



Inspector's Report

PL-500368-WW-25

Development	A log cabin to be used as home office and rehabilitative space.
Location	5 Burnaby Park, Greystones, Co. Wicklow.
Planning Authority	Wicklow County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	25/273
Applicant(s)	Ann Teehan and Will Cullen
Type of Application	Retention
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Retention
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Beth Teehan
Observer(s)	1. Eric Colhoun 2. Jill Mellon 3. Robert and Lesley Kemp 4. Valerie Jennings & Joe McCarthy
Date of Site Inspection	12 th June 2026
Inspector	Susan McHugh

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.....	5
5.0	Policy Context.....	6
6.0	EIA Screening.....	10
7.0	The Appeal	11
8.0	Assessment	13
9.0	AA Screening.....	19
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	20
11.0	Recommendation.....	20
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	21
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	22

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located at 5 Burnaby Park, Greystones, Co. Wicklow.
- 1.2. Burnaby Park is a mature residential area located on the southern side of Greystones. It is accessed from The Mill Road R762 which also serves Greystones RFC, Greystones Community Centre & Swimming Pool, located to the east.
- 1.3. The existing house is a detached one and a half storey house with gable fronting the road. It also includes a granny flat to the eastern side of the house. The house benefits from a large front garden with driveway. The front garden is bounded by mature evergreen hedging to the front/south and on the western front/side bounding No. 6 Burnaby Park. The boundary to the eastern side comprises a low front boundary wall and hedge.
- 1.4. The single storey structure to be retained is located inside the front garden boundary with the public footpath and addresses the front driveway. The structure is located parallel to the western planted boundary with No. 6 Burnaby Park.
- 1.5. It is currently in commercial use operating as a beauty salon 'Makeup by Beth'.
- 1.6. The site has a stated area of 0.077ha.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development (as described in the public notices) seeks permission for retention of a log cabin to be used as a home office and rehabilitative space for autistic daughter.
- 2.2. The existing structure has a stated area 12.70sqm.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Wicklow County Council decided to **refuse** to grant retention permission by Order dated 06/11/2025. Permission was refused for one reason.

1. Having regard to the location of the structure in the front garden of a dwelling, its positioning forward of the established building line and its proximity to the

roadside boundary, the design and external finish to the structure, and the extent to which the development will be reliant on planting to screen it from public view along the roadside, it is considered that development proposed for retention would adversely impact upon the established pattern of development and would detract from the visual amenity of the area and of the streetscape generally. The retention of the development would set an undesirable precedent for similar types of development in the area. The retention of the development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report: dated 6/11/2025

- Unit still operating as a beauty salon.
- Details not provided on the intensity of the 'home office use by the applicant as required under CPO 9.24.
- Notes previous refusal for a home-based economic activity on Farm Lane The Burnaby (PRR 10/2627).
- Notes previous determination by the Commission under (ABP-311946-21) where a change of use of part of a residential dwelling to part-time beautician by appointment only is incidental to the use of the property as a house and therefore does not constitute a material change of use and is not development.
- Subject to compliance with CPD 9.24 and the beauty salon being of a small scale in terms of the intensity of use, principle of a home-based activity 'home office' and use as a small ancillary rehabilitative space can be considered on the subject lands.
- Should permission be granted this would be for a temporary period of 5 years and potential impacts could be monitored.
- Notwithstanding that the development is not overly visible from the street the location forward of the building line would set a poor precedent.

- Design and external materials of the structure acceptable, but should be located in the rear garden, behind the building line.
- As proposal is not proposed for human habitation it is not necessarily in contravention of CPO 6.29. Applicant should have addressed why the structure cannot be located in the rear garden.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- None

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- None

3.4. Third Party Observations

6 No. observations were received by the Planning Authority of which 4 objected to the development. Issues raised in the objections are similar to those raised in the observations to the appeal and are summarised in section 7.4 of this report below.

2 No. observations were in support (one from the appellant to the appeal and the other from the adjoining neighbour to the east). Similarly, issues raised by those in support are reiterated in the grounds of appeal summarised in section 7.1 of this report.

4.0 Planning History

Appeal Site

PA Reg.Ref.23/876 ABP-319022-24: Permission **refused** 31/07/2024 for retention of a log cabin structure and its commercial use by Ann and William Teehan, for the following reason.

