



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-319351-24

Development	Retention permission for use of the existing creche to provide childcare services for up to 68 no. children (the permitted capacity is 47 no. childcare spaces) and planning permission for the provision of 8 no. bicycle stands and all associated works.
Location	79-81 Celtic Park Avenue, Beaumont, Dublin 9.
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	3002/24
Applicant(s)	Clever Cloggs Creche Limited
Type of Application	Retention permission and planning permission
Planning Authority Decision	Split decision
Type of Appeal	First party
Appellant(s)	Clever Cloggs Creche Limited
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	23 rd January 2025
Inspector	D. Aspell

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site at is No. 79-81 Celtic Park Avenue, Beaumont, Dublin. It comprises a pair of semi-detached former dwellings on the corner of Celtic Park Avenue. The site is used as a creche. Ground floor extensions on either side of the creche building adjoin the two neighbouring dwellings to the north and east. There is a parking area to the front and a garden to the rear. There are two vehicular accesses which provide for an in-out system from one section of Celtic Park Avenue to another.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The description of development is summarised as follows:
- Retention permission for use of the creche to provide for up to 68 no. children;
 - Planning permission for 8 no. cycle stands and all associated works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Dublin City Council issued a notification of a split decision, summarised as follows:
- Grant permission for: Provision of bicycle stands, subject to 7 no. conditions.
 - Refuse permission for: Retention of the existing creche to provide childcare for up to 68 no. children was refused for 1 no. reason. The reason stated retention for up to 68 no. children contravened the Z1 zoning due to: the large scale of the facility in a non-purpose built facility; the small scale of the existing outdoor play space; and its close proximity to private gardens of adjoining dwellings and excessive noise disturbance, which was over intensification of the existing childcare facility and seriously injured the amenities of property in the vicinity.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning report: The planning authority report recommended a split decision. The main points made in the report are summarised as follows:

- Policy: Government Policy is to expand childcare services. Development plan states good quality, fit-for-purpose, neighbourhood-based, and local childcare services are central to sustainable communities;
- Previous refusal: Site has permission for 47 childcare places. A previous application to for 80 places was refused. Report stated the question to be answered is whether the application responds to the previous refusal reason. Report stated the applicant did not provide a compelling or substantial case to overturn the previous refusal reason;
- Intensification: Retention of 68 no. childcare spaces in a building not purpose built and in an established residential area would be over-intensification of a use on a site not capable of sustainably catering for such;
- Outdoor space and noise: Given the small scale of the play space; its proximity, layout & orientation adjoining residential gardens, the proposal would result in excessive noise. Retention would be contrary to the Z1 zoning objective;
- Air quality: Readings from nearby monitoring stations indicate pollution is low;
- Traffic & transportation: Transportation section requested further information, but given concerns regarding the retention overall means Further Information is not reasonable. Requirements regarding cycle parking can be conditioned.

Other Technical Reports

3.2.2. Transportation Planning: Report recommended further information, as follows:

- Previous refusal: Report noted the increase in traffic was included in the reasons for refusal on the recently refused permission on the site;
- Operation travel plan: No reduction in car parking proposed. Due to the location and increased number of children there is concern with the lack of detail on the numbers dropped off/collected by vehicles; drop-off/pick-up arrangements; and the potential impact on residential streets. Further information required;
- Cycle parking: The report stated the cycle parking is too close to the vehicular entrance. Details of buggy storage and children scooter parking is required.

3.2.3. Air Quality Monitoring & Noise Control Unit: Report stated no comment.

3.2.4. Drainage: Report stated no objection subject to standard conditions.

3.3. Third Party Observations

- 3.3.1. Twelve observations were made to the planning authority, including from a local Councillor. The majority of submissions stated support for the facility and highlighted benefits of the access; the nature of the facility; community benefits; traffic safety; waste management; and limited supply of childcare in the area. Some submissions objected on grounds of traffic impact; parking; road safety; waste management; noise; and adequacy of the premises.

3.4. Prescribed Bodies

None.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Subject site

Reg. Ref. 3693/23: Planning permission refused by the planning authority in 2023 for an increase in the number of children catered for from 47 to 80. The application was not appealed. Permission was refused for one reason as follows: the Z1 zoning objective; the large scale of the facility proposed in a non-purpose built facility; the small scale of existing outdoor play space; and the close proximity to adjoining private gardens would result in excessive noise, disturbance and a significant increase in traffic movements thereby representing over intensification contravening the Z1 zoning objective and seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity.

I note the planning authority and applicant reference older applications (1996 to 2008) relating to the original and subsequent permissions for a crèche on the site.

