



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500194-DN

Development	Proposed new vehicular and pedestrian access gates with alterations to the existing boundary wall and pedestrian access gates and all associated site works.
Location	No. 50 Whitworth Road, Dublin 9, which also addresses Claude Road & the laneway to the rear, D09 K8H4
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB2870/25
Applicant(s)	Damien Garvey & David Cochrane
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Damien Garvey & David Cochrane
Observer(s)	John and Valerie Hammond

Louisa Crowley and Des Carberry
Patricia Brazil and Trevor Redmond
Marian and Donal Loftus

Date of Site Inspection

15th January 2026

Inspector

Paul Christy

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	5
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	6
3.1 Decision: Refuse	6
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	6
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	7
3.4. Third Party Observations	8
4.0 Planning History.....	8
4.1. Subject site.....	8
4.2. Wider Locality.....	8
5.0 Policy Context.....	9
5.1. Development Plan: Dublin City Development Plan, 2022-2028	9
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	10
6.0 EIA Screening.....	10
7.0 Water Framework Directive Screening	10
8.0 The Appeal	11
8.1. Grounds of Appeal	11
8.2. Planning Authority Response	13
8.3. Observations	13
9.0 Assessment	14
9.1. Overview	14

9.2. Proposed Loss of Existing On-Street Parking and Its Compatibility With
Development Plan policy 14

9.3. Other Matters 17

10.0 AA Screening 18

11.0 Recommendation 19

12.0 Reasons and Considerations 19

Appendix A – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject property is an end-of-terrace dwelling with a generous rear garden plot located in a predominantly residential area of Drumcondra in the north of the city. It is a corner plot with the front elevation facing onto Whitworth Road, which Road runs parallel with the adjacent Royal Canal Way and railway line. Claude Road runs along the (eastern) side of the plot. The eastern boundary of the plot is currently formed by a solid red brick wall along its entire length, save for a solid, lockable pedestrian gate (located approximately at the mid-point of the wall) and a roller shutter door (located at the extreme northern end next to the lane to the rear) providing access to what appears to be a shed/garage, or similar. There is a laneway to the rear of the property. A second roller shutter door providing access to what appears to be a second garage/shed structure opens onto the lane to the rear although the geometry (width) of the land would suggest that manoeuvring vehicles into and out of this structure would be difficult.
- 1.2. There are 'pay and display' parking bays on both sides of Claude Road, including along almost the entire eastern boundary of the subject property, save for short stretches in the vicinity of Whitworth Road and the junction of Claude Road and the lane to the rear of the subject property.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The central component of the proposed development is for the provision of a single off-street parking space to the rear of the existing dwelling. In order to achieve access to the space, it is proposed to construct a new sliding metal gate with a built-in pedestrian opening section along the eastern boundary of the property. This will be enabled by the removal of a 3m section of the existing boundary wall. Also included are modifications to the roadside kerb to allow for level vehicular access and blocking up of the existing pedestrian gateway. Finally, of note also is the final part of the public notices in which it is stated that '*this will result in the loss of one existing on-street parking space*'.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1 Decision: Refuse

3.1.1. There was one reason for refusal and this is set out below.

'The proposed new 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 (On-Street Parking), Section 8.5.7 (Car Parking) and Volume 2, Appendix 5, Section 4.1 (On-Street Parking) 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, and kerbside activity. 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 development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.'

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. [Planning Report]: One unsigned report dated 6th October, 2025 on file. The report includes the following elements of relevance to the refusal reason:

- Notes that a number of submissions '*strongly object*' to the loss of the existing on-street parking space on the basis that it would be contrary to Development Plan Policy, Appendix 5, Section 4.1 dealing with the loss of on-street parking spaces in residential areas (please refer to Section 8.3); Local surrounding residents highlight the current demand for on street parking and the further impact that one less on street parking space would have on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties;
- The development's compatibility with the relevant Zoning Objective Z1 ('To protect, provide and improve residential amenities') in the Development Plan;

- Noted from site inspection that the dwellings situated on Claude Road rely on on-street parking;
- The detailed comments of the City Council's 'Transportation Planning Division' (please refer to para. 3.2.2).