1. Having regard to the provisions of the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028, the Board considered that the location of the structure in the front garden of a dwelling, its positioning forwards of the established building line and its proximity to the roadside boundary, the design and external finish of the structure, and the extent to which the development will be reliant on planting to screen it from public view along the roadside, the development proposed for retention would adversely impact upon the established pattern of development and would

detract from the visual amenity of the area and of the streetscape generally. The retention of the development would set an undesirable precedent for similar types of development in the area. The retention of the development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

PA Reg.Ref.13/8172: Permission **granted** 04/06/2013 for removal of existing car port and construction of single storey granny flat (70 sqm) attached to east side of existing dormer dwelling (218 sqm) to William & Lily Teehan. This permission has been implemented on site.

In the Vicinity of the Site (referred to in the Planners Report)

PA Reg.Ref.10/2627: Permission **refused** 25/08/2010 for retention of change of use of existing premises from domestic garage/games room (49.52sqm) to eyelash extension studio (home based economic activity) at Rosella, Farm Lane, The Burnaby, Greystones, Co. Wicklow. The reason for refusal is as follows;

'With respect to the RE zoning objective for this site which seeks 'to preserve and improve residential amenity, infill housing shall reflect the prevailing density and character of its immediate area it is considered that the provision of commercial development in this location would be contrary to the zoning objective, would result in the piecemeal alteration of the character of this area and would set a precedent for further commercial development in this Residential zoning and would be contrary to the objectives of the Greystones/Delgany Local Area Plan 2006-2012.'

Enforcement (referred to in Observations)

UD No: UD5753 Enforcement Order issued 15th May 2025 requiring removal of the structure within 10 weeks, expired on 25th July 2025.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028 (as varied) (the WCDP)

The following extracts from the WCDP relate to aspects of the subject development but is not an exhaustive list of all relevant policies and objectives contained in the Development Plan.

Chapter 6 - Housing as varied March 2026

6.4 Housing Objectives - Existing Residential Areas

- **CPO 6.21** - In areas zoned 'Existing Residential' house improvements, alterations and extensions and appropriate infill residential development in accordance with principles of good design and protection of existing residential amenity will normally be permitted (other than on lands permitted or designated as open space, see CPO 6.25 below). While new developments shall have regard to the protection of the residential and architectural amenities of houses in the immediate environs, alternative and contemporary designs shall be encouraged (including alternative materials, heights and building forms), to provide for visual diversity.
- **CPO 6.29** Temporary residential structures (e.g. mobile homes, caravans, cabins, portacabins etc) form a haphazard and substandard form of residential accommodation and generally have poor aesthetic value and can detract from the overall appearance of an area. Therefore, permission will generally not be granted for such structures.

Chapter 9 Economic Development

- **CPO 9.1** - To support all forms of employment creation, especially where this can mitigate long distance commuting, subject to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area and compliance with all other objectives of this plan. Strategic employment development will be directed into the towns of Bray, Wicklow-Rathnew, Arklow, Greystones and Blessington.

Home Based Economic Activity

- **CPO 9.24** - To encourage, where appropriate, home-based economic activity¹ including the provision of small-scale individual enterprises. Proposals which

¹ Home based economic activity is defined as small scale commercial activity carried out by residents of a house which is subordinate or ancillary to the use of the dwelling as a place of residence.

involve the change of use and/or new development for purposes of home-based employment will generally be considered favourably where it can be clearly demonstrated that:

- the nature of the proposed process or activity to be carried out shall be appropriate to and compatible with the character and amenity of the adjoining area;
- the proposed development is of an appropriate scale for its location;
- there is no adverse environmental, health and safety impacts; and
- the development is not detrimental to residential amenity.

In dealing with applications for such developments, the planning authority will have regard to the following:

- the nature and extent of the work;
- the effects on the amenities of adjoining properties particularly as regards hours of operation, noise and general disturbance;
- the anticipated level of traffic generation; and
- the generation, storage and collection of waste.

Permissions for change of use shall be temporary for a period of five years, to enable the Planning Authority to monitor the impact of the development. Permission will not normally be granted for such changes of uses in apartments.

The Planning Authority will determine the appropriate number of employees that will be permitted at a development. In certain cases, it may be appropriate that a development is restricted to owner operator use only, and no other employees will be permitted. In any case, no more than three people, including the owner operator will be permitted to be employed at such a development.

