



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-323573-25

Development	Creation of off-street parking within the curtilage of the dwelling incorporating a new gate
Location	7 Ailesbury Park, Ballsbridge, Dublin 4
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB/2500/25
Applicant(s)	Colm & Fina Walsh
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse permission
Type of Appeal	First party
Appellant(s)	Colm & Fina Walsh
Observer(s)	Philip O'Reilly
Date of Site Inspection	11 November 2025

Inspector

Killian Harrington

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	4
3.0	Planning Authority Decision.....	4
4.0	Planning History	6
6.0	EIA Screening	12
7.0	The Appeal	12
8.0	Assessment.....	15
9.0	AA Screening	19
10.0	Water Framework Directive	20
11.0	Recommendation	21
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	21
13.0	Conditions	22
Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening.....		24

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1 The subject site is a two-storey semi-detached, red brick period property, located on the southeastern side of Ailesbury Park. This is a residential street on the northern side of Merrion Road although the vehicular access is from Sydney Parade Avenue. The front boundary of the property is consistent with neighbouring dwellings and is 10.4m in width, currently hedging which surmounts a low granite plinth with a steel rail. There is a pedestrian opening close to neighbouring No.5 Ailesbury Park. The front curtilage has a depth of 4.94m from the front of the property. The side of the property is stepped back affording a depth is 6.37m with a width of approx. 3.047m. To the front of the property, there is a street tree on the footpath and on the roadside there is demarcated controlled parking.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1 The proposed development comprises the following:

- The creation of a vehicular access to front to form new off-street parking within the curtilage of the dwelling incorporating a new gate by modification of existing railings hedgerow and kerbing and all associated site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1 Decision

Dublin City Council refused planning permission for the following reason:

The proposed vehicular entrance would result in the removal of on-street parking spaces on Ailesbury Park to accommodate a private vehicular entrance, which is contrary to Policy SMT25, Section 8.5.7 and Appendix 5, Section 4.1 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022- 2028, which aims to manage on-street parking to serve the needs of the city alongside the needs of residents, visitors, businesses, kerbside activity, and accessible parking requirements. The reduced supply of on-street parking would detract from the convenience of road users and the residential

amenity of surrounding properties, would be contrary to the stated policy and would set an undesirable precedent for similar type developments on adjacent roads. The development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area

3.1.1. Planning Authority Reports

The report notes that the proposal in principle is considered to be in line with the Z2 zoning objective of the site. However, the proposed vehicular entrance would result in a loss of on-street parking and its width would also fall short of development standards and is therefore contrary to the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. Accordingly, permission should be refused.

3.1.2 Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Division – no objection subject to conditions
- Road Planning Division - recommended that permission be refused for the following reason:

‘The proposed vehicular entrance would result in the removal of on-street parking spaces on Ailesbury Park to accommodate a private vehicular entrance, is contrary to the policy of the planning authority, as set out in Policy SMT25, section 8.5.7 and appendix 5, Section 4.1 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022- 2028, which aims to manage on-street parking to serve the needs of the city alongside the needs of residents, visitors, businesses, kerbside activity, and accessible parking requirements. The reduced supply of on-street parking would detract from the convenience of road users and the residential amenity of surrounding properties, would be contrary to the stated policy and would set an undesirable precedent for other similar developments on adjacent roads. The development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.’

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No reports received

3.4. Third Party Observations

Observations from two neighbours, one supportive and one objecting, raised the following issues:

- Loss of front garden open space amenity
- Loss of historical plinth and railings.
- Adversely impact the visual and residential amenity of the area.
- Provide a practical and positive solution to ongoing parking and access issues.
- Current volume of on-street parking contributes to congestion in the area
- The entrance would help with waste collection.
- Overall car parking capacity in the area will increase with the entrance.

