



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-323065-25

Development	Retention of (1) tarmac finish to driveway, (2) altered barbecue structure to rear garden, (3) 4.02 vehicle entrance width
Location	6 Shanowen Avenue, Santry, Dublin 9
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2012/25
Applicant(s)	Viorel Ianus
Type of Application	Retention Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Retention Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Viorel Ianus
Observer(s)	Martha Fagan Sharon Hughes & David Handcock
Date of Site Inspection	29 th September 2025
Inspector	Conor Hughes

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0	Planning History	6
5.0	Policy Context	6
6.0	EIA Screening	9
7.0	The Appeal	9
8.0	Assessment	10
9.0	AA Screening	16
10.0	Water Frame Directive	16
11.0	Recommendation	18
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	18
Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening		20

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1.** The site is located in an established residential neighbourhood in Whitehall Dublin 9 approximately 70 metres north of junction of the R103 Collins Avenue Extension.
- 1.2.** Shanowen Avenue is a traffic calmed tree lined residential street of two-storey semi-detached dwellings. Parking is mainly in curtilage with some on-street visitor parking between the driveways.
- 1.3.** The site at No.6 Shanowen Avenue is the left-hand side of a pair of two-storey semi-detached dwellings. Pedestrian access to the rear is through the dwelling which has been extended in recent years. The parking is on a hardstanding in front of the dwelling.
- 1.4.** The building is of masonry construction with a dry dash finish on the first floor and brick finish on the ground floor of the front elevation, a dry dash finish on the gable and rear elevation, tiled roof and uPVC windows.
- 1.3.** The boundary to the street is defined by the driveway and hardstanding of the property. The other boundaries are made up of rendered block walls.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1.** The proposed development consists of the retention of an altered barbecue structure in the rear garden, a 4.02-metre-wide entrance and tarmac hardstanding in the front garden of the dwelling.

3.1 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- On 25th June 2025 the Planning Authority issued notification of a decision to refuse retention permission for a tarmac finish to front driveway; an altered barbecue structure to rear garden with chimney removed with piped flue retained; and a 4.02 metre vehicle entrance width for the following reasons.

- The change of part of a chimney stack to a pipe flue for the barbecue structure in the rear garden, would have a negative impact and injure the amenity of the adjoining properties due to smoke nuisance and odours and the visual impact of the structure at 3.2 metres in height. This is not in compliance with the Z1 Zoning objective which seeks to protect, provide and improve residential amenities.
- The retention of the tarmac hardstanding is contrary to policy SI24 of the Development Plan which requires all private driveways to be managed through the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage systems (SuDS).
- The retention of the 4.02 metre vehicular entrance is contrary to Section 4.3.1(Dimensions and Surfacing), Volume 2, Appendix 5 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, which states that for a single residential dwelling, the vehicular opening proposed shall be at least 2.5 metres or at most 3 metres and which aims to avoid creation of a traffic hazard for passing traffic and conflict with pedestrians.
- For all three reasons the Planning Authority considered the proposed development would set an unacceptable precedent and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.1.2. Planning Authority Reports

- The planning report noted that the proposed development is on land zoned Z1 (Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods) of the Dublin City Council Development Plan 2022 to 2028 (the Development Plan), with a land use zoning objective 'To protect, provide and improve residential amenities.'
- It was identified in the report that the development is permissible in principle subject to consideration of the policies and objectives for the zoning and being consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- In respect of the alteration of the barbecue structure chimney stack to a flue in the rear garden the Planning Authority noted the third-party comments that the chimney had not been altered to match the drawings.

- Despite not being able to access the site but having regard to the observations of the third parties the Planning Authority concluded that whilst the flue would be less visually dominate than the chimney it would still be visible and negatively impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties due to the impact of smoke and odours. It would also set a negative precedent in the area.
- The Planning Authority identified the retention of the tarmac hardstanding in front of the dwelling as a breach of the grant of planning permission 3475/20 and should be refused in accordance with the recommendation of the Drainage Division as the works are contrary to policy SI25 of the Development Plan and if granted would set a precedent for other unsuitable materials.
- The Planning Authority identified the retention of the entrance to the driveway at 4.02 metres as a breach of a grant of planning permission 3475/20 and should be refused in accordance with the recommendation of the Transportation Division and the advice contained in Appendix 18 of the Development Plan.