Appendix 1 – Development and Design Standards

3.1.10 Temporary residential structures - Temporary residential structures (e.g. mobile homes, cabins, caravans, portacabins etc) form a haphazard form of residential accommodation and generally have poor aesthetic value and can detract from the overall appearance of an area.

Furthermore, by reason of the overall design and construction of such structures, they are normally seriously substandard as regards attainable amenity as a place of residence with reference to:

- The recommendations in the DoEHLG Best Practice Guidelines “Delivering Homes for Sustainable Communities” (Durability)
- The criteria set out under Section 66 of the Housing Act 1966 (fitness of a dwelling i.e. stability, resistance to dampness, pest control etc.)
- Compliance with the Building Regulations.

Therefore, permission will generally not be granted for such structures.

5.2. Greystones – Delgany and Kilcoole LAP/LPF 2026

The Greystones-Delgany and Kilcoole Local Area Plan 2013-2019 (LAP) previously expired. The Wicklow County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 was subsequently varied under **Variation No. 2** to include the LAP, and a replacement Local Planning Framework (LPF) has been prepared and was adopted at a Council Meeting on the 9th February 2026 under **Variation No. 4**.

Variation No. 5 to the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028 was made by Wicklow County Council on 30th March 2026, pursuant to Section 13 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended). The reason for the variation was to take account of ‘NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements’ - Guidelines for Planning Authorities, issued under Section 28 of the Planning & Development Act 2000 (as amended) (July 2025). The **Variation** revised the Wicklow Core Strategy and associated housing targets, and a number of related housing objectives set out in the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028 Written Statement.

Arising from **Variation No. 5**, changes consequent were required to be made to the Greystones-Delgany & Kilcoole Local Planning Framework 2026 Written Statement, largely in relation to the phasing of land zoned for residential development.

Under the Greystones – Delgany and Kilcoole Local Planning Framework 2026 the subject site is zoned ‘**Special Residential**: ‘To protect, provide and improve residential amenities in a format and a density specified in this LPF’.

The zoning objective is described as ‘to facilitate for the provision of high quality new residential environments with excellent layout and design, reflecting the density and character of the historic Burnaby and not exceeding density of 10 units per hectare.’

GDK20 Special Residential Zonings

‘1. Any new development on lands zoned RS (Special Residential) at ‘The Old Burnaby’ ACA shall be restricted to a lower density (not exceeding 10 units per hectare), and a design and height that reflects the character of this existing historical residential area. All applications within this area shall include Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment in support of the development.’

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

The site is not located within or adjoining a European Site. In relation to designated conservation sites:

The Murrough Special Protection Area SPA (Site Code 004186) is located c. 1km east of the appeal site.

5.4. Water Framework Directive

The European Union Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EC (WFD) was adopted in 2000 as a single piece of legislation covering rivers, lakes, groundwater and transitional (estuarine) and coastal waters and includes heavily modified and artificial waterbodies. The overarching aim of the WFD is to prevent further deterioration of and to protect, enhance and restore the status of all bodies of water with the aim of achieving at least ‘good’ ecological status by 2015 (or where certain derogations have been justified to 2021 or 2027).

6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development to be retained does not fall within a class of development set out in Part 1 or Part 2 of Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001. No Mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is no requirement for a screening determination. (Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of the report)

Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development to be retained 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 environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The relevant planning grounds of the Third-Party appeal (by Beth Teehan, the daughter of the applicants William and Anne Teehan) are, in summary, as follows:

- *Reason for Refusal* - Dispute that granting permission for retention would set an undesirable precedent. Precedent established under PA Reg.Ref.18/385 for a home office in the front garden of a dwelling in Greystones zoned residential.
- *Planning Policy and Guidelines* – Notes Section 28 Development Management Guidelines which recognise exceptional personal circumstances, including disability-related needs, as valid planning considerations.
- *Wicklow CDP 2022-2028* – Supports residential amenity and personal well-being, ancillary structures meeting household and personal needs, and development compatible with the character of the residential area.
- *UN Convention on the Rights of Persons and Disabilities (CRPD)* – Notes that Ireland is a signatory and public authorities must provide reasonable accommodation where it does not conflict with proper planning.
- *Precedent* - already established.
- Compliance with Zoning and Development Plan
- *Exceptional Personal Circumstances* – Outline applicants requirements for a space separate from the household.
- *Minimal Impact* – Submit structure is screened by tall hedges, does not give to overlooking and does not have a significant impact on the streetscape.