4.0 Planning History

4.1 Subject site

Reg. Ref WEB1803-23 – Permission refused for new off-street parking within the curtilage of the dwelling incorporating a new gate. The reason for refusal was as follows:

‘The development would result in the removal of on-street parking to accommodate private vehicular entrances, which would be contrary to the policy of the planning authority, as set out in Policy SMT25 and section 8.5.7 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022- 2028, which aims to manage on-street parking to serve the needs of the city alongside the needs of residents, visitors, businesses, kerbside activity, and accessible parking requirements. The reduced supply of on street parking would detract from the convenience of road users and the residential amenity of surrounding properties, would be contrary to the stated policy and

would set an undesirable precedent for other similar developments in the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.'

Reg. Ref. WEB1476-23 – Planning permission refused for creation of vehicular access to front to form new off-street parking within the curtilage of the dwelling incorporating a new gate by modification of existing railings-hedgerow & kerbing and all associated site works for the following reason:

- 1. The vehicular entrance would result in the removal of on-street parking to accommodate private vehicular entrance, which would be contrary to the policy of the planning authority, as set out in Policy SMT25 and section 8.5.7 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022- 2028, which aims to manage on-street parking to serve the needs of the city alongside the needs of residents, visitors, businesses, kerbside activity, and accessible parking requirements. The reduced supply of onstreet parking would detract from the convenience of road users and the residential amenity of surrounding properties, would be contrary to the stated policy and would set an undesirable precedent for other similar developments in the area. The development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

Reg. Ref. 3040-23 – Planning permission granted to demolish rear two story projection and to construct new one and two storey rear extension and rear dormer extension, modify roof of main house to rear incorporating two bedrooms in attic. Renovate existing dwelling and all associated site works.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

Under the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 the site is zoned objective objective Z2 Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas), which has an objective 'to protect and or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas'. The property is not listed on the Record of Protected Structures. The

following Dublin City Development Plan policy objectives have specific relevance to this appeal:

Section 8.5.7 Car Parking

Dublin City Council recognises the need to further control and manage on-street parking across the city to safeguard and enhance city living for people of all ages and abilities and for families. Dublin City Council is committed to reviewing the residential and non-residential car parking provision across the city and urban villages and evaluating the implementation of parking demand management strategies in areas where deemed appropriate and practicable

Section 14.7.2 Residential Neighbourhoods (Conservation Areas) – Zone Z2

Residential conservation areas have extensive groupings of buildings and associated open spaces with an attractive quality of architectural design and scale. The general objective for such areas is to protect them from unsuitable new developments or works that would have a negative impact on the amenity or architectural quality of the area.

Policy BHA9 (Conservation Areas)

To protect the special interest and character of all Dublin's Conservation Areas – identified under Z8, Z2 zoning objectives and denoted by red line conservation hatching on the zoning maps. Development within or affecting a Conservation Area must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible. Enhancement opportunities may include:

1. Replacement or improvement of any building, feature or element which detracts from the character of the area or its setting.
1. Re-instatement of missing architectural detail or important features.
2. Improvement of open spaces and the wider public realm and reinstatement of historic routes and characteristic plot patterns.

3. Contemporary architecture of exceptional design quality, which is in harmony with the Conservation Area.
4. The repair and retention of shop and pub fronts of architectural interest.
5. Retention of buildings and features that contribute to the overall character and integrity of the Conservation Area.
6. The return of buildings to residential use.

Changes of use will be acceptable where in compliance with the zoning objectives and where they make a positive contribution to the character, function and appearance of the Conservation Areas and its setting. The Council will consider the contribution of existing uses to the special interest of an area when assessing change of use applications and will promote compatible uses which ensure future long-term viability.

Policy SMT25 (On-Street Parking)

To manage on-street car parking to serve the needs of the city alongside the needs of residents, visitors, businesses, kerbside activity and accessible parking requirements, and to facilitate the re-organisation and loss of spaces to serve sustainable development targets such as in relation to, sustainable transport provision, greening initiatives, sustainable urban drainage, access to new developments, or public realm improvements.

