



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501032-CC-26

Development

Retention of reinstated front boundary wall, railings, piers and a 2.9 metre wide vehicular entrance, together with associated site works.

Location

8 Grandview Terrace, Victoria Road,
Cork, T12A0K5

Planning Authority

Cork City Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2544426

Applicant(s)

Narvacrest Limited

Type of Application

Retention

Planning Authority Decision

Refuse Retention

Type of Appeal

First Party Normal Planning Appeal

Appellant(s)

Narvacrest Limited

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

19 May 2026

Inspector

Natalie de Róiste

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development.....	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0	Planning History.....	5
5.0	Policy Context.....	7
6.0	EIA Screening.....	11
7.0	The Appeal	11
8.0	Assessment	14
9.0	AA Screening.....	17
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	17
11.0	Recommendation.....	18
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	18
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	19

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site, 8 Grand View Terrace, Victoria Road, is a mid-terrace two-storey dwelling with front and rear garden. It is one of a terrace of 11 facing onto Victoria Road, with long front gardens of c. 20 metres in length.
- 1.2. It is described by the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (record 20508112) as a *'[t]erraced two-bay two-storey house, built 1896, with single-storey flat-roofed bay, having timber sash windows and timber entrance door with glass insets, garden area with cast-iron railings to front and enclosed area to rear. Slate pitched roof with oversailing courses and bracketed eaves course. Brick chimney stack'. The appraisal is given as '[o]ne of a complete late 19th century terrace retaining original proportions and many features including slate roof, hood mouldings, front door and timber sash windows'*.
- 1.3. There is a gateless vehicular entrance to one side (c. 2.9 metres), with rendered rectangular-profile piers. A stretch of boundary wall is rendered to the street elevation, and of coursed rubble granite to the garden elevation, topped with trefoil railings. The side boundary to the west is newly planted hedge; the side boundary to the east is mature hedge. The whole of the front garden is gravelled, with a small tree (weeping willow type) to the centre.
- 1.4. This stretch of Victoria Road is a fairly busy road, with free-flowing traffic and no speed bumps or other traffic calming measures. Short stretches of on-street metered parking are interspersed with vehicular entrances on the south side. Kennedy Park is located on the north side. There are double yellow lines on the north side of the road, at the bus stop outside no. 4 Grandview Terrace, and close to the junction with the Old Blackrock Road, where it joins the Blackrock Road.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. It is proposed to retain the development described as follows:
reinstated front boundary wall, railings, piers and a 2.9metre wide vehicular entrance, together with associated site works.

The piers in question are c. 1.6 metres in height; the drawings erroneously show the measurement as 1080 mm. Similarly, the boundary wall is c. 1.1 metres in height, compared with a stated height of 595 mm.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission was refused, for the following reason:

The previously existing front boundary of the site, consisting of a low wall, cast iron railings and pedestrian gate, was one of the last few remaining original boundaries located within the Victoria Road Architectural Conservation Area and was explicitly conditioned within the recent permission, Pl. Ref. 23/42045, to be retained in situ. The retention of the reconstructed boundary treatment, with its inclusion of a vehicular entrance and loss of the original iron pedestrian gate, by virtue of the nature of the development and its setting, has resulted in the loss of an important historic feature and has adversely impacted on the setting of this NIAH building and on the character of the wider Victoria Road Architectural Conservation Area. The subject development contravenes Strategic Objective 7 and Objectives 8.17, 8.18, 8.20, 8.23 and 8.24 Of the cork City Development Plan 2022-2028, as varied, and is therefore considered contrary to proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning reports are on the file dated 19/02/2025, 09/03/2026 by Acting Senior Executive Planners, and dated 19/02/2026 by Acting Senior Planner.

3.2.2. Planning Reports

- Report dated 19/02/2025 – (Acting SEP) site context, live enforcement, and adjacent planning history noted. Zoning, policy, and internal reports noted. Refusal recommended due to loss of an important historic feature and impact on the character of the ACA, and contravention of Development Plan objectives.
- Report dated 19/02/2025 (Acting Senior Planner) – above report referenced, refusal recommended in line with report.

- Report dated 09/03/2026 (Acting SEP) – identical issues raised, refusal recommended for two reasons, as above, and for non-compliance with a condition of Pl. Ref. 23/42045.

3.2.3. Other Technical Reports

- Conservation –Report noted NIAH listing (regional significance for architectural interest), ACA, Development Plan policy, planning history with condition to retain front boundary, and open enforcement file on the issue. Apart from part of the original iron fence, all remaining historic fabric lost. Composition altered, with no pedestrian gate or path, and with large vehicular entrance, impacting on historic character of the house and setting, and the wider terrace. Refusal at 6 Grandview Terrace for similar works noted. Refusal recommended.
- Contributions – no objection subject to conditions.
- Drainage – no objection subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Health and Safety Authority – no observations to forward.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None on file.