- Indicate willingness to relocate log cabin slightly further back from the front boundary.
- Rationale for not locating log cabin in back garden presented.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

- No response received.

7.3. Observations

Four no. observations were received from the following third parties;

- Eric Colhoun
- Jill Mellon
- Robert and Lesley Kemp
- Valerie Jennings & Joe McCarthy

The nearest neighbours are Robert and Lesley Kemp who live in the adjoining house to the west, while Eric Colhoun lives two doors away. The other two observers are residents within Burnaby Park. Issues raised can be summarised as follows;

- Structure constructed in March 2023 for commercial use by Beth Teehan (daughter of Ann Teehan) advertised as Makeup by Beth.
- Retention permission previously refused by WCC and ABP.
- Enforcement Order issued 15th May 2025 requiring removal of the structure within 10 weeks expired on 25th July 2025. Structure is still in place, therefore non-compliant with Enforcement Order.
- Current application invalid considering planning history, and nature of commercial use.
- Request ACP refuse permission as previously.
- Note offer by owners to move structure back from the public footpath but not to cease the commercial use. Precedent for commercial use in front garden in a residential area unacceptable.

- Note description of the needs of the applicant's daughter while also running a business.

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. **Introduction**

The Commission previously refused planning permission for retention of a log cabin structure and its commercial use under ABP-319022-24 on 31st July 2024. The current application for retention is substantially similar to the previous application. It differs only in terms of the description of the use which is now described as home office and rehabilitative space.

The current application for retention lodged on 28th November 2025 follows an enforcement case taken by the PA in relation to Unauthorised Development at the site and required removal of the log cabin by 25th July 2025.

The current application and third-party appeal were lodged prior to the adoption of the Greystones – Delgany and Kilcoole Local Planning Framework 2026, on 9th February 2026, and subsequent variation No. 5 to the County Development Plan and LPF on 30th March 2026.

Having examined the application details and all other documentation file, including all the submissions received in relation to the appeal, and inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are as follow:

- Principle of Development
- Residential Amenity
- Precedent

Principle of Development

The subject log cabin has an area of 12.7sqm and is located in the front garden of the family home. It does not physically form part of the existing dwelling and is therefore ancillary to the family home.

The third-party outlines in the appeal that the structure to be retained has been in use as a home office and rehabilitative space by the appellant (the applicants daughter).

It is submitted in the appeal that the retention of the log cabin and its use as a home office and rehabilitative space would align with national and local policy goals around recognising exceptional personal circumstances, including disability-related needs, as valid planning considerations.

The Planning Officer in their assessment of the proposal noted that at the time of the site visit the unit was operating as a beauty salon. I also refer the Commission to third party observations to the application and the grounds of appeal which provide evidence of the use as a beauty salon operating commercially. I can further confirm from my site visit the unit is currently in use as a beauty salon and appears to be trading as 'Makeup by Beth'.

In my opinion the nature of the commercial use to be retained has not been accurately described in the public notices.

The Planning Officer notes that while the principle of development ancillary to a dwelling is open to consideration, the Planning Authority would have to be satisfied that any such structure is one that has an appearance and use as an ancillary structure.

The Planning Authority consider that subject to compliance with CPO 9.24 and the beauty salon being a small scale in terms of its intensity of use, the principle of a home-based economic activity 'home office' can be considered on the subject lands, as can the use as a small ancillary rehabilitative space.

County Development Plan **CPO 9.24** refers to home based economic activity it encourages where appropriate, home-based economic activity including the provision of small-scale individual enterprises. Proposals which involve the change of use and/or new development for purposes of home-based employment will generally be considered favourably where it can be clearly demonstrated that:

- the nature of the proposed process or activity to be carried out shall be appropriate to and compatible with the character and amenity of the adjoining area;
- the proposed development is of an appropriate scale for its location;
- there is no adverse environmental, health and safety impacts; and
- the development is not detrimental to residential amenity.

Accordingly, I would accept the point raised by the appellant that there is relevant policy in the Development Plan which seeks to facilitate home based economic activity.

In relation to the scale of the structure to be retained relative to the main dwelling, I am also satisfied that it can be considered as small scale commercial activity carried out by residents of a house which is subordinate or ancillary to the use of the dwelling as a place of residence.

8.2. Residential Amenity

The refusal reason issued by the Planning Authority refers to the location of the structure in the front garden of a dwelling, which would detract from the visual amenity of the area, and of the streetscape generally, and set an undesirable precedent for similar developments.

