



Development	Construction of vehicular access to the front of dwelling and all associated site works.
Location	232 Larkhill Road, Whitehall, Dublin, D09DP76
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council North
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB5504/25
Applicant(s)	Conor Lyons
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Conor Lyons
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	14/03/26
Inspector	Adrian Ormsby

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3	
2.0	Proposed Development.....	3	
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	3	
3.1.	Decision	3	
3.2.	Planning Authority Reports	4	
3.2.1.	Planning Reports		4
3.2.2.	Other Technical Reports		4
4.0	Planning History.....	5	
5.0	Policy Context.....	6	
5.1.	Dublin City Development Plan 2022-28 (DCDP).....	6	
5.2.	Natural Heritage Designations	8	
6.0	EIA Screening.....	8	
7.0	The Appeal	8	
8.0	Assessment	9	
9.0	AA Screening.....	12	
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	12	
11.0	Recommendation.....	13	
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	14	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located at no. 232 Larkhill Road, Whitehall, Dublin. This is a two storey mid terrace dwelling with front garden and pathway. The front boundary of the site includes a low rail style fence on a stone plinth with a pedestrian gate. The site is bounded by a wide public path (c. 2.7m.)
- 1.2. There is an existing bus stop in close proximity to the site but in front of the adjoining dwelling no. 231. A number of houses along this street have existing vehicular entrances and parking on or partially on the path was evident at the time of the site inspection. There are no yellow lines along this section of the public road. There is an existing dished kerb to the other neighbouring dwelling No.233.
- 1.3. The stated site area is 0.004 ha.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal comprises-
 - Construction of a 3m wide vehicular access to the front of dwelling
 - Two pillars either side of the 3m entrance c. 1.145m high
 - A driveway detailed as standard plain concrete finish
 - Soft landscaping

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission was refused for the following reason-

“The proposed development comprising a new vehicular entrance and proposed dished kerb would negatively impact the existing bus stop serving Larkhill Road and would impact on the kerb currently in place which provides improved access to buses for people with mobility impairments and/or disabilities. The relocation of the same bus stop is not considered feasible. Therefore, safe access and egress cannot be achieved due to conflict with the existing bus stop. The proposed

development would, therefore, be contrary to Volume 2, Appendix 5 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The planners report dated 15/12/2025 can be summarised as follows-

- The site is zoned Z1 (Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods), with a land use zoning objective '*To protect, provide and improve residential amenities*'.
- The relatively minor nature of the proposal is generally acceptable in principle.
- Appendix 5 of the City Development Plan provides the policy support for works of this type and sets out the specific requirements for such developments to be considered acceptable.
- It identifies serious concerns raised by the Transportation Planning Division.
- It recommended planning permission be refused.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Report have been received from the-

- Transportation Planning Division-
 - There are serious concern with the potential hazardous manoeuvres in and out of the site and negative impact on Bus Stop No. 210 directly outside the house.
 - The bus stop is within 4.0m of the site.
 - In order to operate safely, a minimum of 7m is required to allow both front and back doors of the bus to operate.
 - The Division consulted with Dublin Bus who have advised that while there are future plans for the existing bus stop to be relocated as part of the BusConnects phasing where the existing route No.44 will be withdrawn and no new route will run through Larkhill estate.

- Although there are future plans, the existing bus stop should be retained until such time as the new routes come into operation.
- At the time of this assessment, the plan is for such changes to occur during Phase 9 of the BusConnects network redesign which is scheduled to launch in late 2026 but no fixed date at this time.
- There is no alternative location for the existing bus stop on Larkhill Road and future plans are scheduled for 2 years.
- On this basis refusal is recommended as the proposed vehicular entrance will pose a negative impact on the existing No. 210 bus stop and would set an undesirable precedent for future developments.
- Drainage Division-
 - No objections
 - The proposed new parking area / driveway shall incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems in the management of surface water so that there is no increase in surface water run-off from the development to the drainage network.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- None

3.4. Third Party Observations

- None

4.0 Planning History

- None relevant

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Dublin City Development Plan 2022-28 (DCDP)

- The appeal site is zoned Z1: Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods, with the associated land use objective '*to protect, provide and improve residential amenities*'.
- Appendix 5 - Transport and Mobility: Technical Requirements-
 - 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
 - *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.*
 - *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. A proposal will not be considered acceptable where there is insufficient area to accommodate the car safely*

within the garden without overhanging onto the public footpath, or where safe access and egress from the proposed parking space cannot be provided, for example on a very busy road, opposite a traffic island or adjacent to a pedestrian crossing or traffic junction or where visibility to and from the proposed access is inadequate. In certain circumstances, applicants may be required to demonstrate that vehicles can turn within the site and exit in forward motion.