3.2.2. [Transportation Planning Division]: The Report advises of 'concerns' over the proposed removal of on-street parking space and includes the following detailed points:

- The informal parking area, located to the west of Claude Road, is approximately 31m in width and 2.4m depth, with the potential to accommodate 6 to 7 parallel car spaces. While it might be reasonable to assume 1 off street space could replace 1 on street space as the space required in the public road to accommodate a VE footpath dishing, the spaces are not clearly subdivided at this location and would likely reduce the on street car parking by more than one space.
- The principle of private vehicle entrances at this location would set an undesirable precedent for this area and negatively impact on the needs of residents, visitors, and kerbside activity.
- Notes that there is a live application for a new dwelling on the rear of this site which includes a vehicular entrance where there are existing garages to the rear. None of the houses along Claude Road, bar the subject site which has a garage off Claude Road, have in-curtilage car parking off Claude Road.
- Recommends refusal.

3.2.3. [Engineering Department – Drainage Division]: No objection, subject to standard conditions re the incorporation of sustainable drainage systems.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. [Transport Infrastructure Ireland]: Requests that the planning authority has regard to the provisions of official policy for development proposals as follows: proposals impacting national roads, to the DoECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads

Guidelines for Planning Authorities and relevant TII Publications and proposals impacting the existing light rail network, to TII's "Code of engineering practice for works on, near, or adjacent the Luas light rail system.

3.4. Third Party Observations

- 3.4.1. A total of 9 observations were submitted to the Planning Authority, eight from local residents and one from the 'Iona & District Residents' Association'. The issues raised in the submissions are generally as per those included in the observations submitted to the Commission. The issues raised, therefore, are addressed at Section 8.3.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Subject site

- 4.1.1. P.A. Ref. WEB2858/25 Demolition of rear outbuildings and construction of new dwelling, proposed new vehicular and pedestrian access gates off Claude Road, proposed new boundary wall. Request for Further Information (RFI) issued by Planning Authority on 30th September, 2025. RFI refers only to detailed house design issues¹.
- 4.1.2. P.A. Ref. WEB1411/17 Demolition of rear extension/chimney and construction of new side/rear extension, and increase in height of existing eastern boundary wall to Claude Road. 2017 Grant.

4.2. Wider Locality

- 4.2.1. P.A. Ref. 2821/18 (Similar corner site at corner of 60 Whitworth Road/Wigan Road) Provision of a new dwelling to rear of existing house, access for new house provided through revision of existing access to side of property, and provision of a new vehicular access and gate opening from Wigan Road to serve retained house. 2018 Grant. 2018 Grant. Condition 4 of the Permission required the permanent omission of the proposed 3.3m wide vehicular access gate opening onto Wigan Road to serve

¹ Position as of date of report drafting – 28th January 2026

the existing house. The Reason given was to protect the existing on street car parking in accordance with Policy MT14².

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan: Dublin City Development Plan, 2022-2028

- 5.1.1. Zoning: The subject site is within an area zoned as ‘Z1 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods’. The relevant objective as contained in Section 14.7.1 of the Development Plan is: *‘To protect, provide and improve residential amenities.’*
- 5.1.2. Policy SMT 25: 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.’*
- 5.1.3. Section 4.1 – ‘On-Street Parking, Appendix 5 – ‘Transport and Mobility: Technical Requirements, Volume 2 – ‘Appendices’: *‘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 will preserve available on-street parking, where appropriate. However, the space currently occupied by on-street parking may be needed in the future for strategic transportation 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.*
- 5.1.4. Policy S122; Sustainable Drainage Systems – *‘To require the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in all new developments, where appropriate, as set out in*

² Dublin City Development Plan, 2016-2022

the Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study (Vol 2: New Development)/ Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works...'

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.2.1. The site is located: 47m to the north of the Royal Canal Proposed Natural Heritage Area (Site Code 002103); 2.23km to the west of the North Dublin Bay Proposed Natural Heritage Area (Site Code 000206); and 2.47km to the west of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (Site Code 004024).

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (As Amended). 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 Water Framework Directive Screening

- 7.1. The subject site is located 47m to the north of the Royal Canal Main Line (Liffey and Dublin Bay) IE_09_AWB_RCMLE river and water bodies, and is over the Dublin ground water body IE_EA_G_008. The proposed development comprises a proposed new vehicular and pedestrian access gates with alterations to the existing boundary wall and pedestrian access gates and all associated site works within an established urban residential area. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 7.2. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & 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:

- the small scale nature of the works, notwithstanding the proximity of the site to the aforementioned river and canal water bodies.