It is set out in the reason for refusal that the location of the structure, forward of the established building line, its proximity to the roadside boundary, design and external finish to the structure, and extent to which the development will be reliant on planting to screen it from public view along the roadside, would adversely impact upon the established pattern of development.

The applicant submits in their application for retention permission that the structure is modest in scale and subservient to the main dwelling, has been designed to blend with the surrounding environment, has no negative impact on the visual amenity of the streetscape and does not result in traffic, parking or access issues.

The Greystones-Delgany and Kilcoole Local Planning Framework 2026 has been adopted and varied since the planning application and appeal were lodged. Under the LPF the subject site is zoned RS 'Special Residential'. The zoning objective seeks 'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities in a format and a density specified in this LPF'.

Uses generally appropriate for special residential (RS) zoned areas include home based economic activity, ancillary development and other residential uses in accordance with the County Development Plan and this LPF.

The zoning objective is described as ‘to facilitate for the provision of high quality new residential environments with excellent layout and design, reflecting the density and character of the historic Burnaby and not exceeding density of 10 units per hectare.’ While Objective **GDK20** recognises the particular character of the historical Burnaby estate, I would also note that the subject site is located outside the designated Architectural Conservation Area.

As already noted above County Development Plan Objective CPO 9.24: refers to home based economic activity. In dealing with applications for such developments, the planning authority will have regard to the following:

- the nature and extent of the work;
- the effects on the amenities of adjoining properties particularly as regards hours of operation, noise and general disturbance;
- the anticipated level of traffic generation; and
- the generation, storage and collection of waste.

The third-party appellant has outlined her requirements for a space separate from the household and sets out her own exceptional personal circumstances. A rationale for not locating the log cabin in the back garden is also presented. I am not convinced however that the particular needs of the appellant could not be equally served by extending the existing house to the front in some manner to accommodate the relatively small area currently required.

The observers to the appeal note that the building remains in constant commercial use as a beauty salon with customers attending daily. Hours of operation are listed as Monday to Sunday - seven days a week - 10am to 5pm or 6pm. Observers also note that the business is still advertised as “Makeup by Beth” on Google maps, Apple maps, Instagram and Facebook.

I accept that the structure to be retained is not for human habitation, however I am not satisfied that the applicant has accurately described the nature of the commercial use on site in terms of effects on the amenities of adjoining properties, particularly as regards hours of operation, noise and general disturbance. I am not therefore satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated compliance with County Development Plan Objective CPO 9.24.

The log cabin to be retained is located to the front/south of the dwelling and it is set forward c. 8.235m from the front building line of the dwelling. It is set off the front/southern site boundary with the public footpath by 0.6m and 1.2m from the western site boundary with no. 6 Burnaby Park.

The structure is positioned perpendicular to the front boundary with glazed entrance door and two windows addressing the front driveway and front garden of house no. 4 Burnaby Park. It has a pitched roof with a ridge height of 3.094m.

The external finish of the log cabin is of timber fabrication painted dark green and as such it does not integrate with the dwelling which features a brick and render external finish to the front elevation.

I can confirm from my site visit that the structure is only partially visible from the street, as it is largely screened by tall evergreen hedges. It is clearly visible however from the front garden of the adjoining house to the east no. 4 Burnaby Park.

Notwithstanding I would concur with the Planning Authority and the previous planning inspector that the location of the structure forward of the building line would set a poor precedent.

In my opinion the existing structure fails to integrate with the existing dwelling, is out of keeping with the pattern of development in the area and is incongruous as a result at its current siting. In my opinion it therefore negatively impacts upon the character of the existing dwelling and the streetscape.

I have considered the merits of relocating the structure, given the willingness of the appellant to relocate the log cabin slightly further back from the front boundary; however, I see no particular advantage to this.

On this basis I am not therefore satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated compliance with County Development Plan Objective CPO 9.24.

In my opinion the grounds of appeal have not addressed the reason for refusal and the decision of the planning authority should be upheld.

Precedent

The reason for refusal refers to the retention of the development which would set an undesirable precedent for similar types of development in the area.

The applicants in their application and the appellant in the grounds of appeal have referred to established precedent in the locality of the site namely under PA Reg.Ref.18/1385 and argue that it is similar to the current application. I have had regard to PA Reg.Ref.18/1385 which was for permission for a home office in the front garden of Cullenmore House, Blacklion, in Greystones.

