



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500004-DN

Development

New vehicular entrance.

Location

18 Main Street, Raheny, Dublin 5.

Planning Authority

Dublin City Council.

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

WEB2674/25

Applicant(s)

Michael Kyle.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse permission.

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant(s)

Michael Kyle.

Observer(s)

(1) Myriam Black

(2) Kevin & Claire McKeague / Terry &
Mary Wade.

Date of Site Inspection

25/11/25.

Inspector

Anthony Abbott King

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. No. 18 Main Street is a mid-terrace two-storey two bay house located in the centre of a terrace of similar houses. No. 18 Main Street has a front garden accessed from the street via a pedestrian gate from the public footpath.
- 1.2. No.18 Main Street is located in a terrace of 5 houses (no. 14-22). The houses in the terrace have intact front gardens with pedestrian access gates. A vehicular entrance located at the northern end of the terrace to the side of no.14 Main Street would appear to serve a mews type lane to the rear of the terrace.
- 1.3. There is a communal parking bay located in front of no.18 Main Street between the public carriageway and the footpath. There appear to be 8 number parking spaces within the communal bay accommodating perpendicular parking onto the public carriageway.
- 1.4. The terrace and associated communal parking bay are located to the north of the Watermill Road / Main Street junction in an area designated as a “slow zone”.
- 1.5. The site area is given as 0.015 hectares.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises a new vehicular entrance and ancillary site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Refuse permission

3.1.1. Reason for refusal:

The proposed vehicular entrance would result in the removal of on-street parking to facilitate a private vehicular entrance and car parking space, which is considered contrary to the relevant aims and objectives of the Planning Authority as set out under Policy SMT25 (On Street Parking), Section 8.5.7 (Car Parking) and Section 4.1 (On Street Parking) of Appendix 5 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 removal of on-street parking to facilitate private off-street parking would detract from the convenience of road users (of all types) and the residential amenity of surrounding properties, would be contrary to the above referenced policy and would set an undesirable precedent for other similar developments in the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The decision of the CEO of Dublin City Council reflects the recommendation of the planning case officer.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- The Road Transport Planning Division of the planning authority object to the proposed development and recommend a refusal of planning permission.

3.3. Third Party Observations

The planning authority received two submissions from the residents of no.14 Main Street and No. 16 Main Street, Raheny. The grounds of objection relate principally to the following matters:

- Loss of on-street public parking for residents, visitors and businesses in the vicinity. It is noted that the loss of spaces would impact on permit parking and would cause further capacity constraints during peak business hours and evenings;
- Adverse impact on the existing Watermill Road / Main Street junction in terms of increased congestion and road safety.
- Potential impact on drainage and floor resilience due to the removal of the front garden of no.18 Main Street resulting in an impermeable surface;
- Adverse impact on uniformity and cohesion of the intact boundary treatment and streetscape breaking the visual rhythm and diminishing the established character of the street.

- The precedent grant of planning permission cited (WEB1565/24) reflect different circumstances and the comparison is not applicable.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. The following planning history is relevant.

- Under Reg. Ref: WEB2678/25 planning permission was recently refused for a vehicular entrance and in-curtilage parking at no. 20 Main Street, Raheny.
- Under Reg. Ref. WEB1565/24 planning permission was granted for the widening of an existing pedestrian access to create a new vehicular access at no. 26, Station Road, Raheny.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The following policy objectives of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 are relevant.

- **Zoning**

The zoning objective is 'Z4'(Map C): '*key urban villages / urban villages*', which seeks '*to provide for and improve mixed services facilities*'.

The development is permissible under the zoning objective.

- **Sustainable Mobility and Transport**

Chapter 8 (Sustainable Movement and Transport) Section 8.5.7 (car parking) is relevant, which provides for strong car parking policy implementation in Dublin City. In the matter of on-street parking, Policy Objective SMT25 states:

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.