Appendix 5 Transport and Mobility – Technical Requirements

Section 4.1 On Street Parking

There will be a presumption against the removal of on-street parking spaces to facilitate the provision of vehicular entrances to single dwellings in predominantly residential areas where residents are largely reliant on on-street car-parking spaces or where there is a demand for public parking serving other uses in the area.

Section 4.2 Accessible Car Parking

At least 5% of the total number of spaces shall be designated car-parking spaces, with a minimum provision of at least one such space, whichever is the greatest. In particular circumstances, the planning authority may require a higher accessible parking content depending on the nature of development. All accessible parking shall be allocated and suitably signposted for convenient access.

Section 4.3 Parking in Front Gardens

Planning Permission is required for the alteration of a front garden in order to provide car parking by creating a new access, or by widening of an existing access. Proposals for off-street parking in the front gardens of single dwellings in mainly residential areas may not be permitted where residents rely on on-street car parking and there is a strong demand for such parking.

Section 4.3.1 Dimensions and Surfacing

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. Detailed requirements for parking in the curtilage of Protected Structures and in Conservation Areas are set out below in section 4.3.7. The basic dimensions to accommodate the footprint of a car within a front garden are 3 metres by 5 metres. It is essential that there is also adequate space to allow for manoeuvring and circulation between the front boundary and the front of the building. Any works to the public road to facilitate the provision of an entrance including the removal or relocation of utility poles/boxes and public lighting are carried out at the applicant/developers own expense to the requirements of the relevant utility provider and Dublin City Council

Section 4.3.4 Sustainable Urban Drainage Section

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 Sustainable Drainage Design and evaluation Guide (2021) which is summarised in Appendix 12.

Section 4.3.5 Treatment of Front Boundaries

When considering any alterations, minimal interventions are desirable and proposals should aim to be complementary or consistent to others in the area which are of a high standard and in keeping with the overall character and streetscape. Vehicular entrances with splayed entrance walls or fences will not generally be permitted. All boundary treatment shall take cognisance of the need to provide adequate visibility

Section 4.3.6 Landscape Treatment of Front Gardens

The front boundary wall or fence should always be provided with a screen of ornamental small trees or hedging to give visual definition to the extent of the front garden and soften the appearance of the parked car. Importantly, any planting incorporated in the garden must not obscure visibility for drivers when exiting the driveway.

Section 4.3.7 Parking in the curtilage of Protected Structures, Architectural Conservation Area and Conservation Areas.

Proposals for parking within the curtilage and front gardens of such buildings will not normally be acceptable where inappropriate site conditions exist, particularly in the case of smaller gardens where the scale of intervention is more significant, and can lead to the erosion of the character and amenity of the area and where the historic plinths, decorative railings and gates, historic gate piers, and historic ground surfaces are still intact.

Where site conditions exist which can accommodate car parking provision without significant loss of visual amenity and/or historic fabric, proposals for limited off-street parking will be considered where certain criteria (set out in this section) can be met.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

The subject site is c. 0.5 km west of South Dublin Bay proposed NHA, and European sites South Dublin Bay SAC & South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA and c. 1 km northwest of Booterstown Marsh proposed NHA

6.0 EIA Screening

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. 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

The first party appeal includes an appeal statement and drawings from the planning application. The grounds are as follows:

- No net loss of parking
 - The appellant refutes the reason for refusal and states that while the proposal removes 3.5m of kerbside parking, it introduces one new off-street parking space
 - DMURS requires 6 metres per parallel parking space. Thus a 40m bay can accommodate 6 cars, not 8. Allowing for the proposed 3.5 - 4m entrance, the bay will still accommodate 6 cars. Therefore, when the new off-street space is factored in, the overall result is a net increase of 1 space.
- Sustainable Transport & EV Charging
 - Off-street provision enables the installation of a safe electric vehicle charging point, which is not possible from the street due to public footpath safety. It complies with National Sustainable Mobility Policy (2022), Climate

Action Plan (2024) and Development Plan objectives for sustainable transport.

