



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500356-DR-25

Development	Widening of vehicular entrance with associated works.
Location	10, Carysfort Woods, Blackrock, Co. Dublin, A94XR24.
Planning Authority	Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown Co. Co.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D25A/0696/WEB.
Applicant(s)	Des Dockery & Laura Chambers.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Des Dockery & Laura Chambers.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	20 th January 2026.
Inspector	Des Johnson

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located in an established residential estate with access from, and to the east of, Carysfort Avenue, Blackrock.
- 1.2. No. 10 is a two-storey detached dwelling. It has a partly paved area to the front, which currently accommodates two off-street car parking spaces – one at right angles to the front of the dwelling and one on the driveway at right angles to the public road.
- 1.3. Nos 2-9 Carysfort Woods to the east have widened vehicular accesses with off-street parking for 2 cars. Nos 11 and 12 adjoining to the west have narrower entrances with one car parking space each.
- 1.4. There is a footpath and grass verge to the front. There is a large deciduous tree in the grass verge.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal is for the widening of the front vehicular entrance to 6.5m and associated alterations to the pier and increased driveway area, all with associated site, landscaping and drainage works.
- 2.2. The gross floor area of development on the site is stated to be 159.10sqm, and the site area is 0.030ha.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority decided to refuse permission for 1 reason. The reason in summary states that the widening of the entrance to 6.5m would contravene Development Plan standards. SPPR 3 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements seeks to limit car parking provision in proximity to high-capacity public transport. The proposed development would facilitate additional parking, undermining the principles of sustainable transport and compact urban growth. The proposal is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The Planning report states that the development is permissible in principle under the zoning for the area subject to being compatible with other policies and objectives for the zone, and not have undesirable effects. The application refers to other precedents in the area, but there is no evidence that these have planning permission. The site is within an accessible area, defined under SPPR 3 – Car Parking of the Compact Settlement Guidelines 2024, being within 1 km of a high-capacity public transport stop. The Guidelines permit a maximum of 1.5 spaces vehicular parking spaces in such areas. As such, the planning authority would not encourage the widening of entrances to accommodate additional vehicles. Section 12.4.8.1 of the Plan stipulates a maximum driveway width of 3.5 metres, and the proposal exceeds that standard. The planning authority recommends refusal.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage – no objection subject to condition relating to hardstanding.
- Transport Planning – no objection subject to conditions including restricting the entrance to a maximum width of 3.5m, minimum of one third of the front garden to be maintained in grass or landscaped, and prevention of mud, dirt etc.

3.3. Third Party Observations

None.

4.0 Planning History

D25B/0494/WEB – permission granted for development consisting of (1) construction of a 1st Floor extension to front/side over existing study (2) all associated site, landscaping and drainage works at 10, Carysfort Woods.

Adjacent properties – no planning history.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The Dun-Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022-2028 is the statutory Plan for the area.

The site is zoned 'A' with the objective *to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities.*

Section 12.4.8 refers to Vehicular Entrances and Hardstanding Areas.

Section 12.4.8.1 refers to General Specifications. For new entrances for a single residential dwelling, the maximum width of an entrance is 3.5m.

Section 12.4.8.3 refers to Driveways/Hardstanding Areas. It states that a minimum of one third of front garden areas should be maintained in grass or landscaped in the interest of urban greening and SUDS.

5.2. Ministerial Guidelines

Compact Settlement Guidelines 2024 are made under Section 28 of the Planning & Development Act 2000, as amended. Planning Authorities and An Coimisiún Pleanála are required to have regard to the Guidelines and apply any specific planning policy requirements in the carrying out of their functions.

SPPR 3 relates to Car Parking.

It is a specific planning policy requirement of these Guidelines that, in accessible locations, defined in Chapter 3 (Table 3.8) car- parking provision should be substantially reduced. The maximum rate of car parking provision for residential development, where such provision is justified to the satisfaction of the planning authority, shall be 1.5 no. spaces per dwelling.

Table 3.8: refers to Accessibility. A High Capacity Public Transport Node or Interchange are listed as 'Lands within 1,000 metres (1km) walking distance of an existing or planned high capacity urban public transport node or interchange, namely an interchange or node that includes DART, high frequency Commuter Rail¹¹, light rail or MetroLink services; or locations within 500 metres walking distance of an existing or planned BusConnects 'Core Bus Corridor'¹² stop'.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

South Dublin Bay & River Tolka Estuary SPA & pNHA – c. 1.85km to the north east

South Dublin Bay SAC – c. 1.8km to the north east

Dalkey Island SPA & pNHA – c. 6km to the south east.

6.0 EIA Screening

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

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

These may be summarised as follows:

- Similar works have been carried out at 2-9, Carysfort Woods (inclusive).
- The requirement for the development comes from the need for improved vehicular access safety, design continuity with neighbours, and ease of use of the driveway. Then development will allow for off-street charging of both the 1st Party cars.
- Section 12.4.8.1 of the Development Plan states that “vehicle entrances shall be designed, but due to entrance width, to avoid traffic hazard for pedestrians and passing traffic”. The maximum width of an entrance is stated to be 3.5m in general. This is not a new entrance and there is no proposal to increase the area of hardstanding, save to align with the widened entrance. The driveway is already paved to provide for 2 cars but due to the entrance width the first car prevents ingress/egress of the second car. This leads to increased traffic movements and creates a blockage on the estate road. The grounds of appeal include a series of photographs of Carysfort Woods entrances.
- The existing kerbside/grass verge outside No.10 is not sufficient to facilitate a parallel parked car without obstructing the entrance to No.9 or No.10.
- EV charging is not possible for a car parked at the kerbside.
- The planning authority has wrongly applied SPPR 3. Two off-street car spaces already exist. No additional parking is proposed or being provided.
- Should the Coimisiún decide that permission could be granted for a lesser width, this should be by a conditioned permission.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

It is considered that the grounds of appeal do not raise any new matter which would justify a change of attitude by the planning authority.