Nearby sites: None.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The site is zoned 'Z1'; 'childcare facility' is a permissible use in this zone.

Policy QHSN55 'Childcare Facilities' states:

- *"To facilitate the provision of appropriately designed and sized fit-for-purpose affordable childcare facilities as an integral part of proposals for new residential and mixed-use developments, subject to an analysis of demographic and geographic need undertaken by the applicant in consultation with the Dublin City Council Childcare Committee, in order to ensure that their provision and location is in keeping with areas of population and employment growth."*

Section 5.5.8 under the heading 'Childcare Facilities' states:

- *"The provision of good quality and fit-for-purpose neighbourhood-based and local childcare services are central to providing for sustainable communities"*

Policy SMT1 'Modal Shift and Compact Growth'.

Section 15.8 'Residential Development' subsection 15.8.4 'Childcare' states:

- *"Childcare facilities should also be located in existing residential areas..."*

Section 15.8.4.1 'Design Criteria' states:

- *"All childcare facilities are required to provide private outdoor play space or demonstrate safe and easy access to a safe outdoor play area. Such outdoor space should be appropriately located to be protected from air pollution – see objective QHSNO19."*
- *"The internal design, layout and size of the childcare facility shall be in accordance with the standards set out in the Childcare Facilities, Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2001."*
- *"Safe and secure access should also be provided in terms of pedestrian and cycle movements in association with public transport services in the area. Associated vehicular drop off will also be required in certain locations. This should be accompanied by a traffic and transport assessment which sets out the need to accommodate vehicular movements."*

5.2. National guidelines and strategies

Circular Letter: PL 3/2016 – ‘Childcare facilities operating under the Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) Scheme’. The Circular states: “... *planning authorities are requested to exclude matters relating to childcare facility standards outlined in Appendix 1 of the Childcare Facilities Planning Guidelines 2001 – including the minimum floor area requirements per child - from their consideration of planning applications relating to childcare facilities and to solely focus on planning related considerations that fall within the remit of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, in the determination of such planning applications.*

Childcare Facilities Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2001). Section 3.2 ‘Development Control’ sets out criteria that should be applied. Section 3.3.1 ‘New and Existing Residential Areas’ states that “*Detached houses/sites or substantial semi-detached properties with space for off-street parking and/or suitable drop-off and collection points for customers and also space for an outdoor play area*” are suitable sites for full day care facilities.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.3.1. The South Dublin Bay & River Tolka Estuary SPA is c.2.06km from the site, and the North Bull Island SPA and the North Dublin Bay SAC are 3.9km from the site.

5.4. Environmental Impact Assessment screening

- 5.4.1. The development is not a class of development specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001. See Appendix 1 Form 1.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of First-Party Appeal

- 6.1.1. The first-party appeal received is summarised as follows:

- Use: Appeal states the planning authority confirmed childcare use is acceptable in this zone and residential areas are appropriate for childcare facilities;

- Existing crèche: Given the size of the creche it is operating with 68 no. children. Site has been a creche since 1996.
- Demand for places: There is a waiting list for the creche. To cater for demand an application to increase to 80 no. spaces was made in 2023. To alleviate concerns raised, an application to regularise the current 68 no. spaces is made;
- Noise: Planning authority planner report point the outdoor area results in excessive noise for surrounding properties is unjustified. The Air Quality Monitoring & Noise Control Unit raised no objection. Appeal states no noise complaints have been received from neighbours since the increase in spaces;
- Outdoor space: The outdoor space is adjacent neighbour gardens, however this is not uncommon as childcare facilities are often in residential estates. Even in purpose-built facilities outdoor areas are often next to or below apartments. The boundary walls are 2 / 2.5m high which helps attenuate noise;
- Residential amenity: Cognisant of the impact the outdoor area may have, the operator has put mitigation measures in place: the outdoor play area is not used before 09:45 or after 17:30 or between 12:00 and 13:30. When used the children are brought in groups of between 6 and 16 no;
- Existing facility: Planning authority planner report statement the site is unsuitable as a non-purpose-built facility is unfounded. The creche meets all requirements of the 2001 Childcare Guidelines. Under the guidelines the creche has capacity for 80 spaces;
- Transport: Planning authority transportation section did not read the operational travel plan (OTP). It is supported by surveys and actual travel information from the creche. It confirms traffic on adjoining streets is similar to other urban areas and does not cause congestion or road safety issues. Measures to encourage sustainable travel are proposed. The creche operates a minibus service;
- Cycle parking: Condition 3(a) of the planning authority decision addresses concerns in this regard;
- Refusal reason: The refusal relates to noise from the garden and its impact on residential amenity. No quantitative justification was provided. Appeal states the

applicant demonstrated there is no adverse impact that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal;

The appeal refers to other childcare facility applications in Dublin City Council.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

6.2.1. None.

6.3. Observations

6.3.1. None.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having regard to the foregoing; having examined the application, appeal and planning authority reports; having inspected the area around the site; and having regard to relevant adopted development plan policies and objectives, I consider the main issues in this appeal are those raised in the reason for refusal, as follows:

- Impact on residential amenities;
- Traffic and transportation;
- Related matters raised in the course of the appeal.