- Residential Amenity & Accessibility
 - On-street parking currently creates conflict with neighbours' turning movements. Off- street provision resolves this.
 - There are no designated disabled parking spaces on Ailesbury Park. The applicants' elderly parents regularly visit and require safe assisted access to the dwelling. This directly supports the intent of TGD Part M (Access and Use) and Development Plan accessibility objectives
- Established Pattern of Development
 - Majority of dwellings in Ailesbury Park already benefit from off-street parking (photographic evidence submitted to demonstrate this)
- Technical Compliance
 - The entrance is 3 metres, not 4 metres wide and so complies with Appendix 5. It also achieves the 3m x 5m bay size in Appendix 5. The sightlines are maintained and swept path analysis confirms no vehicle hazards
- Architectural Conservation & Reversibility
 - The proposal retains the granite plinth and iron railings with only a temporary modification required so the entrance is fully reversible and can revert to previous front garden with same materials.
- Conditions

The appellant would accept the following conditions

- Use of permeable paving or SUDS for parking bay
- Installation of EV charging point
- Landscaping to soften the front boundary

7.2. Planning Authority Response

None

7.3. Observations

An observation was submitted responding to the first party appeal statement and is generally summarised as follows:

Loss of on street parking

- Must not have a repeat of past planning failures where off-street parking was approved at the expense of on-street spaces
- Policy SMT25 (protecting existing on street parking stock) should be adhered to
- The general community use the on-street parking spaces for hospital and retail centre
- EV charging issue – the local authority should make decisions on planning policy and Policy SMT25 has priority

Residential Amenity

- On-street parking does not cause turning movement issues and there is no kerbside congestion currently.
- Proposal will not improve public realm
- Lack of disabled bay on the street is not relevant
- Other planning applications have been refused even when disability is referred to in the application

Pattern of development

- The majority of dwellings on Ailesbury Park do not have off-street parking
- Reference is made to refusals for off-street parking in the general DCC area

Architectural Conservation and Reversibility

- The proposal would negatively impact conservation with the removal of railings, plinth and hedgerows (original architectural content). How can the removal only be temporary?
- There would be substantial loss of an original open front garden complete with hedgerow
- The proposed electric gates are at odds with the established Edwardian character of the area

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Following a review of the file, assessment of the relevant planning policies and inspection of the site, I conclude that the primary concerns in this appeal is (1) loss of on-street parking and (2) design and conservation matters

Loss of on-street parking

8.2 The proposed development, as shown on the drawing submitted to the Planning Authority involves a 4 metre wide vehicular entrance with a c. 3m x 5m parking bay inserted within the front of the curtilage. It is not possible to quantify the exact loss of on-street parking as a result of the need for a new entrance due to the necessary clearance and road markings unknown at this time. However, it would be at least one space and a maximum of two spaces. While the existing on-street space may be used by the applicant, thereby nullifying its removal in terms of parking space availability, its removal also removes a space available to the public in this pay and display zone. The question is therefore whether the space is in high demand, and whether its removal would negatively affect the demands of residents.

8.3 It is important to note the wording of Policy SMT25 (On-Street Parking). The policy is '*to manage on-street car parking to serve the needs of the city alongside the needs of residents*'. Furthermore, the policy objective is '*to facilitate the re-organisation and loss of spaces to serve sustainable development targets such as*

in relation to, sustainable transport provision, greening initiatives, sustainable urban drainage, access to new developments, or public realm improvements.'

Therefore the Development Plan seeks to manage on-street parking and a loss is acceptable in certain circumstances.

8.4 Section 4.0 of Appendix 5 in the Development Plan (Car Parking Standards) states that proposals for off-street parking in the front gardens of single dwellings in predominantly residential areas will not be permitted '*where residents are largely reliant on on-street car parking and there is a strong demand for such parking*'.

Section 4.1 states that there will be a presumption against the removal of on-street parking spaces to facilitate the provision of vehicular entrances to single dwellings in predominantly residential areas '*where residents are largely reliant on on-street car-parking spaces or where there is a demand for public parking serving other uses in the area*'.