- *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. Applications for new vehicular entrances or works to existing entrances shall clearly delineate in the submitted drawings the location of any existing street trees, utility boxes/poles, public lighting and other relevant infrastructure located in the immediate vicinity of the entrance.*
- Section 4.3.3- Impact on Public Transport Infrastructure
 - *Where a vehicular entrance is located in proximity to a bus stop or shelter, the Council will consider the impact of any conflict between vehicles and pedestrians at this location. The removal or relocation of a bus stop or bus shelter to accommodate a vehicular entrance may not be possible having regard to the impact on the overall bus route and will be considered on a case by case basis, in consultation where necessary, with Dublin Bus and the National Transport Authority (NTA). The impact of a proposed vehicular entrance or widening of an existing entrance on existing Kassel Kerbs, which provide improved access to buses for people with mobility impairment and/or disabilities, will also be taken into consideration and determined on a case by case basis.*

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- The proposed development is not located within or immediately adjacent to any European Site.

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 (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Please refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

This is a first party appeal. The grounds of appeal are generally summarised as follows-

- The application was refused by DCC due to the proximity of the nearby bus stop.
- The bus stop is in front of the neighbours garden.
- The application proposes a kerb length of 3.5 meters between the dished kerb and the (bus) stop sign. The other side of the bus stop has a kerb length of over 10 meters.
- The refusal refers to the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028. Volume 2 Appendix 5. There is no information in this reference regarding bus stops, driveways, and kerb lengths.
- It does state-

"There is a predisposition to consider residential off-street parking, subject to design and safety criteria, particularly along bus Core Bus Corridors (CBCs) and to facilitate traffic management proposals."

- Considering the above, everyday a car parks in front of the applicants house up against the (bus) stop sign. A photograph is provided. This prevents the bus from being able to pull up to the kerb. The bus must stop in the middle of the road.
- As there is no requirement for a kerb length for bus stops it is understood it is at DCC's discretion to make a practical decision.
- In this instance allowing the proposed entrance would prevent any car from blocking the bus stop. It would still leave sufficient kerb which could be used by wheelchair users of the bus.
- The Applicant now suggests reducing the entrance to 2.5m and moving the entrance to as close to the boundary of the garden as possible. A revised drawing is included within the appeal.
- This would leave a kerb length roughly 5.5m between the dished kerb and the bus stop sign.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

- None

7.3. Observations

- None

8.0 Assessment

- 8.1. The application site is located in an area zoned Z1: Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods as per the Dublin City Development Plan. The associated zoning objective is '*to protect, provide and improve residential amenities*'. The proposed site entrance to facilitate car parking to front of an existing house is acceptable in principle.
- 8.2. DCC have refused the permission as set out in section 3.1 above. The refusal reason details that the application proposes dishing the kerb to the front of the site. The area

of works to dish the kerb are not included within the red line and are to public lands i.e. the public path. Such works are not in the control of the applicant and to do such works require requires separate consent of DCC regardless of the planning decision for the proposed vehicular entrance to the private site boundary.

- 8.3. Having reviewed the information set out in DCC's Transportation Planning Division report, it is evident there are serious concerns regarding potential hazardous turning manoeuvres in and out of the site and negative impacts on the existing Bus Stop. They state-

"In order to operate safely, a minimum of 7m is required to allow both front and back doors of the bus to operate".

It is also detailed that the Transportation Division consulted with Dublin Bus and there are plans for the bus stop to be relocated as part of future BusConnects phasing works but there are no confirmed plans for the bus stop to be moved or timing for such changes as yet.