- **Vehicular Entrances and Front Garden Parking**

Appendix 5 (Transport and Mobility: Technical Requirements) Section 4.0 (Car Parking Standards) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 is relevant. including the following provisions:

Section 4.1 (On Street Parking) is relevant and *inter alia* states:

Public on-street parking is a necessary facility for shoppers and business premises and is necessary for the day-to-day functioning of the city. Dublin City Council preserve available on-street parking, where appropriate. However, the space currently occupied by on-street parking may be needed in the future for strategic transport projects or active travel infrastructure. 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 4.3 (Parking in Front Gardens), which *inter alia* states:

Panning 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 & Surfacing) is relevant and *inter alia* states:

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.

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

- The Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage 'The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Growth Guidelines for Planning Authorities', (15 January, 2024).

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. The proposed development is not within a class where EIA applies.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal, prepared by O'Neill Town Planning on behalf of the applicant, is summarised below:

- The appeal site accommodates a two-storey terraced house located on Main Street served by a 1m wide pedestrian entrance. There is a 2m footpath and an 8 space parking bay in front of the dwelling. The speed limit on Main street is 50 km / h while the ambient speed is close to 30 km.
- The appellant notes that Main Street has two distinct residential types: Residential terraces with very small front gardens on the west side of the street where car parking spaces would be feasible and would not destroy dwelling and boundary context; smaller houses close to the street on the east side of the street within insufficient space to create car paring space within the front curtilage.
- The front garden is approximately 9m long and 6m wide. The proposed in-curtilage car parking space will be 5.5m long and 2.5m wide. The residual garden will be landscaped. It is claimed that car parking can be inserted into the appeal site without creating significant changes to the boundaries or landscaping protecting visual amenities.

- The proposed car parking space would be consistent with Objective SMT27 (expansion of EV charging) of the development plan ensuring that the appellant can charge his car on site.
- The car parking space requirement in Zone 2 parking areas is one space per dwelling. The appellant solely requires one car parking space. The appellant proposes a maximum of one parking space with the remainder of the front garden being permanently retained in soft landscaping / planting.
- The proposed development is located within a “Key Urban Villages & Urban Villages” (formerly district centres) zoning objective. Residential is a permissible use under the area Objective 4 zoning. There is a clear obligation on an applicant when promoting a land use that is permitted, in this case a single-car parking space, to put forward a case why the proposed land use is compatible with the planning authority objective.
- It is claimed that the insertion of a narrow car parking space would not degrade the character of the streetscape. The proposed development would not have an adverse or disproportionate negative impact on Raheny Village having regard to the pattern of contextual residential development in the vicinity.
- The appellant claims that the reason for refusal of planning permission for a new vehicular entrance and off-street parking is not sustainable given the nature of development proposed and the precedents created by other similar developments in the immediate area.
- The appellant cites SMT25 (car parking in residential and mixed use areas), SMT27 (expansion of the EV charging network), SMTO19 (Elimination of ‘free’ on street parking), SMTO20 (control supply and price of public parking), SMTO21 (feasibility study of residential and non-residential car parking provision) and Appendix 5 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.
- The appeal cites a grant of planning permission to widen an existing pedestrian access to create a new vehicular access at no. 26, Station Road, Raheny Under Reg. Ref. WEB1565/24. It is claimed that this application is similar of the application under appeal. The precedent is highly relevant as both applications involve the following: the create of new off-street parking adjacent to a parking

bay; the safe and permissible use of the public footpath for vehicle access and; similar constraints as there is no parking to the rear.

