



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

**PL-500557-DS-26**

---

<b>Development</b>	The development will consist of a new vehicular entrance and off street parking within the existing front garden. Works to include part removal of front boundary wall, and all associated site works
<b>Location</b>	27 Irishtown Road, Dublin 4
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Dublin City Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	WEB5335/25
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Peter O'Boyle and Caroline Brady
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Refuse permission
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Peter O'Boyle and Caroline Brady
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None

**Date of Site Inspection**

15 February 2026

**Inspector**

Killian Harrington

## Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description .....	4
2.0	Proposed Development .....	4
3.0	Planning Authority Decision.....	4
4.0	Planning History .....	6
5.0	Policy Context .....	6
6.0	EIA Screening .....	9
7.0	The Appeal .....	9
8.0	Assessment.....	10
9.0	AA Screening .....	12
10.0	Water Framework Directive .....	12
11.0	Recommendation .....	13
12.0	Reasons and Considerations .....	14
	<b>Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening .....</b>	<b>15</b>

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

1.1 The subject site consists of a single-storey dwelling at no. 27 Irishtown Road, Dublin 4. The property forms part of a northeast-facing terrace of cottages on Irishtown Road and is adjoined by no. 183 Oliver Plunkett Avenue and no. 25 Irishtown Road. The front curtilage comprises of hard landscaping with the front boundary defined by a pebble dash concrete wall, with pillars and pedestrian access. The property has been extended to the rear and retains a small rear yard space. To the roadside, on the footpath there is a street tree adjoining no.25. There is parking on the carriageway to the front of the site and to the side of no.183 Oliver Plunkett Avenue, where there is an area of hard landscaping which extends from the building line. The other properties in this terrace have similar boundary treatment and front gardens.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

2.1 The existing front garden area has an overall depth of between 4.46m and 5.27m, with an approximate width of 6.33m. The proposed development comprises a new vehicular entrance (2.8m wide and a varying depth of between 4.4m at northern end and 5.2m at southern end) and off-street parking within the existing front garden of the property. Works to include part removal of front boundary wall, and all associated site works. A new separate pedestrian gate is proposed within the side boundary of the wall.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1 Decision**

Dublin City Council refused planning permission for the following reason:

The parking area depth is substandard and would endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard and obstruction of pedestrians and would be contrary to Section 4.3.1, Appendix 5 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, which aims to ensure that vehicular entrances are designed to avoid creation of a traffic

hazard and adequate car parking space is provided to accommodate a car safely without overhanging the public footpath. The development would therefore set an undesirable precedent for similar type development and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

#### 3.1.1. Planning Authority Reports

The report notes that the proposed modifications are, in principle, considered to be in line with the Z1 zoning objective of the site. However, the proposed design of the vehicular entrance would fall short of the relevant standards set out in Appendix 5 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and is therefore contrary to the Development Plan. Accordingly, permission should be refused.

#### 3.1.2 Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Division – no objection subject to conditions
- Transportation Planning Division - recommended that permission be refused, stating the following:

*'The proposed car space (according to dwg. No 643/02) is contrary to the required 3 by 5 metres minimum, as set out in Appendix 5 of the Development Plan. A full 3 x 5 m area around the car cannot be achieved, even at an alternative angle. The inadequate space provided can lead to parked vehicles overhanging the public footpath and obstruction/conflict with pedestrian using the footpath.'*

#### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No reports received

#### 3.4. Third Party Observations

None

## **4.0 Planning History**

### **4.1 Subject site**

Reg. Ref 2117/16 –Planning permission granted for the construction of a one-bedroom, single storey house at the rear of 27 Irishtown Road, Dublin 4. The proposal subdivides the existing back garden to leave a smaller back garden for the existing house and a garden for the proposed house. The proposed house to be accessed from laneway to the rear of the site with provision for car parking. Part of the existing extension to the existing house to be demolished

## **5.0 Policy Context**

### **5.1 Development Plan**

Under the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 the site is zoned objective Zone Z1 ‘Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods’ with the aim ‘to protect, provide and improve residential amenities.’ The following Dublin City Development Plan policy objectives have specific relevance to this appeal:

