Rear 4 to 16 St. Brendan's Cottages, Irishtown, Dublin 4
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2
	☐ No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	

3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
☐ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
☒ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)	Class 10 (b)(i) Relevant threshold – more than 500 houses
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: _____ B. Wyse Date: __7 August 2026

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-501362-DS-26
Proposed Development Summary	One house
Development Address	Rear 4 to 16 St. Brendan's Cottages, Irishtown, Dublin 4
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (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).	Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed. The development, comprising a single house, has a modest footprint, comes forward as an addition to a small development of just three houses, does not require extensive demolition works, does not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is particularly vulnerable to climate change (noting the proposed flood risk protection measures). It presents no risks to human health.
Location of development (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).	Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed The development is situated in an inner urban area on brownfield land. While the development is adjacent to a residential conservation area it is removed from sensitive natural habitats and designated sites and landscapes of identified significance in the City Development Plan.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts	Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects.

(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	Having regard to the nature and modest scale of the proposed development and its location as described above, and absence of any significant cumulative effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required. See also Section 6.0 of Inspector's report
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	

Inspector: ____B. Wyse **Date:** ____7 August 2026

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

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)