7.3. **Observations**

None relating to appeal.

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. The proposal is for the widening of the front vehicular entrance to 6.5m and associated alterations to the pier and increased driveway area, all with associated site, landscaping and drainage works. The site area is 0.030ha.

8.2. The Planning Authority refused permission for reason that the widening of the entrance to 6.5m would contravene Development Plan standards. SPPR 3 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements seeks to limit car parking provision in proximity to high-capacity public transport. The proposed development would facilitate additional parking, undermining the principles of sustainable transport and compact urban growth. The proposal is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

8.3. I submit that the key issues to be addressed are as follows:

- Policy
- Reason for refusal
- Other issues
- Appropriate Assessment

Policy

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

Reason for refusal

8.5. The reason for refusal states that the widening of the entrance would contravene Development Plan standards, and SPPR 3 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines. It would facilitate additional

parking thereby undermining the principles of sustainable transport and compact urban growth.

- 8.6. The grounds of appeal contend that similar works have been carried out at Nos 2-9 Carysfort Woods and this is the case on the ground. However, there is no record of planning permissions for these widenings which facilitate additional off-street car parking spaces. The adjoining houses to the west, Nos 11 and 12 do not have widened vehicular accesses.
- 8.7. The appellant states that this is not a new entrance, there is no proposal to increase the area of hardstanding, save to align with the proposed widened entrance, and that there would no increase in off-street car parking provision. I observe that this is not a new entrance, that the proposed layout would leave one third of the front garden area unpaved, and that there is already hardstanding at right angles to the driveway which can accommodate a second vehicle. The proposed development would allow for the movement of two cars in and out of the site. At present, a car in the driveway would obstruct the second car from entering the site. I note that the Planning Authority's Transportation Planning Section did not raise public safety as an issue.
- 8.8. It is a specific planning policy requirement of the Compact Settlement Guidelines that in accessible locations, defined in Chapter 3 (Table 3.8) car- parking provision should be substantially reduced. This is an accessible location as defined in the Guidelines, being within 1000m walking distance of an existing high-capacity public transport node or interchange. These Guidelines are made under Section 28 of the Planning Act and the Planning Authority and the Board must have regard to them in carrying out their functions. While there exists sufficient hardstanding area to accommodate a second car, there is no information on file to indicate that authorisation was ever given for this or the provision of two car parking places on-site. The Guidelines permit a maximum of 1.5 spaces vehicular parking spaces in such accessible locations. On balance, I submit that the proposed development is not consistent with the Guidelines and should be refused.

Other issues

- 8.9. The appellant contends that the existing kerbside/grass verge outside No.10 is insufficient to facilitate a parallel parked car without obstructing the entrance to Nos.9 or 10. I do not agree and consider that there is sufficient space for a car to park kerbside.

- 8.10. The appellant contends that EV charging is not possible for a car parked at the kerbside. I submit that EV charging is possible on-site.
- 8.11. The existence of the existing large deciduous kerbside tree is not addressed in the planning report. I note that the tree is not shown on drawings submitted. I consider that, in the event of the footpath being dishd to facilitate the entrance as proposed, the impact on this tree should be addressed. In the event of the Board deciding to grant permission, a reduction requiring a maximum width of 5.5m could accommodate the likely retention of this tree.

9.0 **AA Screening**

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

10.0 **Water Framework Directive**

- 10.1. The subject site is located in an established residential area. The proposed development relates to the widening of a vehicular access and associated works. No water deterioration concerns are raised in the appeal. I have assessed the development in the context of the objectives of the Water Framework Directive. Having regard to the nature, and location of the development, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment as there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

11.0 **Recommendation**

- 11.1. I recommend that planning permission be refused.

12.0 **Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to the location of the site which is accessible to high-capacity public transport, it is considered that the proposal to widen the existing vehicular access to 6.5m to facilitate ease of movement for a second car on the site, would be contrary

to SPPR 3 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines, which seeks to substantially reduce car parking provision in accessible locations, and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Note: Should the Board decide that permission may be granted as there would be no increase in the on-site car parking provision, I recommend a condition requiring a reduction in the width of the proposed vehicular entrance to a maximum of 5.5m, and a consequent reduction in the dishing of the public footpath and on-site hardstanding 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.

Des Johnson
Planning Inspector

22nd January 2026

Form 1
EIA Pre-Screening

An Coimisiún Pleanála	PL-500356-DR-25		
Case Reference			
Proposed Development Summary	Widened vehicular access and associated works.		
Development Address	10, Carysfort Woods, Blackrock, Co. Dublin, A94XR24.		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		YES	Yes
		No	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?			
No	No		
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
N/A			
N/A			
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
N/A			
5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?			
No			

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