7.3. Conclusion: 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.

8.0 The Appeal

8.1. Grounds of Appeal

8.1.1. One appeal was received from the Applicants. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The Planning Authority's interpretation of Policy SMT25 is incorrect and inconsistent with the stated intent of the Policy. The refusal cites Policy SMT25 as grounds for protecting on-street parking. This misrepresents the policy. The proposal '*directly advances*' the sustainability aims of the Policy by: facilitating EV charging on private property, supporting low-emission transport; and use of SuDS-compliant permeable surfaces.
- Contrary to a comment in the Transportation Planning Division report, there is existing in-curtilage parking on Claude Road (at No.1A). Previously, there was also in-curtilage parking at No.49A Whitworth Road.
- The proposed entrance width of 3m corresponds to a single parallel space. The Applicants already park in this location on-street, meaning there will be no net loss of available parking. On-street parking on Claude Road is not fully

utilised³. The proposal simply relocates one car from the street to off-street. It reduces overall demand and therefore improves efficiency.

- The entrance is designed fully in accordance with Development Plan standards. This includes a width of 3m and a sliding gate, not outward opening.
- No objections from TII or the Planning Authority's Drainage Division; no objection from the Council's Transportation Planning Division in terms of road safety.
- Re precedent concerns in refusal reason, each application must be considered on its own merits. The site is a corner plot with generous frontage. The proposal is compliant with Appendix 5 of the Development Plan, and is already visually open due to its side boundary facing Claude Road. Furthermore, off-street access has existed, or currently exists, at both 1A Claude Road and 49A Whitworth Road.
- The references to Wigan Road (P.A. Ref. 2821/18) in the submissions to the Planning Authority are not comparable. That decision involved multiple new entrances on a continuous terrace, whereas this corner plot has distinct geometry and full compliance with Appendix 5 of the Development Plan.
- The refusal's reliance on the 2018 decision at 60 Whitworth Road (P.A Ref. 2818/18) is misplaced. That case was assessed under Policy MT14 of the 2016-2022 Development Plan. Reliance on a decision determined under an outdated policy framework cannot reasonably justify refusal under the current Plan.
- The proposed parking space is compliant in terms of technical and safety considerations (sightlines, safety, drainage).
- The subject application and the concurrent application for an additional dwelling to the rear of the subject plot are entirely independent. There is

³ At this point the submission refers to the under-utilisation of Claude Road parking being 'shown in Appendices'. It is assumed that this is a reference to 5 photographs of Claude Road attached to the end of the Appeal statement and showing areas not taken up by parked cars.

already a garage and off-street space to the rear of the plot accessed off Claude Road. The proposed dwelling is to be a mews dwelling that would include its own dedicated parking space with EC charging capability. Access to that dedicated parking space is already accommodated within the existing garage entrance on Claude Road and would therefore not result in any loss of on-street parking on Claude Road.

8.2. Planning Authority Response

8.2.1. None received.

8.3. Observations

8.3.1. Four observations were received, all from residents in the locality. All of the observations express opposition to the proposed loss of the existing on-street parking space for reasons including that:

- It would be contrary to the statement contained in Section 4.1, Appendix 5 of the Development Plan⁴ *‘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. The site is in an area where the residents are largely reliant on on-street parking, but also has a demand for public parking for other uses in the area eg. Croke Park.*
- The Appellants’ contention that there will be a loss of 1 space may not be accurate, noting the comments contained in the Planning Authority’s Transportation Planning Division that *‘the spaces are not clearly sub-divided at this location and would likely reduce the on-street parking by more than one space’.*

⁴ Section 4.1 - On-Street Parking, Appendix 5 – Transport and Mobility: Technical Requirements, Volume 2 - Appendices

- The residents of 50 Whitworth Road (the subject site) and 1A Claude Road have both on-street and off-street parking. *'This results in multiple spaces being used by each dwelling, often simultaneously, resulting in low availability of parking for the remaining residents.'*
- The photographs submitted with the Appeal are selective in terms of the times and dates they were taken. They were taken during daytime and at mid-term, bank holidays and weekends – *'a time when many people leave the city in their cars'*.
- Local residents are often unable to secure a space in the evening after work, despite having a parking permit;
- Permit applications have been refused;
- A similar proposal was refused in the locality (Whitworth Road/Wigan Road); contrary to Development Plan policy.