Reason for refusal

7.2. The site is zoned Z1. The zoning objective is: *“To protect, provide and improve residential amenities”*. Childcare services are permissible in principle in this zone. I am satisfied creche use is acceptable in principle.

7.3. The refusal reason stated retention of the use of the creche for up to 68 no. children contravened the Z1 zoning on a number of grounds. I address each below.

Nature of the facility

7.4. Regarding the reference to the large scale of the facility in a non-purpose-built facility, no change to the scale of the facility is proposed and I see no requirement in either the development plan or national guidelines for childcare facilities to be purpose-built. Development plan Policy QHSN55 refers to fit-for-purpose facilities

rather than purpose built. Section 3.3.1 of the Childcare Guidelines identifies substantial semi-detached properties as suitable sites.

- 7.5. Regarding the facility being fit-for-purpose, I have considered the type and size of creche, and the development control and related standards for childcare facilities. I have had regard to the provisions of the development plan, the Childcare Guidelines and Circular Letter PL 3/2016 in relation to the General Standards in Appendix 1 of the Guidelines. Having regard to the foregoing, and to the layout of the creche including rooms for children of different ages, overall I am satisfied the facility meets the relevant planning requirements to accommodate the increased places.

Outdoor space

- 7.6. Regarding the refusal reason reference to the small scale of the existing outdoor play space, development plan Section 15.8.4.1 '*Design Criteria*' states all childcare facilities are required to provide private outdoor play space or demonstrate safe and easy access to a safe outdoor play area. No quantifiable requirement in this regard is set out in either the Guidelines or development plan.
- 7.7. The area of garden is not clearly stated in the submitted documents however I estimate the available space is c.75sqm. The applicant states children are brought to the garden in groups of 6-16 children, which equates to c.4-12sqm of space per child. The applicant indicates that a range of childcare services are provided (full day, half day, sessional, and two afterschool services). Given the total numbers on site, the age range, and mix of services, I consider it likely that smaller groups use the garden at a time. I accept it is not feasible to control use of the garden through a planning permission, however it is not necessarily the case that reducing the total number of children on site would lead to a material increase in open space per child, and in any event there are no quantifiable planning standards for creche open space. The space is to the rear of the building, well protected, and not overlooked by other dwellings. Given the foregoing I am satisfied the quantum of open space is acceptable and that refusal on these grounds is not warranted.

Noise

- 7.8. Regarding the refusal reason reference that retention of the use of the creche for up to 68 no. children results in excessive noise disturbance, I note the applicant submitted no quantifiable information in relation to noise, and the report from the

planning authority Air Quality Monitoring & Noise Control Unit stated only that the section had no comment. As such there is no noise data for the creche on file.

- 7.9. I note the applicant planning statement states the increase in childcare places is not significantly higher than the approved 47 no. places and is therefore not considered to be an intensification of the use of the premises. The increase in places is in the region of 45% which I consider is significant. The planning statement also stated no noise complaints have been reported to the creche by neighbouring properties since the increase in childcare spaces in the facility. Two submissions to the planning authority referenced noise from the site. Notwithstanding, the question remains whether the proposal is acceptable or not in this regard.
- 7.10. Regarding noise from the garden, the first party appeal indicates the rear outdoor amenity area is used between 09:45-12:00 and 13:30-17:30. From the information submitted the children on site are typically no older than 6 years of age. Regarding location and layout, 2 no. rear gardens adjoin the rear amenity space. The applicant states the rear boundary walls are 2 - 2.5m high. The appeal states the creche operates Monday to Friday from 07:40-18:00 and that the outdoor play area is not used before 09:45 or after 17:30 and is closed during lunch (12:00-13:30).
- 7.11. In summary, given the age of the children and numbers involved, and the arrangement of the creche and adjacent dwellings, I am generally satisfied retention of the increased number of places would not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenities. I note in particular the planning authority Air Quality Monitoring & Noise Control Unit had no comment. I visited the site mid-morning and from the road heard little to no noise from the garden. As set out above, I am satisfied the garden is likely used by smaller groups of children at one time and as such it does not necessarily follow that noise would be materially greater. Overall I consider the creche size and its relationship to neighbouring dwellings is not unusual for childcare or educational facilities in the City, and I also satisfied that given the stated hours of operation, noise from the garden would not extend into the early morning or late evening, however I consider a condition is warranted in this regard to ensure the reasonable protection of residential amenities.