3.1.3 Other Technical Reports

- Transport Planning Division: Recommended refusal as the 4.02 metre vehicular entrance is contrary to Section 4.3.1 (Dimensions and Surfacing), Volume 2, Appendix 5 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. This would result in the creation of conflict with pedestrian safety by facilitating hazardous manoeuvring at increased speed and extensive dishing of the footpath. The proposed development would also set an unacceptable precedent and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- Engineering Department – Drainage Division: Recommended refusal as the driveway has been paved entirely with impermeable surfacing with no Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) incorporated contrary to policy SI24 – Control of Paving of Private Driveways / Vehicular Entrances /Grassed Areas.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- Irish Water – Nil Response

3.4. Third Party Observations

- Three observations were received in objection to the proposed retention of the barbecue structure as altered with a 100mm diameter flue and precipitator. The third parties were agreed that the operation of the barbecue harmed their residential amenity due to the nuisance of smoke and odour.
- The third parties highlighted a previous refusal of permission for the barbecue structure (3475/20) and the advice of the Air Quality Monitoring and Noise Control Unit of the Council that the structure would likely give rise to complaints under the Air Pollution Act 1987. It was cited by all the third parties that the appellant had failed to comply with the enforcement notices issued by the Planning Authority.
- The third parties indicated a pattern of non-compliance with other planning permissions for a leisure room adjacent to the barbecue and the construction of an entrance and hardstanding in front of the dwelling.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Appeal site

- Planning Authority Reference 3475/20 – permission sought for the construction of a 1.2 metre brick boundary walls with piers; new 3.2 metre wide entrance gates with cobble-lock driveway; change canopy profile and tiles all to front; roof cover for barbecue area to rear; new timber storage shed to rear; retention of brick barbecue structure to rear garden; underground storage area to rear garden; shower and WC facilities to leisure room; all finishes to match existing and all of the above to include associated site-works and all services connected to existing – Decision: Split Decision
- The planning permission included a condition requiring the following:

The proposed car parking area shall be constructed using permeable materials to allow for rainwater to soak into the ground within the property and the remainder of the garden shall be retained as a grassed area or soft landscaping.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and sustainable development

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- The Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 (the Development Plan) is the relevant plan for the area and the site zoned as Land Use Zoning Objective Z1 – Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods. The objective of Land Use Zoning Z1 is ‘to protect, provide and improve residential amenities.’
- There is no other policy or guidance in the Development Plan for the retention and alteration to the chimney flue.
- In respect of the vehicular entrance, it is stated at Section 4.3.1 – Dimensions and Surfacing of Appendix 5 that:

Vehicular entrances shall be designed to avoid creation of a traffic hazard for passing traffic and conflict with pedestrians. Where a new entrance onto a public road is proposed, the Council will have regard to the road and footway layout, the impact on on-street parking provision (formal or informal), the traffic conditions on the road and available sightlines. For a single residential dwelling, the vehicular opening proposed shall be at least 2.5 metres or at most 3 metres in width and shall not have outward opening gates. Where a shared entrance for two residential dwellings is proposed, this width may increase to a maximum of 4 metres.

- In respect of the tarmac hardstanding in front of the dwelling Policy SI24 – Control of Paving of Private Driveways / Vehicular Entrances / Grassed Areas states:

To require that all surface water run-off from new/ extended domestic driveways, repaired/ replacement driveways, and vehicular entrances (where such development is not exempted from the requirement to obtain planning permission), is managed through the use of SuDS, ensuring no increase in surface water discharges to the public drainage network (for further guidance, please refer to Appendices 5 and 12).

- It is further stated at Section 4.3.4 Sustainable Urban Drainage of Appendix 5 that:

The combined effect of paving a number of gardens in a street or area increases the risk of flooding and pollution (oil, brake dust, etc.). The use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) can help remove pollutants from surface water runoff and reduce overall flood risk in the city while also enhancing amenity and biodiversity. In accordance with Policy SI22, proposals should indicate how the design aims to control surface water runoff in a sustainable fashion through the use of permeable or porous surfaces such as gravel and green areas etc. rather than excessive hard surfacing (for further design guidance please refer to the Dublin City Council Sustainable Drainage Design and Evaluation Guide (2021) which is summarised in Appendix 12. Large unrelieved areas of paving or other impermeable surface treatments will not be considered acceptable. Precast or natural slabs, setts, cobble or other such materials are preferable to the use of concrete or tarmacadam for the paved area. This minimises the visual impact when the car is not parked in the garden. Where unbound material is proposed for driveway, parking and hardstanding areas, it shall be contained in such a way to ensure that it does not transfer on to the public road or footpath on road safety grounds.