9.0 Assessment

9.1. Overview

9.1.1. Having examined the application details, and all other documentation on file including 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 local policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issue in this appeal to be assessed is as follows:

- The proposed loss of existing on-street parking and its compatibility with Development Plan policy.

9.2. Proposed Loss of Existing On-Street Parking and Its Compatibility With Development Plan policy

9.2.1. In its single refusal reason, the Local Authority cited Policy SMT25 and Section 4.1, Appendix 5 respectively of the Development Plan, and took the position that the

proposed development would be contrary to these policy provisions. Those members of the public who made submission agree with this interpretation. In their Appeal, the Appellants contend that the Local Authority's interpretation of Policy SMT25 is incorrect and inconsistent with, and misrepresents the stated intent of, the policy. Further, the proposal 'directly advances' the sustainability aims of the Policy by: facilitating EV charging on private property, supporting low-emission transport; and use of SuDS-compliant permeable surfaces.

- 9.2.2. In my opinion, it is necessary to consider Policy SMT25 and Section 4.1, Appendix 5 collectively and 'in the round'.
- 9.2.3. The narrative contained in Section 8.5.7 provides context for the subsequent Policy SMT25. Like the Policy, the narrative also includes a strong emphasis on sustainable transportation with references to '*strategic improvements such as street greening initiatives, secure bicycle parking and improvements to footpaths and cycle lanes*'. In my opinion, the term '*strategic improvements*', is significant here. Whilst this term is not included in the Policy, its inclusion in the narrative is, nevertheless, an important factor when interpreting the Policy. In other words, it is reasonable to deduce that the core intention of Policy SMT25 is to facilitate the re-organisation and loss of spaces to serve strategic sustainable development targets. It follows that this policy does not, in my opinion, provide any support for the proposed development.
- 9.2.4. The Appellants contend that the proposed development is consistent with the aims of the policy by: facilitating EV charging on private property, supporting low-emission transport; and use of SuDS-compliant permeable surfaces. Whilst the development may incorporate these attributes, the incorporation of such elements for one parking space does not constitute a strategic sustainable development.
- 9.2.5. While Policy SMT25 may be open to interpretation, and I have provided my own interpretation in the preceding paragraph, the other provision referenced in the Local Authority's refusal reason, Section 4.1 – 'On-Street Parking, Appendix 5, is much clearer. Included in the policy is the following unambiguous statement: '*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. Comparing the proposed development against this policy, the development includes the removal of on-street parking space to facilitate the provision of a vehicular entrance to serve a single dwelling. It is in a predominantly residential area where the residents are largely reliant on on-street parking spaces. It can only be concluded, in my opinion, that the proposed development is contrary to this policy. I note the contrasting sets of photographs submitted by the Appellants on the one hand, and those who made observations on the other. The photographs of the Appellants showing significant availability of spaces, while the photographs submitted by the observers showing much heavier levels of parking. At the time of my inspection, ie.during the daytime, approximately two-thirds of the spaces were occupied. With reference again to the policy, in my opinion, it can only be concluded that residents are largely reliant on these on-street parking spaces.

- 9.2.6. The Appellants contend that there will be no net loss of parking spaces as the on-street space to be lost will be replaced by the proposed private space. However, the Local Authority's Transportation Division advise that: *'While it might be reasonable to assume 1 off street space could replace 1 on street space ... the spaces are not clearly subdivided at this location and would likely reduce the on street car parking by more than one space.'* Even if it could be indisputably established that only one space would be lost, the policy is for a presumption against the removal of on-street parking spaces to facilitate the provision of vehicular entrances to single dwellings and does not include any derogation for compensatory private, in-curtilage spaces.
- 9.2.7. In support of their application the Appellants also state that, contrary to a comment in the Local Authority Transportation Planning Division report, there is an existing in-curtilage space at No. 1A Claude Road and that previously there was also in-curtilage parking at No.49A Whitworth Road. This establishes a precedent for their proposal. In my opinion, these factors do not outweigh the currency of the policies of the existing Development Plan as discussed at the paras. above.
- 9.2.8. I note that the Appellants challenge the point raised in submissions to the Local Authority that a similar proposal was refused in the locality (Local Authority Ref.