Demand for childcare places

- 7.12. Regarding childcare facilities in area, the applicant references the local need for childcare services, and significant and increased demand for places in the area. Minimal data is provided. I note the number of submissions stating their support for the service and lack of childcare places in the area. I am not aware of other childcare facilities in the immediate area, including the neighbourhood centre to the east. Having regard to the foregoing, and to local policy and national guidelines, I consider the existing creche contributes to meeting demand for childcare places in the area.

Traffic and transportation

- 7.13. The appeal states the planning authority transportation section did not appear to review the operational travel plan (OTP). It states the OPT travel data from the existing creche confirmed traffic on adjoining streets is not dissimilar to other urban areas and does not cause adverse congestion or road safety issues. It also states measures encouraging sustainable travel are proposed.
- 7.14. I note the development was not refused on grounds of traffic and transportation. The planning authority transportation section report recommended further information. I note that traffic safety was not specifically raised in the report.
- 7.15. Regarding the surrounding area, it comprises lower density terraced and semi-detached dwellings. Celtic Park Avenue to the west and north are dead ends, with the road east being the only way in and out of the estate. As such I do not consider there is significant through-traffic. The majority of dwellings in the area have on-curtilage parking. The adjacent roads are wide enough for two cars to pass and have footpaths either side. There are little to no road markings in the area. At the time of my site visit there was some uncontrolled parking along the neighbouring roads.
- 7.16. Regarding existing access arrangements, there are two vehicular accesses to the site, with the creche operating a one-way system with an entrance from Celtic Park Avenue to the south and egress onto Celtic Park Avenue to the west. This arrangement provides for parking on-site and for children to be dropped off within the site at the front door. The creche also operates a minibus service, and at the time of my site visit two minibuses were parked on site.
- 7.17. Regarding the submitted operational travel plan (OTP) and travel survey, it highlights that all children attending the creche live in a 1-3km catchment of the site. The OTP indicates that 6 no. staff drive to work. It indicates a range of childcare services are

provided. It states the survey found the number of vehicles travelling through the junction outside the site over the 12-hour survey period is very low.

- 7.18. The OTP set out a number of recommendations. It recommended a mobility manager be appointed to further develop the plan and implement the plan recommendations. It states that crèche management are required to control parking and ensure illegal parking is not permitted. The plan proposes that an appropriate level of cycle parking be provided on site. It also states the provision of dedicated bus parking on site will be considered.

Parking

- 7.19. Regarding car parking, development plan standards give a requirement for c.4 car parking spaces for the creche, to include a Mobility Management Plan outlining how drop offs/pickups will be managed. No floorspace changes to the creche are proposed. There are 10 no. car parking spaces on site which equates to an overprovision of c.6 no. spaces despite the increased childcare places. This is based on current development plan requirements however I note the parking spaces are already in place and have been for some time. The submitted OTP states dedicated bus parking on site will be considered. I am satisfied that to accommodate the foregoing, including bus parking, an appropriate reorganisation and reduction in car parking will be required and can be accommodated in line with development plan requirements. I am satisfied the provision and layout of parking on site can be resolved by condition.
- 7.20. Regarding cycling parking, there is dedicated cycle parking on site. Development plan standards give a requirement for 2 long term spaces and 7 short stay spaces for the creche, and to include provision for scooter parking/cargo bikes/bike trailer. The application proposes 8 no. cycle stands and indicates 10 staff are on site at a time. Provision for scooter parking/cargo bikes/bike trailer is not proposed. I note the planning authority transportation planning report points in this regard, including that the cycle parking is too close to the vehicle entrance and that details of buggy storage and children scooter parking are required. Given the foregoing, and the size and layout of the site, I am satisfied these matters can be resolved by condition.
- 7.21. In summary, the submitted OTP shows traffic in the area over the course of the day is low. It indicates that whilst there are morning and evening traffic peaks around the

site, the services provided mean movements related to the creche are spread through the day. I visited the site in the mid-morning and observed very little traffic on or around the site. I consider the site is reasonably well laid out, in particular the provision of a one-way system and the potential to drop children outside the front door within the site. The majority of children live within walking or cycling distance. I am satisfied the layout and access arrangements are generally acceptable, subject to agreement of details in relation to parking and management as proposed by the applicant. I am also satisfied the foregoing will provide the details required by the planning authority transportation section. As such I consider the proposal and the impact on adjoining residential streets is acceptable subject to condition.