8.5 Section 4.3 of Appendix 5 states that proposals for off-street parking in the front gardens of single dwellings in mainly residential areas may not be permitted '*where residents rely on on-street car parking and there is a strong demand for such parking*'. The appeal submits that the majority of properties in Ailesbury Park benefit from off-street parking and so supply outweighs demand for on-street parking in the area. That was also the case on the date of my site inspection, with many spaces available. The third party observation disputes this. However, publically available information, submitted photographic evidence in the appeal and a site inspection has shown this to be correct. There are vehicular entrances and hardstanding areas in 13 properties out of 23 in Ailesbury Park.

8.6 It is worth referring to the recent planning permission for a two-storey two-bedroom dwelling integrating existing garage in side garden of existing house at 31 Ailesbury Park (Reg. Ref. WEB1816/24). The Roads Planning report for Dublin City Council noted the following:

'Controlled on-street parking (permit and pay-and-display) is available in the vicinity of the site on both Ailesbury Park and Sydney Parade Avenue, with relatively low demand for same generally noted. In addition, it is noted that a

considerable majority of dwellings in the area accommodate in-curtilage car parking, with very few reliant on the on-street provision. On this basis, the loss of in-curtilage parking for the existing dwelling is considered acceptable and would not be expected to give rise to an exacerbation of overspill parking’.

- 8.7 The submitted observation suggests that members of the public use the Ailesbury Park parking for the Merrion shopping centre and St. Vincent’s Hospital. This may well be the case on occasion but I note the substantial parking facilities at both and the availability of pay and display parking in the east Merrion Road area.
- 8.8 The appellant makes the case that off-street parking is needed for the provision of EV charging facilities. I agree that this is an increasing problem in urban residential areas. However it is not sufficient justification on which solely grant the permission given the availability of public charging in the surrounding area. The need to make access easier for disabled visitors is also not a planning policy justification for the removal of on-street parking.
- 8.9 Given that there is no great demand for parking in Ailesbury Park and the majority of residents benefit from off-street parking, it is considered that the proposal does not contravene Policy SMT25 or indeed Section 8.5.7 of the Development Plan which states that Dublin City Council recognises the need to further control and manage on-street parking and are committed to reviewing the residential and non-residential car parking provision across the city.

Design and conservation matters

- 8.10 The Z2 zoning objective and Policy BHA9 (Conservation Areas) are set out in Section 5 of this report. The submitted observations on architectural conservation issues are noted. However, the site is not located within an Architectural Conservation Area and instead is subject to the criteria set out in Policy BHA9, which states that any development within a Conservation Area ‘*must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible*’. The proposal has taken positive measures to protect and enhance the

character and appearance of the area and its setting in so far as is possible. The proposal has been designed to retain the granite plinth and low iron railings, modified only to accommodate the new entrance. The works would provide a neat boundary treatment to match neighbouring dwellings.

- 8.11 Section 4.3.7 of Appendix 5 relates to parking in the curtilage of properties in Conservation Areas. It states that proposals for parking within the curtilage and front gardens of such buildings will not normally be acceptable where inappropriate site conditions exist. It goes on to state that where site conditions exist which can accommodate car parking provision without significant loss of visual amenity and/or historic fabric, proposals for limited off-street parking will be considered where certain criteria (set out in that section) can be met. The proposed vehicular entrance and parking bay meets this criteria and protects and enhances the visual amenity and historic character of the Conservation Area.
- 8.12 The existing front boundary of the property is consistent with neighbouring dwellings in that it is 10.4m in width with hedging which surmounts a low granite plinth with a steel rail. There is a pedestrian opening close to neighbouring No.5 Ailesbury Park. I note the appearance of other dwellings in Ailesbury Park that have in-curtilage parking. The retention of the granite plinth and railings is a key characteristic of Ailesbury Park but the vehicular opening that most of these properties have in their front boundary to allow vehicle access is common on this street and also forms part of the existing residential character. The proposal is in keeping with that appearance and protects and preserves the low railing, stone plinth and hedgerow planting in the same way as the surrounding properties. The proposed sliding gate does not detract from the neat appearance of this boundary treatment as the gate and railings are both visually in keeping with the front boundaries of the other properties in height, colour and style.
- 8.13 In terms of technical design, I note the proposed entrance on the drawings is 4 metres wide and this does not align with the standards set out in Appendix 5, which states that a vehicular opening width should be a minimum 2.5 metres and maximum 3 metres. The appeal statement claims that the opening is 3 metres wide but includes the planning application drawings as an appendix with no