4.0 Planning History

- On site:

Reg ref 23/42045

Permission GRANTED for the demolition of the existing lean-to single-storey extension to the rear (south-west) of the existing two-storey dwelling, and the construction of a part single/part two-storey extension to the rear (south-west) of the existing dwelling with elevational changes to the rear of the existing dwelling to suit, also with the provisional of two rooflights to the rear (south-west) facing roof and with all associated site works.

Condition 4 of this permission was as follows:

The following shall not be permitted to the building or the site without the benefit of planning permission:

- a) Removal or replacement of the external render or decorative stuccowork to the front elevation of the house*
- b) Demolition/deconstruction/re ordering/removal of boundary walls or gate piers*
- c) Alteration or removal of railings, gates or any other boundary treatments.*

Reason: To conserve and enhance the character of the Architectural Conservation Area.

A compliance submission dated 13th September 2023 noted the condition and agreed to it.

E8753

The conservation report refers to an open enforcement file, following interventions to the front garden and boundary treatments observed in January 2025, and a warning letter sent, on the matter.

- On neighbouring sites:

6 Grandview Terrace

ABP ref PL28.314393 reg ref 2241179

Permission for new vehicular entrance and parking spaces refused by An Bord Pleanála for the following reason:

The existing front boundary of the site, consisting of a low wall, cast-iron railings and pedestrian gate, is one of the last few remaining original front boundaries located within the Victoria Road Architectural Conservation Area. The proposed development would result in the loss of this historic fabric and the alteration of an important historic feature, which would have an adverse impact on the character and setting of the existing dwelling on the site, which itself is of regional architectural importance as indicated in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage, and would also similarly impact on the character of the Architectural Conservation Area. The proposed development would be contrary to Objective 8.23(a) and Objective 8.24 of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Cork City Development Plan 2022-28

- 5.1.1. The site and the surrounding area is zoned ZO 01 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods with the objective *“to protect and provide for residential uses and amenities, local services and community, institutional, educational and civic uses.”*

Chapter 4 deals with Transport and Mobility. Table 4 in this chapter (and the associated Car Parking Zones map in Volume 2) categorises this site within Zone 1 Cork City Centre and Inner City.

Chapter 8 deals with Heritage, Arts & Culture.

Strategic Objective 7 includes the following text:

To protect and reinforce the unique character and built fabric of the city, towns, villages, suburbs, neighbourhoods and places that make up the fabric of Cork City, both the character derived from the natural environment and the man-made character created by the built form. This will be achieved by protecting Protected Structures, archaeological monuments, and archaeological heritage and Architectural Conservation Areas, while providing opportunities for new development that respects the rich, historic built heritage of the city.

Proposals for new development must have regard to the historic built heritage of the city, particularly Protected Structures, archaeological monuments and archaeological heritage and Architectural Conservation Areas, and any development that has a detrimental impact on these assets will not normally be acceptable.

Objective 8.17 Conservation of the City’s Built Heritage

- a. To seek to ensure the conservation of Cork City’s built heritage.*
- b. To ensure that Cork’s Built Heritage contributes fully to the social and economic life of the city and to pursue actions that ensure Cork’s built heritage will benefit from good custodianship and building occupation.*

Objective 8.22 National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH)

Cork City Council will have regard to Ministerial recommendations to the City Council to consider the designation of the buildings and gardens listed in the National

Inventory of Architectural Heritage as Protected Structures. Cork City Council will consider the structures listed in the NIAH for protection, by designation of Protected Structures; by the adoption of Architectural Conservation Areas to protect groups of buildings; or by whatever other means the Council considers will most effectively protect the architectural heritage of the city. These Ministerial Recommendations will be taken into account when the Cork City Council is considering proposals for development that would affect the historic or architectural interest of these structures. Cork City Council will seek to engage with key stakeholder groups, including public representatives, building owners and the public to develop the most appropriate response for the protection of specific buildings, groups of buildings and historic areas.