- The appellant claims that following review of the documentation, including the reports of the transportation division and the planning department of the planning authority, the one important feature of the development to be highlighted is that the parking area to the front of the terrace is in private ownership. The proposed development will not involve the removal of public parking, as the parking area is privately owned.
- It is claimed that the on-street car parking spaces are private and as such are not controlled by the planning authority. Therefore, the inclusion of the lands to the front of the subject houses in the terrace (nos. 14-22 Main Street) cannot be deemed public car parking spaces but privately owned spaces for the sole use of the residents of the terrace.
- It is claimed that the grounds of appeal are sufficient to allow the Commission to overrule the planning authority decision to refuse planning permission. The appellant would accept a condition setting out the width, gate type and dished footpath. The appellant meeting all costs agreed with the "Area Engineer".
- The appellant includes the wording of a draft condition to be attached to a grant of planning permission restricting the width of the vehicular entrance to 3m.
- Finally, the appellant acknowledges that the appeal site would only be the second dwelling in the terrace with in-curtilage parking. However, the appellant believes that the other residents in the terrace would follow the example of the subject application. No. 20 Main Street has already applied but was refused planning permission. It is claimed that the front gardens of the dwellings in the terrace can accommodate one space per dwelling.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

- The planning authority consider that the decision to refuse planning permission for the proposed vehicular entrance outlined in the Planner's Report remains valid.

7.3. Observations

There are 2 number observations on file.

(1) Myriam Black, 20 Main Street, Raheny.

- The observer is a lifelong resident of the terrace of house (nos. 14-22 Main Street) and clarifies that the subject parking bay was from inception for the explicit use of four of the residential properties in the terrace.
- The residents did not mark out nor place signs to reserve parking spaces within the communal provision though it was advised that action could be taken. However, the parking situation has significantly changed over time and residents are now competing with outside commuters for free parking.
- There is paid parking spaces available in the immediate vicinity accommodating commuters and shoppers a short walk from the subject parking bay. However, the unmarked free parking spaces in the subject bay are attracting commuters, which is having a deleterious impact on residents.
- The planning authority imposed policies not relevant to the private nature of the subject parking bay in their decision to refuse planning permission for off-street parking.
- The observer supports the appellant's laudable desire to install an E.V. charging point in the neighbouring house, which is an exemplary thing to do. The alternative would involve constant supervision requiring the pipping of cables through the garden to the external parking bay via a wall charging unit.
- It is claimed that the removal of a car parking space from the communal bay doesn't have to threaten the residents at nos.14 and 16 Main Street, as they can delineate their private parking spaces once they have decided on a course of action.
- The existing communal parking bay can be used by longer vehicles that overhang the public carriageway especially at the Watermill Road junction causing a danger to traffic. The observer provides photographic evidence of vehicles overhanging the parking bay onto the carriageway.

- The use by large trucks especially on Saturday of the area with double yellow lines on the opposite side of the road to the parking bay obstructs the flow of traffic in the main street to single file and results in problematic manoeuvring in and out of the parking bay.
- It is claimed the removal of car parking off the street will result in an enhanced public domain respecting the residential character of this part of Main Street, which was formerly part of Watermill Road.
- The planning authority has received an application (ref: 2322/19) at 31 Main Street on the opposite side of the road to build three triple storied terrace houses with dedicated off-street parking. There will also be a second development phase which will not have dedicated parking putting further pressure on the on-street parking provision.

(2) Kevin & Claire McKeague / Terry & Mary Wade, residents 14 & 16 Main Street, Raheny.

- The observers fully support the planning authority's decision to refuse planning permission for a new proposed vehicular entrance at no.18 Main Street. The planning authority is correct in concluding that a change from public to private parking would be contrary to policy aims to manage on-street parking for the wider public benefit.
- The conversion of an existing on-street parking space to a private driveway would remove valuable shared parking for residents, visitors and customers of nearby shops and services. The applicant's submission does not clarify the number of potential on-street spaces to be removed.
- The subject terrace (nos. 14-22 Main Street) maintains a consistent building line and boundary treatment that contribute to the visual character of Raheny Village. The introduction of a single-driveway at no.18 Main Street, into the middle of the terrace and communal parking bay, would disrupt the uniformity of the terrace and would have a negative visual impact.
- The introduction of a single-driveway into the middle of the parking bay would both functionally and visually confuse drivers with cars parked on either side of the new entrance. The proposed development would set a precedent for further

similar development leading to the gradual erosion of the streetscape and loss of established character.