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

- Not applicable

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

5.3.1 The site is located approximately:

- 7 kilometres northwest of the North Bull Island Special Protection Area (SPA:004006)

- 7 kilometres northwest of the North Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC:000208)

6.0 EIA Screening

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

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

- GPRA Consulting acting for Viorel Ianus have appealed the decision of Dublin City Council to refuse retention permission for a tarmac finish to front driveway; an altered barbecue structure to rear garden with chimney removed and only pipe flue retained; and a 4.02 metre vehicle entrance width. The grounds of the appeal can be summarised as follows:

Refusal Reason 1

- The appellant considers that the Planning Authority has not properly considered the submitted plans as the chimney is 2.557 metres in height. There is also precedence for similar development granted planning permission under reference 1488/22. It is queried why this precedence has not been applied to this proposal.

Refusal Reason 2

- The appellant advises that the tarmac driveway has a soakaway under and a gradient to prevent water running onto the main road. It is stated that the absence of the material specified in an earlier grant of planning permission will not injure the sustainable development of the area. The age of the estate means there is limited opportunity for further development.

Refusal Reason 3

- The appellant argues entrances have been open between 2 metres and 6 metres in width and that there is precedence for similar entrances between 3 and 4.25 metres in width. Examples of similar approved entrances for planning permissions 1206/20, 1570/21 and 1103/23 are cited. It is also queried why these precedents have not been applied to this proposal.

Other Matters

- The appellant disagrees with the observations of the third parties and maintains that the barbecue has not been used since the photograph used in the letters of objection was taken in 2019.
- It is further stated that observations are only received from two neighbouring properties and there has been no objection from other neighbouring residents.
- The appellant provides a personal statement explaining how the planning application has impacted on him and family and requesting that fair treatment is given as there are other precedents for similar development in the area.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

- None

7.3. Observations

- Two third party observations are received in response to the appeal. Both parties reject the statement made by the appellant that the barbecue has not been used since 2019 and reassert the negative impact that the barbecue has on their amenity as a consequence of the nuisance from smoke and odour.
- No new planning grounds are raised by the third parties as part of their submissions to this appeal.

8.0 Assessment

- 8.1. Having examined the application details and all the other documentation on file, including the submission received to appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regards to the relevant local/regional/national

policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered as follows:

- The principle of development
- The protection of residential and visual amenity
- The width of the entrance and the road safety implications
- The surface of the driveway and hardstanding and the drainage implications

The principle of development

- 8.2.** The site is zoned as Z1 – Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods and the objective of this zoning is ‘to protect, provide and improve residential amenities.’
- 8.3.** The Planning Authority does not engage with the principle of development but I accept that an extension in the form of an outdoor barbecue with a chimney at the dwelling at No.06 Shanowen Avenue is acceptable in principle subject to being in accordance with the requirements of the policies and objectives of the zoning and consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

The protection of residential and visual amenity

- 8.4.** I was not able to gain access to the rear of No.06 Shanowen Avenue on the date of my site visit despite having made attempts to make a prior appointment. I was still able to observe the site in the context of the street and the surrounding neighbourhood to assess the visual impact of the retained chimney. I also had access to photographs provided in evidence by the appellant and the third parties and submitted plans to examine this issue.
- 8.5.** It is my observation from the site visit that the chimney cannot be seen from Shanowen Avenue and views from elsewhere are interrupted by the development in between the site and the R103 Collins Avenue Extension and Shanowen Park. The photograph supplied by the third party from No.596 Collin Avenue Extension was taken from within the property looking over a gate. Someone travelling along this street would only have glimpsed views of the chimney with other development in the backdrop.
- 8.6.** There is little in the Development Plan that provides assistance in terms of what should be taken in account when assessing the visual impact of this type of

development in the rear of a dwelling. The only place the barbecue chimney can be seen from is the back gardens of the neighbouring properties.