Objective 8.23 Development in Architectural Conservation Areas

Development in Architectural Conservation Areas should have regard to the following:

- a. Works that impact negatively upon features within the public realm, such as stone setts, cobbles or other historic paving, railings, street furniture, stone kerbing etc. shall not be generally permitted;*
- b. Design and detailing that responds respectfully to the historic environment in a way that contributes new values from our own time. This can be achieved by considering layout, scale, materials and finishes and patterns such as plot divisions in the surrounding area;*
- c. Historic materials and methods of construction should be retained and repaired where this is reasonable, e.g. historic windows and doors, original roof coverings, metal rainwater goods should be retained along with original forms and locations of openings etc;*
- d. Repairs or the addition of new materials should be appropriate and in keeping with the character of the original structures.*

Objective 8.24 Demolition in Architectural Conservation Areas

Demolition of structures and parts of structures will in principle only be permitted in an Architectural Conservation Area where the structure, or parts of a structure, are considered not to contribute to the special or distinctive character, or where the

replacement structure would significantly enhance the special character more than the retention of the original structure.

Chapter 11 of the Plan relates to Placemaking and Managing Development. The following text is of relevance.

11.12 All new development should enrich the urban qualities of the City and its towns, villages and suburbs. A high standard of design is essential to this process, as well as the fostering socially and economically viable communities. Creating a distinctive sense of place taking into account context, character and setting is essential. Development proposals will be assessed on the visual characteristics of the built form and related elements such as aspect and orientation, proportion, the balance of solid to void, the shapes and details of roofs, chimneys, windows and doors and the materials used. Details of walls, gates, street furniture, paving and planting will also be noted. Roof forms should harmonise with and not clash with the city's traditional pitched roof forms. Layouts of buildings and spaces must be designed to ensure that areas are permeable, pleasant, legible and safe.

On the topic of *Residential Entrances/Parking in Front Gardens* the following Section is of relevance:

11.145 The cumulative effect of the removal of front garden walls and railings damages the character and appearance of suburban streets and roads. Consequently, proposals for off-street parking need to be balanced against loss of amenity. The removal of front garden walls and railings will not generally be permitted where they have a negative impact on the character of streetscapes (e.g. in Architectural Conservation Areas and other areas of architectural and historic character) or on the building itself (e.g. a Protected Structure). Consideration will be given to the effect of parking on traffic flows, pedestrian and cyclist safety, and traffic generation. Where permitted, "drive-ins" should:

- 1. Not have outward opening gates;*
- 2. In general, have a vehicle entrance not wider than 3 metres, or where context and pattern of development in the area allows not wider than 50 per cent of the width of the front boundary;*

3. *Have an area of hard-standing equivalent parking space of (2.5 m x 5m) with the balance of the space suitably landscaped;*
4. *Hard surfaces must be permeable;*
5. *Inward-opening gates should be provided; Where space is restricted, the gates could slide behind a wall. Gates should not open outwards over public footpath or roadway;*
6. *Other walls, gates, railing to be made good.*

Table 11.13 sets out Maximum Car Parking Standards. The maximum for a three-bedroom or larger house in Zone 1 is 1.0 spaces.

Volume 3 of the Plan deals with Built Heritage Objectives, with part 1 setting out a number of Architectural Conservation Areas, including the Victoria Road ACA at Section 1.232. The text of the ACA is as follows:

“This group includes houses in Grand View Terrace, Woolacombe Place, Park Villas, Parkhurst, Victoria Road, Landsdowne Villas and Park View. They are a mixture of house types comprising detached, semi-detached and terraced buildings and vary from two-storey to three-storey in height, some with attics. They are significant as a group of late 19th century houses retaining their original form and features and provide the area with a distinctive quality. Although the houses that make up this ACA show a variety of styles and forms they have an overall architectural coherence because of the shared elevational treatment and the brick and stone front walls with attractive ironwork which give a unified expression to the road.”

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

5.2.1. Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht 2011).

Chapter 3 deals with Architectural Conservation Areas,

Chapter 13 deals with works in the curtilage and attendant grounds of a relevant structure, with specific sections on boundary features, basement areas, hard landscaping, gardens, and car parking.

5.2.2. Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2019)

Section 4.4.9 On-Street Parking and Loading

On-street parking, when well designed can:

- *Calm traffic by increasing driver caution, visually narrow the carriageway and reduce forward visibility.*
- *Add to the vitality of communities by supporting retail/commercial activities that front on to streets through the generation of pedestrian activity as people come and go from their vehicles.*
- *Contribute to pedestrian/cyclist comfort by providing a buffer between the vehicular carriageway and foot/cycle path.*
- *Reduce the need or temptation for drivers to kerb mount and block foot/cycle paths.*
- *Provide good levels of passive security as spaces are overlooked by buildings.*

It notes that on-street parking has a finite capacity, and in higher density residential areas, off-street parking will be required. It notes that on-street parking on public streets should not be allocated to individual dwellings, to allow for a more efficient turnover of spaces.