revisions made. In the previously refused application (Reg. Ref. WEB1803/23), the entrance width complied with the standards with a width of 3 metres and contained the same railing and electric gate. It is not clear why this was increased to 4 metres in the subsequent planning application and this was not amended in the drawings. If the Commission are minded to grant permission for this development, revised drawings showing a vehicular entrance of maximum 3 metre width should be submitted to the planning authority by way of a pre-commencement condition to ensure the proposal does not cause a traffic safety hazard.

- 8.14 On balance, and noting the provisions of Section 8.5.7 and Policy SMT25 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and Sections 4.1 and 4.3 of Appendix 5 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, it is considered that the removal of 1 or 2 on-street parking in a residential location where demand for same is not strong, is in keeping with the pattern of development of the area, does not injury the visual amenity of the area, is in keeping with the appearance and character of the Conservation Area and is therefore acceptable. Furthermore, the proposal is consistent with the Z2 zoning objective and Policy BHA9 as it contributes positively to the character and distinctiveness of the Conservation Area and takes positive measures to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting.
- 8.15 Should the Board be minded to grant permission, the applicant should be required to liaise with the Roads Planning Department of Dublin City Council to minimise the extent of on-street car parking to be removed. Furthermore, a condition requiring the vehicular entrance to have a width no greater than 3 metres should be attached.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located

in an established residential area less than 1 km west of South Dublin Bay SAC & South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA.

- 9.2. The proposed development comprises the creation of off-street parking within the curtilage of the dwelling incorporating a new gate. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.3. 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 effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Nature of works
 - Location in an established residential area
 - Lack of connections to nearest European sites
- 9.4. 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 (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The subject site is located at 7 Ailesbury Park, Ballsbridge, Dublin 4 approximately 500 metres west of the Irish Sea.
- 10.2 The proposed development comprises the creation of off-street parking within the curtilage of the dwelling incorporating a new gate. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.3 I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent

deterioration. 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:

- Nature of works
- Location-distance from nearest water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections

10.4 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 permission be granted subject to conditions

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1 Having regard to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, the Z2 zoning objectives, the removal of and demand for on-street parking and the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the Z2 residential neighbourhood and Conservation Area, would not pose a risk to traffic safety and would comply with the provisions of the Development Plan. The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, 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. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall receive the written approval of the Planning Authority for the revised drawings showing a vehicular opening width not less than 2.5 metres and not greater than 3.0 metres.

Reason: In the interest of traffic safety

3. Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall liaise with the Transportation Department of Dublin City Council, with regards to the extent of on-street car parking that shall be removed by the proposed development.

Reason: In the interest of maximising the provision of on-street car parking available in 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.

Killian Harrington
Planning Inspector
18 November 2025

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-323573-25
Proposed Development Summary	The proposed development comprises the Creation of off-street parking within the curtilage of the dwelling incorporating a new gate
Development Address	7 Ailesbury Park, Ballsbridge Dublin 4
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX /OR LEAVE BLANK	
<p>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?</p> <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) 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
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.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
1. 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	
<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)	Class 10(b) of Part 2 (dwelling units) Proposed development of 2 no. residential units is substantially below the 500 dwelling unit threshold in Class 10(b)
2. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: 18 November 2025

