



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP 322792-25

Development	New vehicular entrance
Location	152, Carysfort Park, Blackrock, Dublin, A94C9P1.
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D25A/0259/WEB.
Applicant(s)	Art McCoy & Nichola O'Reilly.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Art McCoy & Nichola O'Reilly.
Observer(s)	None on file.
Date of Site Inspection	1 st September 2025.
Inspector	Des Johnson

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. Carysfort Park forms part of a large housing development located to the west side of Carysfort Avenue in Blackrock, Co. Dublin. Carysfort Park is a mixture of predominantly two-storey semi-detached and terraced houses. The subject property is a two-storey, end of terrace dwelling facing eastwards.
- 1.2. Semi-detached houses appeared to have off-street parking to the front. Parking bays serve the terraced housing, including housing to the rear and west of the subject premises.
- 1.3. No.90, Carysfort Park opposite the appeal premises, is a detached dwelling with off-street parking provided the front.
- 1.4. There is on-street car parking in a bay to the front of the terrace of houses, including No.152. At the time of inspection, cars were parked at right angles to the carriageway along this stretch in front of the terrace. Further along Carysfort Park, cars were parked parallel to the footpath and kerb.
- 1.5. The front of No.152 is set back from the front building line for the other three houses in the terrace. The front was finished in gravel and paving slabs, and an EV charger was installed.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1 The proposal is for a new vehicular entrance to an end of terrace 2-storey dwelling. The existing opening is stated to be c.5.5m and this is to be reduced to 3.5m.
- 2.2. The existing front curtilage is of gravel/paving slabs, and there is a low boundary wall, which is to be extended to narrow the vehicular opening.
- 2.3. The proposed development would include the dishing of the adjoining public footpath.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

- 3.1. The Planning Authority refused permission for 2 reasons.
- 3.2. Reason 1 refers to the loss of a public on-street car parking space in a development where on-street parking serves multiple residential dwellings, and would result in an undesirable

precedent which would adversely impact on the availability of public parking for other adjacent dwellings.

- 3.3. Reason 2 states that the Planning Authority is not satisfied that the proposed development complies with Development Plan requirements by reason of the failure to provide a satisfactory depth for the parking spaces, and to contain the loose gravel finish within the curtilage of the site. The proposal would pose a risk to public safety and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 3.4 The Planner's Report notes that the end of terrace dwelling is set back from the building line of the adjacent terrace resulting in a larger front curtilage area. One submission was received raising the loss of community parking spaces, and inappropriate precedent. This was taken into consideration. Transportation Planning Report recommends refusal, and Drainage Department raises no objection subject to condition. The site is in an area zoned 'A', and the proposal is permitted in principle subject to being compatible with overall policies and objectives for the zone. Permissions have previously been granted for amendments to existing vehicular entrances in the vicinity. The stated depth of the proposed parking space in the front curtilage area is inaccurately detailed in the drawings; it does not comply with Development Plan requirements. There is potential for parked vehicles to overhang the adjacent public footpath endangering pedestrian safety and causing obstruction. The proposal would result in the loss of an on-street public parking space which is used by residents and visitors of other dwellings and can also be used by the applicant. Strong justification for the provision of off-street parking has not been provided. The site is within walking distance of the N11 and N31 Core Bus corridors.
- 3.5 Transport Planning recommend refusal and this is reflected in Reason 1 of the refusal. Drainage report raises no objection subject to condition.

4. Planning History

- 4.1 Reference 303258 – permission granted at No.90, Carysfort Park (opposite the current appeal site) for construction of extension and alterations to house, demolition of single-storey lean-to to kitchen return, construction of extension to side and rear. The submitted drawings showed off-street vehicular parking

Reference D14A/0691-Permission granted for widening of street entrance to car parking drive at 69, Carysfort Park

Reference D14A/0691-Permission granted for widening of street entrance to car parking drive at 69, Carysfort Park

Reference D13A/0521- Permission granted for widening of existing vehicular entrance at 8, Carysfort Park

Reference D07A/1682 – Permission granted for extensions and increased width of vehicular entrance in front. The decision conditioned the vehicular entrance to be retained at the existing width in the interest of public safety and residential amenities

5. Policy Context

- 5.1. The Dún-Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 is the relevant plan.
- 5.2. The site is in an area zoned 'A' with the objective *to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities*
- 5.3. Section 12.4.5 refers to Car Parking Standards. Section 12.4.5.6 refers to Residential Parking. Section 12.4.8 refers to Vehicular Entrances and Hardstanding Areas. Vehicle entrances and exits shall be designed to avoid traffic hazard for pedestrians and passing traffic. Where a new entrance is proposed regard is had to the road and footpath layout, the traffic conditions on the road and available sightlines. In general, for a single residential dwelling, the maximum width of an entrance is 3.5m, and for a shared entrance for two residential dwellings, may be increased to a maximum width of 4m. Each car parking space for a residential dwelling shall have a minimum length of 5.5m depth to ensure the parked car does not overhang onto the existing public footway and a minimum width of 3m to allow for clearance from nearby wall/steps/boundary.

Natural Heritage Designations

- South Dublin Bay SAC – c.1.2km to the NE
- South Dublin Bay & River Tolka Estuary SPA & pNHA – c.1.2km to NE
- Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC – c.5km to W

6. EIA Screening

- 6.1 The development proposed is not of a Class for the purposes of Schedule 5. As such, the development is excluded at pre-screening stage.