I am of the view that the example referenced by the applicant is not directly comparable as it refers to a building set within the grounds of a period house with substantial curtilage, with set backs of c.4m from the public footpath and c.6m from a regional road. The subject site is located within a housing estate and the structure to be retained which is in commercial use is located much closer to front site boundaries.

I have also had regard to precedent established and referenced by the Planning Officer notably under PA Reg.Ref.10/2627 where permission for retention was refused for of change of use of existing premises from domestic garage/games room (49.52sqm) to eyelash extension studio (home based economic activity) at Rosella, Farm Lane, The Burnaby, Greystones, Co. Wicklow. Permission was refused on the basis that it was not considered to be consistent with the residential character of the area. The application was assessed under a previous CDP and LAP, it also relates to a change of use to part of an existing dwelling house.

Reference is also made by the Planning Officer to a Section 5 Determination by ABP under (ABP-311946-21) where the Board determined that the 'change of use of part of the residential dwelling house to use as a part-time beautician by appointment only' is incidental to the use of the property as a house, and therefore, does not constitute a material change of use and is not development. Again, this relates to a change of use to part of an existing dwelling house, and not therefore directly comparable to the subject appeal.

I would also refer the Commission to a more recent precedent case for retention of a log cabin for use as a gym/office which was refused permission under ACP-323615-25 on 08/01/2026.

While each application is considered on its own merits, I am satisfied in this instance given the planning and enforcement history on the subject site and assessment

outlined above, that to permit retention of the structure which is commercial use in a residential estate, would set an undesirable precedent.

Summary

I am not satisfied that the current application for retention permission has addressed the previous reason for refusal by the Commission, and in my opinion the decision of the PA to refuse retention permission should be upheld.

9.0 **AA Screening**

I have considered the proposed development to be retained in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

The subject site is not located within a designated site, with the nearest site being The Murrough Special Protection Area SPA (Site Code 004186) located c. 1km east of the appeal site.

No nature conservation concerns were raised within the appeal. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature of the development proposed which is located on serviced lands
- The distance to the nearest European sites, and the absence of any hydrological or other pathways
- Connection to public water, drain and sewer.

I conclude on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development to be retained 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, as amended, is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

The site is located within the Ovoca-Vartry (Catchment ID 10) Water Framework Directive catchment area and in the Newcastle (Wicklow)_SC_010 Sub-catchment.

The nearest river waterbody to the site is the Three Trout's Stream (EPA code Wicklow_010) which is located c. 0.6km south of the site. The Three Trout's Stream which is of moderate water quality status flows in an easterly direction where it enters the sea at an outflow close to Greystones south beach/golf course at Greystones.

The proposed development to be retained consists of a log cabin all other associated site development works above and below ground. No third-party concerns were raised in relation to water deterioration.

I have assessed the proposed development to be retained and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seeks to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively. The reason for this conclusion is as follows.

- Scale and size of proposed development
- Separation to nearest water body
- Connection to public water, sewer and drainage

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development to be retained 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 the Commission uphold the decision of Wicklow County Council and **refuse** planning permission for retention for the reasons and considerations set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the siting, design and commercial nature of the development proposed to be retained, specifically the siting of the log cabin forward of the existing dwelling's front building line, it is considered that the development proposed for retention would detract from the visual and residential amenity and streetscape of the area.

As a result, the structure competes visually with the dwelling, with finishes that are not harmonious with the existing vernacular styled dwelling, thus negatively impacting upon its character. Therefore, it is considered that the structure fails to integrate with the existing dwelling and is imposing and incongruous, as a result, at its current siting. Accordingly, it is considered that the development proposed to be retained would be contrary to Objectives CPO 9.24 of the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022 2028 and the 'Special Residential' zoning objective under the Greystones-Delgany and Kilcoole Local Planning Framework 2026.

The development proposed to be retained would, therefore, seriously injure the visual and residential amenities of the area and would be 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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.”

Susan McHugh

Senior Planning Inspector

12th June 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500368-WW-25
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of a log cabin to be used as home office and rehabilitative space.
Development Address	5 Burnaby Park, Greystones, Co. Wicklow.
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 Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> 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)?	
<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	

<p>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?</p>	
<p><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.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><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)</p>	
<p>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)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</p>

No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____