- The appellant cites no. 26 Station Road, Raheny, as a precedent. The observer notes that while Station Road and Main Street share some design characteristics they function very differently. Main Street carries a steady flow of through traffic and provides on-street parking for 20 local businesses, cafes and services. It is claimed comparisons with quieter residential streets of lower parking demand are neither appropriate nor reasonable in this context.
- In the matter of EV charging, it is claimed that extendable arm EV charging units enable residents to safely charge their vehicles from within their boundary without crossing public footpath or creating a private driveway (illustrations provided).
- The observers resident at no. 14 and no.16 Main Street express satisfaction with the extent and operation of the existing communal parking bay. They concerned that the reduction or removal of the bay would make vehicular access proximate to their properties more difficult.
- The residents of no.16 Main Street are both retired and have lived at the address for over 50 years. They were involved in the establishment of the existing communal parking bay, which it is claimed continues to serve the community effectively including residents, visitors (including carers) and businesses.
- It is claimed creating additional vehicular access points, in particular in the middle of the parking bay, would increase conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles, given the that the receiving environment is a busy local road with regular pedestrian movement, creating unnecessary safety risks.
- It is claimed a positive recommendation would result in a proliferation of individual driveways, which would cumulatively remove multiple parking spaces and would have a significant adverse impact on parking availability, residential amenity and the visual cohesion of the Village.
- Finally, the observers note that the proposed development is inconsistent with development plan policy including Policy SMT25 (Section 8.5.7) and Appendix

5 (Sections 4.1 & 4.3), which seeks to manage and retain on-street parking for residents, visitors, businesses. The observers also cite general objectives to protect residential amenity, promote sustainable transport and maintain the character of established streetscapes.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. I have examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant planning policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Zoning / principle of development
- Compliance with Appendix 5
- Policy SMT25
- EV Charging
- Potential impact on streetscape

Principal of Development

8.2. The site is zoned Z4 (Key Urban Villages / Urban Villages) in the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, which seeks '*to provide for and improve mixed services facilities*' Residential is a permissible land use under the Z4 zoning objective.

8.3. The proposal to create a vehicular entrance and provide off-street car parking is acceptable in principle subject to the overall policies and objectives of the development plan.

Compliance with Appendix 5

8.4. Appendix 5 (Transport and Mobility: Technical Requirements), Section 4.0 (Car Parking Standards) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 provides guidelines for the development of off-street parking.

8.5. The applicant proposes to retain the existing pedestrian entrance and to remove the boundary wall between the pedestrian entrance and the western boundary (a new pier

would separate the new opening from the shared property boundary with no. 20 Main Street) in order to create a 3.4m wide vehicular entrance. The in-curtilage parking bay would be located centrally within the existing front garden, which would in part be hard surfaced and landscaped at the margins.

- 8.6. I note the proposed elevation drawing does not show a gate to the new vehicular entrance – Drg. 2500-P-101.
- 8.7. The applicant in the covering letter accompanying the application clarifies that he seeks to provide essential off-street parking. The appellant statement clarifies that the existing on-street parking arrangement is unsatisfactory.
- 8.8. The Transport Planning Division of the planning authority note the dimensions of the existing front garden having a width of 5.9m and a length of 8.8m along the eastern boundary and a length of 7.6m along the western boundary.
- 8.9. I consider that the dimensions of the proposed in-curtilage car-parking space (3m x 5m) would be consistent with development plan guidance.
- 8.10. The Transport Division note that the width of the proposed vehicular access (3.4m) would exceed the maximum width requirement (3.0m) of the development plan.
- 8.11. Appendix 5, Section 1.5 (Dimension & Surfacing) *inter alia* requires the vehicular opening a single residential dwelling be at least 2.5 metres or at most 3 metres in width and shall not have outward opening gates.
- 8.12. I consider that the proposed vehicular opening would be inconsistent with Section 1.5 of Appendix 5. This matter could be dealt with by way of condition if a positive recommendation is to be recorded.
- 8.13. The Transport Planning Division consider that the principle of a new vehicular entrance is not acceptable at this location having regard to the characteristics of the area, including the width of the road carriageway and the number of houses in the terrace with intact front gardens that are served by the existing communal parking bay in front of the appeal site.
- 8.14. It is acknowledged that a grant of permission would result in the removal of on-street parking. The area in front of the terrace of houses, including the area in front of the appeal site, located between the footpath and the carriageway, accommodates a