2821/18 Whitworth Road/Wigan Road) as it was contrary to Development Plan policy. They do so on the basis that that case '*involved multiple new entrances on a continuous terrace, whereas this corner plot has distinct geometry and full compliance with Appendix 5 of the Development Plan*'. Having reviewed that case, the proposal would have resulted in one net additional entrance off the public road. The application was granted on the basis of an existing entrance being retained but subject also to a condition requiring the permanent omission of a proposed vehicular access onto Wigan Road to serve the existing dwelling. Having regard to the existing garage/shed at the rear of the subject property with access onto Claude Road, which garage/shed is 'protected' by double yellow lines, I do not agree with the Appellants' inference that the Whitworth Road/Wigan Road case and the subject case are materially different.

9.3. Other Matters

- 9.3.1. Local Authority Reliance on 2018 Decision: The Appellants state that the Local Authority relied on the 2018 decision at 60 Whitworth Road (P.A Ref. 2818/18) and that this is misplaced as that case was assessed under Policy MT14 of the 2016-2022 Development Plan. In response, I would simply note that the 2018 case is noted in Section 6.0 'Relevant and Recent Planning History' of the Planner's Report but is not referenced at all in the rationale for the recommendation included in the report.
- 9.3.2. Objective SMO3 – 'Public On-Street Accessible Parking Bays' and Section 8.5.7 of the Development Plan: In their submission, John and Valerie Hammond refer to these sections of the Development Plan and conclude that they '*clearly suggest a modal shift from private off-street parking to on-street controlled parking*' I do not agree with this interpretation. Objective SMO3 is '*To provide public on-street accessible parking bays where appropriate.*' The narrative in the preceding para. 8.5.4 clarifies that this Objective is intended to address '*the pertinent transport and access needs of people with mobility impairment and/or disabilities...*'. The narrative in para. 8.5.7 refers to limiting car parking at destinations based on a location's accessibility.

- 9.3.3. In para. 6 of their submission to the Local Authority, Marian and Donal Loftus state that the impact of the subject development needs to be considered in the context of the related application Local Authority Ref. WEB2858/25 (development of a 3-storey dwelling in the rear curtilage of the subject property). They do so by stating that Claude Road is zoned Z2, a Residential Conservation Area (RCA). However, the subject site, whilst adjacent to the RCA, is in fact outside of it and, in my opinion, the subject development will have no material impact on the character or appearance of the RCA.
- 9.3.4. At para. 7 of their submission, Marian and Donal Loftus make further reference to concerns around application WEB2858/25 and non-compliance with Section 15.15.2.2 of the Development Plan. These matters are outside the scope of the subject application under appeal, in my opinion.

10.0 AA Screening

- 10.1. I have considered the proposed new vehicular and pedestrian access gates with alterations to the existing boundary wall and pedestrian access gates and all associated site works at No. 50 Whitworth Road, Dublin 9, in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located 2.47km to the west of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (Site Code 004024). No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reasons for this conclusion are as follows:
- the nature of the works; and
 - the distance of the site from the nearest European site and the absence of any connections between the two.
- 10.2. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and

therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that permission for the development be refused for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Section 4.1 – ‘On-Street Parking, Appendix 5 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022- 2028 provides, inter alia, 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. The proposed development includes a proposal to remove existing on-street parking space to facilitate the provision of a vehicular entrance to a single dwelling in a predominantly residential area where residents are largely reliant on on-street car-parking spaces. 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 development would, therefore, be contrary to the aforementioned policy of the Dublin City Development Plan, 2022-2028 and would thereby be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

Paul Christy

Paul Christy

Planning Inspector

29th January 2026

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500194-DN
Proposed Development Summary	Proposed new vehicular and pedestrian access gates with alterations to the existing boundary wall and pedestrian access gates and all associated site works.
Development Address	No. 50 Whitworth Road, Dublin 9, which also addresses Claude Road & the laneway to the rear, D09 K8H4
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> <hr/> <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) 	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.</p>
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)?	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.</p> <p>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</p>	<p>State the Class here</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3</p>	

<p>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 2</u>, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p>
<p>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</p>	
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

PCA

Inspector: Paul Christy

Date: 29th January 2026