- 7.22. Regarding the previous refusal of permission, I note that application was for an increase to 80 no. childcare places and that the reason included reference to a significant increase in traffic movements. I note the subject proposal is for an increase to 68 no. places and was not refused on grounds of traffic or transportation.

Related matters raised in the course of the appeal

Previous reasons for refusal

- 7.23. The previous application refused on the site was to increase the childcare places on site from 47 to 80 no. The subject proposal is for retention of 68 no. places. I consider the proposed development differs significantly on grounds of the number of childcare places, despite similar issues arising. I am satisfied the subject proposal satisfactorily addresses the issues raised previously, subject to conditions. In relation to traffic and transportation, I note reasons relating to traffic were included in the previous refusal reason but not in the subject application.

- 7.24. Contributions

- 7.25. No Section 48 or 49 contributions apply.

Conclusion

- 7.26. Childcare services are permissible in principle in this zone. The development plan states childcare facilities should also be located in existing residential areas and are an integral component of a successful neighbourhood. The site is in a residential area and has been a childcare facility over c.20 years. There is planning permission on the site for a childcare facility catering for 47 no. children. No physical extension

or increase in scale of the building is proposed. I am satisfied the existing and proposed access arrangements are acceptable, subject to conditions.

- 7.27. I do not consider the facility is of unusual size for a residential area, and I do not consider the proposal would have significantly greater impacts on the amenity of nearby dwellings, including in terms of noise, subject to conditions. The number of places has been significantly reduced from the previous application. I am satisfied retention of the increase in childcare places and related minor works are acceptable, and that the impact on neighbouring residential amenities is acceptable and does not warrant refusal, subject to conditions.

8.0 **Appropriate Assessment screening**

- 8.1. I have considered the creche development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located in a suburban area 2.06km from the nearest European Site. The proposed development comprises a creche use and ancillary works. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any appreciable effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is the nature of the development and associated ancillary works; the distance from the nearest European site and lack of connections. Taking into account screening determination by LPA, I consider that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually, or in-combination with other plans and projects, on a European Site and appropriate assessment is therefore not required.

9.0 **Recommendation**

- 9.1. I recommend permission be **Granted** subject to conditions for the reasons and considerations below.

10.0 **Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, including the 'Z1' land use zoning objective for the area, it is considered that, subject

to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development and the development proposed for retention, would be consistent with Policy QHSN55 'Childcare Facilities' of the development plan; would not seriously injure the residential amenity of dwellings in the area; would not be prejudicial to traffic safety; and would comply with the policies and provisions of the development plan and the Childcare Guidelines 2001; and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, 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 number of children to be accommodated within the premises shall not exceed 68 no. at any time on any day. Reason: To limit the development in the interest of residential amenity.
3.	The proposed childcare facility shall not operate outside the period of 07:30 to 18:00 hours Monday to Friday inclusive, except public holidays, and shall not operate on Saturdays, Sundays or public holidays. Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.
4.	Prior to the opening/occupation of the development, a Mobility Management Plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority. This shall provide for incentives to encourage the use of public transport, cycling and walking by residents/occupants/staff employed in the development. This shall be prepared and implemented by the applicant. Reason: In the interest of encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport.

5.	The applicant shall submit a Car Park Management Plan and details of car parking design, layout and management to the planning authority for agreement in writing prior to the commencement of development. Reason: In the interest of sustainable transport and safety.
6.	Nine (9 no.) safe and secure bicycle parking spaces shall be provided within the site. Provision should be made for a mix of bicycle types including cargo bicycles and individual lockers. Details of the layout and marking demarcation of these spaces shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Reason: To ensure that adequate bicycle parking provision is available to serve the proposed development, in the interest of sustainable transportation.

-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.-

D. Aspell
Inspector
30th January 2025

APPENDIX 1

Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening [EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference		ABP-319351-24	
Proposed Development Summary		Retention permission for use of the existing creche to provide childcare services for up to 68 no. children (the permitted capacity is 47 no. childcare spaces) and planning permission for the provision of 8 no. bicycle stands and all associated works.	
Development Address		79-81 Celtic Park Avenue, Beaumont, Dublin 9.	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	x
		No	No further action required
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes		Class.....	EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	x		Proceed to Q.3
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)
No			No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Class/Threshold.....	Proceed to Q.4
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?			
No		Preliminary Examination required	
Yes		Screening Determination required	

Inspector: _____

Date: __ 17/01/2025__