- 8.4. The road to the front of the site is served by Dublin Bus with a bus stop shown on the drawings 4 metres from the proposed entrance and to the front of the neighbouring property No. 231.
- 8.5. The revised drawing submitted with the appeal shows a slightly relocated entrance away from the bus stop and a reduced entrance width from 3m to 2.5m. It is difficult to read the dimension shown on the revised drawing but it appears to detail the bus stop will be c. 5.5m from the proposed entrance. The suggested amendments would not meet the 7m requirement detailed in DCC's Transportation Division submission.
- 8.6. I acknowledge the Applicant's contention that the proposed entrance will stop car parking to the front of the house, thereby providing more space for the bus to pull into the kerb and better serve mobility impaired users of the bus. I note the photograph submitted with the appeal shows a car parked to the front of the application site and on the public path. This type of parking was also evident in the area during my site inspection. I understand it is an offence to park on a public path and to obstruct a public road. However matters of car parking enforcement are generally ones for the local authority and the Gardai.

- 8.7. The Commission are referred to Appendix 5, Section 4.3 and in particular section 4.3.3 of the DCDP in which it is stated-

'Where a vehicular entrance is located in proximity to a bus stop or shelter, the Council will consider the impact of any conflict between vehicles and pedestrians at this location.....

...The impact of a proposed vehicular entrance or widening of an existing entrance on existing Kassel Kerbs, which provide improved access to buses for people with mobility impairment and/or disabilities, will also be taken into consideration and determined on a case by case basis.'

While noting the existing path does not appear to be a 'Kassel Kerb', it is raised above the road surface and the adjoining dished kerb to the front of No. 233. The existing kerb better facilitates mobility impaired access to buses serving the route than a lowered and/or dished kerb as proposed. In this regard, a lay by or designated area for a bus to pull in is not delineated along this section of Larkin Road and it cannot therefore be assumed the bus will stop directly at the bus stop pole but instead would require an area next to the path as close to the bus stop as possible to pull into, to then adequately serve mobility or disabled users of the bus. This is likely to include area of the public road and the path to the front of the proposed application site.

- 8.8. Accordingly, I consider the development if permitted, will lead to potential for conflict between vehicles and pedestrians at the location of the proposed development i.e. additional traffic turning movements generated in close proximity to the existing bus stop. Furthermore, the need to dish the existing kerb to facilitate the proposed entrance would potentially impact adversely upon existing access arrangement to buses for people with mobility impairment and/or disabilities.
- 8.9. Having considered all of the above, the principle of a vehicular entrance as proposed by the Applicant with this application is generally acceptable. However, given the proximity of the proposed entrance to the existing bus stop, including the amended entrance location as suggested in the appeal, I consider the proposal would potentially create conflict, a traffic hazard and would endanger public safety including the safety of mobility impaired users.

8.10. The proposal would likely be considered permissible when the existing bus stop and route is taken out of service but until then the application is premature. The proposed development should be refused.

9.0 **AA Screening**

9.1. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on any European sites in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required. This determination is based on:

- The small scale and nature of the scheme,
- The urban location of the site,
- The separation distance from nearest European site, and
- The lack of a direct or indirect pathway to any designated site.

10.0 **Water Framework Directive**

10.1. The subject site is located the suburban area of Dublin. There are no watercourses within the appeal site and no water bodies in close proximity to the site. No water deterioration concerns are raised in the planning application or appeal.

10.2. 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 and ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration.

10.3. 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.

10.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows-

- The small scale and nature of the development
- Location-distance from nearest water bodies
- Lack of hydrological connections

10.5. 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 permission is refused for the following reason-

1. It is considered that the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard because of potential for conflict arising between vehicles and pedestrians at this location in close proximity to an existing bus stop. Furthermore the proposal which requires the dishing of an existing public kerb will adversely impact upon existing access to buses for people with mobility impairment and/or disabilities.

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.

Adrian Ormsby

Senior Planning Inspector

14th of March 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500576-DN-26
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of vehicular access to the front of dwelling and all associated site works.
Development Address	232 Larkhill Road, Whitehall, Dublin, D09DP76
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(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)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested.	
<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	
<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)	
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"/>	
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____