communal parking bay. One of the observers notes that the communal bay was negotiated a number of years ago for the use of residents, visitors and other users.

- 8.15. This area is not taken in charge by Dublin City Council. The Transport Division notes that the bay has a dimension 20m in width and 4m in dept and that it can accommodate 7 perpendicular informal parking spaces. I note on the day of my site visit that there were 8 perpendicularly parked cars in the bay.
- 8.16. The Transport Division report clarifies that in order to facilitate the new vehicular entrance and in-curtilage car parking at no.18 Main Street, more than one on-street car parking space would have to be removed. The Division note that any new entrance would incrementally reduce the availability of on-street car parking spaces.
- 8.17. The Transportation Division reports that the intervention to the footpath to accommodate footpath dishing (approximately 4.6m for a 3.0m vehicular entrance) would require the communal on-street parking bay to be altered to remove more than one existing car parking space.
- 8.18. Finally, the Transportation Division report that the Division would have serious concern with the principle of private vehicle entrances at this location. The proposed development would set an undesirable precedent for the area and negatively impact on the needs of residents, visitors, businesses, kerbside activity, and accessible parking requirements along Main Street and the wider area of Raheny Village.
- 8.19. The Transportation Division recommend refusal of planning permission. I concur with the recommendation of the Transportation Planning Division in my assessment as detailed below.
- 8.20. Appendix 5, Section 4.1 (On Street Parking) States 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.
- 8.21. I consider there is an identified need for on-street parking for residents and other users at this location on Main Street.
- 8.22. I note that the residents of the terrace (nos. 14-20 Main Street) are reliant on the on-street parking provision located immediate to their houses within the subject

communal parking bay. One of the observers notes that the communal parking bay from its inception was for the explicit use of the four residents of 14-20 Main Street.

- 8.23. Furthermore, it is claimed that the introduction of a single-driveway into the middle of the parking bay would both functionally and visually confuse drivers with cars parked on either side of the new entrance.
- 8.24. No. 20 Main Street applied for permission for a vehicular entrance and in-curtilage car parking, which was refused by the planning authority on the 05/09/2025, as the proposed development would remove an on-street parking space to facilitate a private vehicular entrance.
- 8.25. The logic in converting the existing on-street car parking provision to a private provision by facilitating a dedicated car parking space per dwelling unit in the front garden of nos.14-20 Main Street would result in a net loss of 3 car parking spaces (Transport Division indicates that the capacity of the existing communal car parking bay is 7 perpendicularly parked cars).
- 8.26. I consider that the proposed creation of a vehicular entrance to no.18 Main Street would result in the loss of one or more existing communal on-street parking spaces, used by the residents of the terrace (nos.14-20 Main Street) and by other users, and would set a precedent for the loss of further on-street parking accommodated by the communal bay resulting in a net decrease in car parking provision in the immediate vicinity.

Policy SMT25

- 8.27. Section 8.5.7 (car parking), Policy SMT25 *inter alia* provides for the management of on-street car parking to serve the needs of the city alongside the needs of residents, visitors, businesses, kerbside activity and accessible parking requirements.
- 8.28. Furthermore, the policy provides for the management of on-street parking 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
- 8.29. The Transport Division of the planning authority expresses serious concern at the principle of private vehicular parking at this location given the negative adverse impact

of the proposed development itself and the undesirable precedent it would set for similar development to reduce on-street parking.