#### Section 8.5.7 Car Parking

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

#### Policy SMT25 (On-Street Parking)

To manage on-street car parking to serve the needs of the city alongside the needs of residents, visitors, businesses, kerbside activity and accessible parking requirements, and to facilitate the re-organisation and loss of spaces to serve sustainable development targets such as in relation to, sustainable transport

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

## Appendix 5 Transport and Mobility – Technical Requirements

### *Section 4.1 On Street Parking*

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

### *Section 4.2 Accessible Car Parking*

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

### *Section 4.3 Parking in Front Gardens*

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

#### *Section 4.3.1 Dimensions and Surfacing*

For a single residential dwelling, the vehicular opening proposed shall be at least 2.5 metres or at most 3 metres in width and shall not have outward opening gates. Where a shared entrance for two residential dwellings is proposed, this width may increase to a maximum of 4 metres. Detailed requirements for parking in the curtilage of Protected Structures and in Conservation Areas are set out below in section 4.3.7. The basic dimensions to accommodate the footprint of a car within a front garden are 3 metres by 5 metres. It is essential that there is also adequate

space to allow for manoeuvring and circulation between the front boundary and the front of the building. Any works to the public road to facilitate the provision of an entrance including the removal or relocation of utility poles/boxes and public lighting are carried out at the applicant/developers own expense to the requirements of the relevant utility provider and Dublin City Council

#### *Section 4.3.4 Sustainable Urban Drainage Section*

In accordance with Policy SI22, proposals should indicate how the design aims to control surface water runoff in a sustainable fashion through the use of permeable or porous surfaces such as gravel and green areas etc. rather than excessive hard surfacing (for further design guidance please refer to Sustainable Drainage Design and evaluation Guide (2021) which is summarised in Appendix 12.

#### *Section 4.3.5 Treatment of Front Boundaries*

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

#### *Section 4.3.6 Landscape Treatment of Front Gardens*

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

### **5.3. Natural Heritage Designations**

The South Dublin Bay proposed NHA, South Dublin Bay SAC & South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA c.1km to the southeast. North Dublin Bay SAC, North Bull Island SPA and North Dublin Bay proposed NHA are c. 2.5km to the northeast.

## **6.0 EIA Screening**

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

## **7.0 The Appeal**

### **7.1 Grounds of Appeal**

The first party appeal includes the following grounds:

- Hatchback car dimensions of 4.68 x 4.79 x 1.84 x 1.89m and this can be accommodated in the proposed parking bay
- The aggregate size of the proposed parking bay achieves 5m x 3m due to the 2 parallel longer lengths measuring 5-5.8m and the 2 shorter widths measuring 2.8m-3.5m
- The proposal complies with Section 4.3.1 Dimensions and Surfacing and would not create a traffic hazard
- The vehicular entrance does not interfere with any street trees
- Appendices including photographic examples of similar vehicular entrances in Dublin with occasional overhanging of the footpath and a personal letter from the applicant stating the need for off-street parking.

### **7.2. Planning Authority Response**

None

### 7.3. Observations

None

## 8.0 Assessment

8.1. Following a review of the file, assessment of the relevant planning policies and inspection of the site, I am satisfied that the principle of a vehicular entrance accords with the Z1 land use zoning. The proposal would involve the loss of general parking space to the front of the property (1-2 spaces). There is no designated on-street residential parking and this does not appear to be an area of high parking demand. Section 4.3 of Appendix 5 in the Development Plan states that proposals for off-street parking in the front gardens of single dwellings in mainly residential areas may not be permitted 'where residents rely on on-street car parking and there is a strong demand for such parking' . There does not appear to be a reliance on on-street parking at this location. A site inspection confirmed that the surrounding residential streets at a right angle to Irishtown Road benefit from their own on-street parking spaces and there is no evidence of overspill or demand for usage. Therefore I am satisfied that proposal would comply with Policy SMT25 (On-street parking) and Appendix 5 of the Development Plan. In my view, the primary concern in this appeal is the design of the proposed vehicular entrance.

### *Design*

8.2 The existing front garden area has an overall depth of between 4.46m and 5.27m, with an approximate width of 6.33m. The proposed development comprises a new vehicular entrance (2.8m wide and a varying depth of between 4.4m at northern end and 5.2m at southern end) and off-street parking within the existing front garden of the property.