- 8.8.** It is not unusual to find ancillary buildings and structure in rear gardens and the retention of a chimney or flue does not harm the visual amenity or character of the area nor will it be incongruous in the streetscape. Even where the height of the structure is disputed, I do not consider this part of the Planning Authority reason for refusal to be sustained.
- 8.9.** The objective for zoning Z1 is however clear that development should not unacceptably affect the amenities of neighbouring properties. In this respect the Planning Authority previously refused retention of permission in 2020 for the barbecue as it caused nuisance by reason of smoke and odour to the amenity of neighbouring properties.
- 8.10.** Evidence from the Air Quality Monitoring and Noise Control Unit of the Council that the structure would likely give rise to complaints under the Air Pollution Act 1987 was an important consideration and the observation of neighbours of the harm it caused to their amenity was given significant weight.
- 8.11.** Despite the Planning Authority not seeking updated advice from the Air Quality Monitoring and Noise Control Unit they are consistent in their approach to this issue and the third parties still object strongly on the grounds of loss of amenity.
- 8.12.** The appellant provides no technical reports or other evidence that the modifications proposed to the chimney and flue would address the impact of nuisance from smoke and odour.
- 8.13.** A decision to grant planning for an outdoor fireplace and chimney with a height of more than three metres at 423 Griffith Avenue Dublin 9 is indicated by the appellant as precedence. Having examined the drawings submitted with this application I note the relationship to the neighbouring properties is not the same and there were no third-party objections citing amenity concerns from the construction and operation of the chimney. I do not consider the two proposals to be comparable and I must consider the retention of the chimney in this case on its own merits.

- 8.14.** I agree with the Planning Authority that the zoning objective for Zoning Z1 is not met. The proposal to retain the chimney as altered in the submitted plans will unacceptably affect the amenities of neighbouring properties and is inconsistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 8.15.** The Planning Authority also consider the proposal for retention of the barbecue will set an undesirable precedent for similar development in the area. The appellant provides a contrary view based on the site-specific circumstances of the case and the precedence elsewhere.
- 8.16.** I have considered this proposal on its own merits and do not accept the objectives of the Development Plan to be met for the reasons outlined above. That said I acknowledge that the design was a response to the applicant's specific needs and that the Planning Authority does not explain why granting planning permission for this proposal would set an undesirable precedent elsewhere.
- 8.17.** The other residents of Shanowen Avenue may have different needs in terms of extending or improving their homes and this proposal may not be easily replicated on neighbouring sites. For these reasons I do not consider this proposal to set a wide range precedent and this part of the refusal reason is also not sustained.

The width of the entrance and the road safety implications

- 8.18.** The dimensions for vehicular entrances are clearly set out Section 4.3.1 of Appendix 5 of the Development and it is stated for single residences the entrance should be no more than 3 metres.
- 8.19.** I observed a large camper van parked in the driveway on the day of my visit which could not be accommodated in a smaller entrance. I also noted that whilst traffic calmed, Shanowen Avenue is a busy residential street connecting to a main distributor on the R103 Collins Avenue Extension. There where cars parked on the opposite side of the street that narrowed the carriageway and there was significant pedestrian activity given the proximity of Shanowen Avenue to DCU.
- 8.20.** Based on my observations and having regard to the content of the advice provided by the Transport Planning Division I consider the concerns of the Planning Authority to be well founded in respect of the entrance. The development if

retained would result in the creation of conflict with pedestrian safety by facilitating hazardous manoeuvring at increased speed and extensive dishing of the footpath.

- 8.21.** The appellant again cites precedence for similar development for approved entrances for planning permissions 1206/20, 1570/21 and 1103/23. Having examined the planning permissions I find that only the 1206/20 grant of planning permission includes a proposal for a widened entrance.
- 8.22.** Having read the planning report I note that the Planning Authority agreed by exception an entrance of 4 metres based on the restricted depth of the front garden which could only accommodate one car in the driveway when the house was extended.
- 8.23.** The appellant does not explain why an entrance of this width is required and I accept that the Planning Authority had distinguished in the 1206/20 grant of planning permission why it had departed from the guidance in the previous development plan. I do not consider this planning history on its own to be a precedent for the retention of a 4.02 metre entrance at No.06 Shanowen Avenue. A departure from guidance on a busy residential street and pedestrian thoroughfare would set an unacceptable precedent and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

The surface of the driveway and hardstanding and the drainage implications

- 8.24.** The appellant sets out in their grounds of appeal that the tarmac driveway has a soakaway under and a gradient to prevent water running onto the main road. They argue that the age of the estate means there is limited opportunity for further development that would require additional capacity in the drainage network to be offset by SuDS in a driveway.
- 8.25.** Policy SI24 states any project to alter or extend a driveway should be managed through the use of SuDS. Section 4.3.4 of Appendix 5 of the Development Plan states that the combined effect of paving a number of gardens in a street or area increases the risk of flooding and pollution.
- 8.26.** It goes on to state that large unrelieved areas of paving or other impermeable surface treatments will not be considered acceptable. Precast or natural slabs, setts, cobble or other such materials are preferable to the use of concrete or

tarmacadam for the paved area. This minimises the visual impact when the car is not parked in the garden.