- 8.30. The appellant claims that the area accommodating the parking area to the front of the terrace is in private ownership. Therefore the subject spaces do not constitute a public parking provision rather they are privately owned parking spaces for the exclusive use of the residents of the terrace.
- 8.31. I note the distinction of car parking provided on public land and private land. However, the 7 number car parking spaces are publicly accessible to all users, including the residents of the terrace. I further note that the residents of nos. 16 & 18 Main Street are happy with this arrangement.
- 8.32. I consider that the proposed development would result in the removal of publicly accessible on street parking that serves the residents of the terrace and other users, including visitors and other businesses within this commercial zone.
- 8.33. I conclude that the proposed development would be inconsistent with Section 8.5.7 (Car Parking), Section 4.1 (On-Street Parking) and Policy SMT25 (On-Street Parking) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.

No. 26 Station Road

- 8.34. The appellant cites a grant of planning permission in August 2024 to widen an existing pedestrian access to create a new vehicular access at no. 26, Station Road, Raheny Under Reg. Ref. WEB1565/24. It is claimed the precedent is 'highly relevant'.
- 8.35. I note that there is no precedent per se applied in a planning assessment rather a development proposal is assessed on its own merits.
- 8.36. I note that the appellant states that both no.18 Mian Street and No. 26 Station Road do not enjoy rear access and that both properties are dependent on on-street parking.
- 8.37. I have reviewed the planning application for off-street parking at no. 26 Station Road, Raheny granted under Reg. Ref. WEB1565/24. I note the Roads Planning Division of the planning authority had no objection to the development following modification by further information response.

8.38. The planning report *inter alia* states that this dwelling (26 Station Road) is the only property in the terrace which does not already have a vehicular entrance and it is considered equitable and appropriate that the proposed development be approved.

8.39. I consider that the receiving contexts are not similar in terms of location, streetscape character and public parking requirement.

8.40. One of the observations highlights that Main Street carries a steady flow of through traffic and provides on-street parking for 20 local businesses, cafes and services. I note that Main Street is located within a “Slow Zone”, which indicates a 30 km/h speed limit.

8.41. The zoning applicable to the subject terrace on Main Street is Z4 objective ‘key urban villages / urban villages’, which seeks to provide for and improve mixed services facilities. I consider that the provision of on-street publicly accessible car parking aligns with the broader commercial zoning objective.

8.42. The houses on Station Road are within a residential zone designated with a Z1 objective. The location of the proposed development within an ‘urban village’ prioritising commercial activities within a designated commercial zone is not comparable to Station Road located within a residential zone where commercial considerations are secondary to residential uses(s).

8.43. I note that the streetscape on Station Road is characterised by vehicular entrances and off-street parking provision – please see photographic record. The majority of houses on the west side of Station Road have vehicular entrances and in-curtailage parking.

8.44. In contrast the streetscape on Main Street in the location of the subject terrace (nos. 14-22) is characterised by a low boundary wall punctuated by pedestrian access gates to the individual landscaped front gardens of the houses in the terrace.

8.45. I note that there is a vehicular entrance located to the side of no.14 Main Street at the northern extremity of the terrace, which appears to serve a rear laneway behind the subject terrace of houses. I consider that the vehicular entrance at the end of terrace does not disturb the rhythm of the dominant intact boundary treatment to Main Street.

8.46. I consider that the receiving environment on Station Road is distinct in context from the village centre location on Main Street. I conclude there is a material difference in

the context at no. 26 Station Road from that pertaining at no. 18 Main Street where supporting criteria for off-street parking is largely absent.