7. The Appeal

- 7.1. The grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

- The majority of houses in Carysfort Park have off-street parking in their front garden.
- There are two types of parking bays throughout the development. The first type (Type A) are located directly outside houses; the second type (Type B) are not located directly outside houses but are dotted throughout the development and are shared by residents as overflow spaces.
- There are no other uses for these communal car-parking bays (Type A) other than to provide on-street parking for the benefit of residents of the houses they sit outside. The subject bay is a Type A bay.
- The removal of one car parking space in a Type A bay would not be contrary to planning policy. The Development Plan presumption to retain on-street parking as provided for in Section 12.4.8 does not apply to Carysfort Park as it is not an area characterized predominantly by pedestrian entrances and few, if any, vehicular entrances.
- The proposal is compatible and consistent with Section 12.4.11 relating to Electrically Operated Vehicles.
- Residents of Carysfort Park, either singularly or as a whole, are not reliant on the availability of on-street car parking in spaces in Type 1 bays.
- A photograph submitted as part of the Observation submitted to the Planning Authority shows car parked perpendicular are directly outside the applicants' house are the applicants' cars. The bay is not wide enough and 50% of each car is jutting out on to the road. The bays do not meet today's needs.

- The advantages of the proposal outweigh the disadvantages of removing one space from a Type A bay. The installation of an EV charger is consistent with the Plan and meets modern needs.
- The depth of the proposed parking space is correctly shown; the drawings appear to have been misread. There is easily 5.5m depth and no cars will overhang the public footpath.

7.2 Planning Authority Response

The grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which would justify a change of attitude.

8. Assessment

- 8.1. The proposal is for a new vehicular entrance to an end of terrace two-storey dwelling. It is proposed to extend the low front boundary wall by 2050mm, leaving a 3500mm opening. The front is finished in gravel surrounded by paving. An EV charger has been installed.
- 8.2. The Planning Authority refused permission for 2 reasons. The first reason refers to the loss of a public car parking space in a development where on-street parking serves multiple residential dwellings, would result in an undesirable precedent, and would adversely impact on the availability of public parking for other adjacent dwellings. The second reason states that the Planning Authority is not satisfied that the proposed development complies with Development Plan requirements.
- 8.3. The appellants contend that the majority of houses in Carysfort Park have off-street parking, that there are two types of parking bay and that the parking bay outside the terrace including the subject premises is for the benefit of the houses it sits outside. It is contended that the advantages of the proposal outweigh the disadvantages of removing one parking space. The depth of the space ensures that no cars will overhang the public footpath.
- 8.4. I contend that the key issues to be addressed are as follows:
 - Policy
 - Reasons for refusal
 - Appropriate Assessment

Policy

- 8.5 The site is in an area zoned 'A' with the objective *to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities*. The proposed development is permissible under this zoning subject to being compatible with other policies and objectives of the Plan.

Reasons

- 8.6 Addressing the second reason for refusal first, I consider that the front garden space of the subject premises would meet Development Plan requirements providing adequate depth to ensure that no cars would overhang the public footpath. I consider that the proposed development would not give rise to public safety concerns, and note that the Planning Authority's Transportation Planning Section did not raise public safety as an issue. I am satisfied that the submitted drawing shows accurate dimensions for the front garden space.
- 8.7 Addressing the first reason for refusal, Carysfort Park is predominantly a mixture of two-storey semi-detached dwellings and newer terraced type dwellings. The semi-detached dwellings provide on-site car parking whereas parking bays provide for the terraced housing. These parking bays are for communal use, but include parking for the terraced houses adjacent to them. Cars were parked at right angles to the carriageway in the parking bay to the front of the terrace including the subject premises. The proposed development would lead to a loss of at least one parking space from this bay, and would require the dishing of the public footpath.
- 8.8 I conclude that the proposed development would result in the loss of public on-street car parking available to other residential dwellings within the development, and adversely impact on the availability of public parking for other adjacent dwellings. Due to the layout of the appeal premises, which provides for a larger front garden space than other terraced dwellings at Carysfort Park, I do not consider that the proposed development would set an undesirable precedent.

9. AA Screening

- 9.1 Having considered the nature, scale and location of the development, I am satisfied that it can

be eliminated for further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European site. The reason for this conclusion is having regard to the nature and small scale of the development, location in an established residential area, and the distance from and absence of connectivity to European sites.

10. Recommendation

I recommend that permission be refused

11. Reasons

It is considered that the proposed development, involving the construction of a new vehicular access and dishing of the adjoining public footpath, would result in the loss of public on-street car parking in this section of Carysfort Park, where on-street parking serves multiple residential dwellings within the development. As such, the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the availability of public parking for other adjacent dwellings, and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Des. Johnson
Planning Inspector

3rd September 2025

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment judgment 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 judgment in an improper or inappropriate way.

Appendix 1 - Form 1
EIA Pre-Screening
[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	322792-25		
Proposed Development Summary	Vehicular entrance		
Development Address	152, Carysfort Park, Blackrock, Dublin, A94C9P1.		
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	Yes	
	No		
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?			
Yes			
No	No		No further action required
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			
No			
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes			

5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No		
Yes		

Inspector: _____ Date: _____