- 8.27.** A material consistent with the guidance set out in 4.34 of Appendix 5 was specified for an earlier grant of planning permission but tarmac was used instead. The appellant does not justify a need for a change in material or how the surface as laid does not increase the risk of flooding and pollution.
- 8.28.** The appellant refers to the installation of a soakaway in the grounds of appeal but does not provide any details of the design or how this is installed.
- 8.29.** I did observe a pin kerb had been laid between the hardstanding and boundary wall with No.08 Shanowen Avenue which was filled with loose stone but there was no gully or drain in the hardstanding and the pin kerb would stop water running into this area.
- 8.30.** The objective of this zoning is to protect, provide and improve residential amenities. The driveway has been almost entirely paved with impermeable surfacing with no evidence that SuDS had been installed.
- 8.31.** As a consequence, its retention will not protect, provide or improve residential amenity. Consistent with the advice of the Drainage Division the proposal to retain the hardstanding is contrary to policy SI24 of the Development Plan.
- 8.32.** The appellant was offered clear direction in a previous grant of planning permission in respect of the use of SuDS Unit and the Planning Authority has been consistent in its approach to this issue. It is not sustainable to continue to use non permeable surfaces irrespective of the age of the buildings in this area.
- 8.33.** Alterations to the curtilage of older buildings provide opportunity to improve drainage and reduce the impact of surface water flooding. I agree with the Planning Authority the its retention would set an undesirable precedent for other similar type developments in the area and as such the proposal is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
-

9.0 AA Screening

9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located approximately 7 kilometres northwest of the North Bull Island Special Protection Area (SPA:004006) and the North Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC:000208).

The proposed development is comprised of the retention of an altered barbecue structure in the rear garden, and a 4.02-metre-wide entrance and tarmac hardstanding in the front garden of the dwelling.

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 it could not have any appreciable effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The site in an established residential area and the scale of the proposed development which is ancillary development.
- The distance to the identified European sites and the lack of connection.
- Taking into account the screening determination by the Planning Authority.

I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (Stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Frame Directive

10.1. The subject site is located approximately two-kilometres north of the River Tolka and approximately two-kilometres south of the River Santry.

The proposed development is comprised of the retention of an altered barbecue structure in the rear garden, and a 4.02-metre-wide entrance and tarmac hardstanding in the front garden of the dwelling.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

I have assessed the proposed 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 and 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 wither qualitatively or quantitatively.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The location of the site in an established residential area, the scale of the proposed development which is ancillary development.
- Despite no evidence of the installation of Sustainable Urban Drainage it could still be used as mitigation and reduce the impact of surface/storm water entering the drainage network if the hardstanding was adjusted in size and a soakaway installed around the edges.
- The distance to the nearest water bodies and the lack of hydrological connection.

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

- 11.1.** I recommend that planning should be refused for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 12.1.** The commission is not satisfied, based on the information provided, that the proposed development would not impact adversely on proposed alteration to part of the chimney for the barbecue in the rear garden of No.06 Shanowen Avenue would impact adversely on the amenity of the adjoining properties with regards to smoke nuisance and odour. Consequently, the development fails to comply with the Z1 Zoning Objective which seeks 'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities' contrary to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 12.2.** The retention of the 4.02 metre vehicular entrance is contrary to Section 4.3. of Appendix 5 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, which states that for a single residential dwelling, the vehicular opening proposed shall be at most 3 metres. The entrance if retained at its as built width would therefore result in the creation of conflict with pedestrian safety by facilitating hazardous manoeuvring at increased speed and extensive dishing of the footpath. The proposed development would set an unacceptable precedent and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 12.3.** The retention of the tarmacked driveway and hardstanding is contrary to policy SI24 of the Development Plan which requires all private driveways to be managed through the use of SuDS. It is also inconsistent with the guidance at Section 4.3.4 of Appendix 5 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 as the effect of paving a garden in a street with a non-permeable material increases the risk of flooding and pollution. Its retention would therefore set an undesirable precedent for other similar type developments in the area and as such the proposal is considered contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

Conor Hughes
Planning Inspector

17th October 2025

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-323065-25
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of (1) tarmac finish to driveway, (2) altered barbecue structure to rear garden, (3) 4.02 vehicle entrance width
Development Address	6 Shanowen Avenue, Santry, Dublin 9
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
<p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1 . EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 2</u>, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
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)?	

Inspector: _____

Date: 17th October 2025