Potential adverse impact on the streetscape

- 8.47. The appellant claims that the insertion of a narrow car parking space would not degrade the character of the streetscape. It is claimed that the proposed development would not have an adverse or disproportionate negative impact on Raheny Village having regard to the pattern of contextual residential development in the vicinity.
- 8.48. One of the observations claims that the proposed development would set a precedent for further similar development leading to the gradual erosion of the streetscape and loss of established character.
- 8.49. The terrace (nos. 14-22 Main Street) is setback from the public street exhibiting landscaped front gardens between the front building line and the property boundary with the public footpath. The existing boundary treatment to Main Street as previously highlighted is characterised by a low boundary wall punctuated by pedestrian access gates.
- 8.50. I note that the development does not include a vehicular gate to the proposed opening, which would present as a gap in the existing boundary wall between a new pier and the existing pedestrian entrance. The existing vehicular access to the rear laneway at the northern end of the terrace to the side of no.14 Main Street is furnished with a double gate providing boundary enclosure.
- 8.51. In summary, the appellant proposes an extensive opening in the existing boundary (3.4m), at a mid-terrace location requiring in-part the hard surfacing of the existing landscaped front garden.
- 8.52. I consider that the removal of the front boundary wall between the shared western property boundary with no. 20 Main Street creating a 3.4m entrance in the intact boundary treatment, between the existing pedestrian gate and a pier inserted between the western boundary and the vehicular opening, would represent a significant intervention in the streetscape.
- 8.53. I conclude that the proposed development to introduce a vehicular entrance and in-curtilage parking would by itself and by reason of the undesirable precedent it would set for the erosion of the existing intact boundary treatment, which comprises

pedestrian access gates (0.9m) to landscaped front gardens punctuating by a low boundary wall (nos. 14-22 Main Street), would depreciate the visual and residential amenities of properties in the vicinity.

EV Charging

- 8.54. The applicant in the covering letter (submitted 16/07/2025) accompanying the application clarifies that he seeks to provide essential off-street parking to accommodate charging of an electric vehicle. The appeal cites Policy SMT27, which supports the expansion of the EV charging network by increasing the provision of designated charging facilities for electric vehicles.
- 8.55. I note the bona fides of the applicant in the provision of a dedicated EV charging bay. However, I do not consider that the provision of a dedicated EV charging point would warrant a grant of planning permission given the adverse impact of the development on the existing on-street parking provision, the visual disruption to the streetscape and the availability of alternative options for the appellant to charge his car.

9.0 AA Screening

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 within an established suburban area and is connected to piped services and is not immediate to a European Site. The proposed development comprises a vehicular entrance to an existing building.

No significant 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 effect on a European Site given the small-scale nature of the development.

I conclude 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 site is located in a mature city location. The site is immediate to a visible watercourse (Santry River).

The proposed development comprises the refurbishment of an existing building.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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 the small scale and nature of the development.

10.2. I conclude based on objective information, the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration of 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 a refusal of planning permission for the reasons and considerations outlined below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Z4 zoning objective, which seeks to provide for and improve mixed services facilities, the pattern of development in the area, which is characterised by front landscaped gardens with intact boundary treatment, and the

policy framework provided by the Dublin City Development plan 2022-2028, it is considered that the certation of a vehicular entrance and off-street parking in the front garden of no.18 Main Street, by reason of the proposed development itself and the undesirable precedent it would set for the other houses in the terrace (nos.16-22 Main Street), would result in the removal of one or more on-street parking spaces located within a communal parking bay serving the residents of no. 14-22 Main Street and other users, inconsistent with Section 8.5.7 (Car Parking), Policy SMT25 (On-Street Parking) and Appendix 5 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, would depreciate the visual and residential amenities of property in the vicinity and, as such, would be inconsistent with 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.



Anthony Abbott King
Planning Inspector

02 December 2025

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500004-DN
Proposed Development Summary	Vehicular entrance
Development Address	18 Main Street, Raheny, Dublin 5
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 Q.2 <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<p>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</p>	
<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 N/A
<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 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?

<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 N/A
<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 N/A

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)?

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: A. M. H. J. Date: 02/12/25