8.3 The other works include part removal of front boundary wall, and all associated site works. A new separate pedestrian gate is proposed within the side boundary of the wall. There is no concern with the part removal of the boundary wall. Although, I note that the land ownership of the proposed side pedestrian gate is unclear. From

the application drawings, it is clear that the proposed vehicular entrance width at 2.8 metres does not exceed the maximum 3 metres allowed in Appendix 5 of the Development Plan. However, the proposed car space is contrary to the required 3 metres by 5 metres minimum in Section 4.3.1. A full 3m by 5 m area around the car cannot be achieved, even at an alternative angle as one side is always shorter. The inadequate space provided can lead to parked vehicles overhanging the public footpath and obstruction/conflict with pedestrian using the footpath.

- 8.4 I note the correspondence on file from the Dublin City Council Tree Officer on the application setting out the need for a 2.5 metre buffer zone around the 'medium sized' tree in front of no. 25 to protect its roots. Section 4.3.2 of the Development Plan ('Impact on Street Trees'), states that a proposed vehicular entrance shall not interfere with street trees and states that 2.5 metres distance from trunk to the edge of proposed dishing applies to the medium tree category. The application drawing demonstrate that this 2.5m clearance to the north of the dishing has been achieved and the tree would not be an obstacle.
- 8.5 The various examples of off-street parking around Dublin submitted with the appeal including those that overhang onto footpaths are noted but none of these examples share the same measurements as the front garden or the same angles as the proposed car parking space that is the subject of this appeal. I also note the lack of planning references or addresses and so it is not possible to determine planning precedent from these images. The critical issue here is that the proposal cannot achieve the required dimensions as set out in Appendix 5 of the Development Plan.
- 8.6 In conclusion, whilst the proposed works would be acceptable in principle, the proposed parking space depth is substandard and would endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard and obstruction of pedestrians and would be contrary to Section 4.3.1, Appendix 5 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. This section of the Development Plan aims to ensure that vehicular entrances are designed to avoid creation of a traffic hazard and adequate car parking space is provided to accommodate a car safely without overhanging the public footpath. The development would therefore set an undesirable precedent for similar type

development and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## **9.0 AA Screening**

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located in an established residential area less than 1 km west of South Dublin Bay SAC & South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA.
- 9.2. The proposed development comprises a new vehicular entrance and off street parking within the existing front garden. Works to include part removal of front boundary wall, and all associated site works
- 9.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Nature of works
  - Location in an established residential area
  - Lack of connections to nearest European sites
- 9.4. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

## **10.0 Water Framework Directive**

- 10.1. The subject site is located at 27 Irishtown Road, Dublin 4 approximately 250 metres east of the River Dodder and 500 metres south of the River Liffey

- 10.2 The proposed development comprises a new vehicular entrance and off street parking within the existing front garden. Works to include part removal of front boundary wall, and all associated site works
- 10.3 I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Nature of works
  - Location-distance from nearest water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections
- 10.4 I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

## **11.0 Recommendation**

- 11.1. I recommend that planning permission be refused

## **12.0 Reasons and Considerations**

12.1 Having regard to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, the Z1 zoning objectives and the proposed dimensions of the vehicular entrance, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would fail to meet the car parking standards set out in Section 4.3.1, Appendix 5 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, would create a traffic safety hazard and would set an undesirable precedent for similar type development 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.

---

Killian Harrington  
Planning Inspector

24 February 2026

## Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	PL-500557-DS-26
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	The development will consist of a new vehicular entrance and off street parking within the existing front garden. Works to include part removal of front boundary wall, and all associated site works
<b>Development Address</b>	27 Irishtown Road Dublin 4
<b>IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX /OR LEAVE BLANK</b>	
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>  (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:  - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,  - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<b>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)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in <b>Part 1</b> .  <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>1. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 2</u>, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</b>	

<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.  <b>No Screening required.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.  <b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.  <b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b>  <b>OR</b>  <b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b>	
<b>2. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</b>	
<b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</b>
<b>No</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b>

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 24 February 2026