5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

Cork Harbour SPA 004030 – 10 km to the east

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 (or Part V of the 1994 Roads.

7.0 **The Appeal**

7.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

One appeal was received, from the applicant against the refusal. A number of photographs of the site and of neighbouring properties are included. Issues raised are summarised below:

- The refusal is based on an incorrect assumption that an intact historic boundary wall existed at the time the works to be retained were undertaken. The wall had been absent for a number of years. The property presented to the street as an open frontage. The works are works to reinstate the historic boundary line, and did not result in the loss of an important historic feature. The planning authority also incorrectly attributed the removal of the side boundary wall to the applicant, when it was removed by the neighbouring property owner (statement from neighbour appended).
- Permission 23/42045 was never commenced, and condition 4 is therefore of no relevance.
- The works are a clear conservation gain within the ACA, reinstating and reconstructing the historic boundary, and reinstating lost features and reusing original materials, as part of a conservation-led approach. The height, proportions, and detailing of the boundary are consistent with surviving examples on the street. The works are in line with Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines, and support, rather than diminish the architectural significance of the property as recorded in the NIAH.
- Grandview Terrace has evolved over the decades, and does not have an intact, uniform Victorian streetscape. There are a number of vehicular entrances in the Victoria Road ACA, and the Planning Authority fails to properly engage with this context, the result of a long evolution, the character of the ACA as it exists today. Ten of the 11 properties in Grandview Terrace have vehicular access or have been substantially altered. The Planning Statement submitted with the application set out this context, supported by photograph evidence and planning history. Vehicular access is a defining characteristic of the streetscape, and the works at no 8 reflect this pattern, with the opening reflecting the scale of openings found elsewhere in the street.
- The Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines emphasise that the character of an ACA is defined by the streetscape as it exists, and are not static environments.
- Directly relevant precedents to support a grant of permission are 9 Grandview Terrace; no's 3, 6, and 10 at Highfield West, 9 Aldergrove. The Planning Authority has placed too much emphasis on the refusal at 6 Grandview Terrace, which

property does not define the character of the terrace. It is an outlier, and not representative of the character of the ACA.

- The works deliver a tangible improvement in residential amenity, allowing for safe and convenient in-curtilage parking, reducing pressure on parking in the public realm, which is heavily used. There is no loss of on-street parking to the Local Authority. The works facilitate universal access and the future installation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure, an issue not addressed by the Planning Authority's assessment.
- The proposal is modest, carefully detailed, and fully reversible, qualities central to their acceptability within an ACA. The vehicular entrance measures just 2.9 metres. The wall is consistent with surviving examples along the street. There are no visually dominant or incongruous elements.
- The assessment is inconsistent, with the planner's report stating that the reinstatement of the original pedestrian gate, gateway plinth wall and railings could be addressed by condition. This route should have been availed of.
- The statutory test for works within an Architectural Conservation Area is whether the works '*materially affect the character of the area*' (as per Section 82(2) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended)). The Planning Authority did not apply this test correctly, operating from an inaccurate assumption that any changes are unacceptable.
- Photographic evidence is submitted, showing neighbouring boundaries as they are, and showing the reinstated boundary to no 8.
- The Commission is requested to grant retention permission.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

None received.

7.3. Observations

None received.

7.4. Further Responses

None received.

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. I have examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the submission received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and the material submitted by the applicant. I have inspected the site, and I have had regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance. I consider the substantive issues to be considered as follows:

- Heritage Impacts
- Car parking and traffic safety

8.2. **Heritage Impacts**

8.3. The appellants state that the development reinstated a boundary treatment that had been absent for a number of years; that the works are a clear conservation gain, reinstating lost features and reusing original materials, and are carefully detailed and fully reversible.

8.4. The drawings submitted with reg ref 23/42045 (dated 31 May 2023) show the front boundary enclosed, save for a pedestrian gate. The material on the file, including the condition attached, and the compliance submission, indicate that the historic boundary was intact at that date. Furthermore, publicly available mapping (google maps dated August 2022 and May 2024) shows the rendered plinth wall and pier with the metal pedestrian gate and railings in situ. The conservation report states an enforcement file was opened regarding removal of the boundary treatment in January 2025, and shows a photograph of an active building site. The application for retention was made in December 2025. In this context, the appellant's assertion that the boundary wall had been absent for 'a number of years' is not persuasive.

8.5. The appellants state that the planning permission reg ref 23/42045 was not carried out, and therefore the condition to retain the front boundary (which the council's refusal refers to) had no operative status. The reason for that condition was '*to conserve and enhance the character of the Architectural Conservation Area*'. The Architectural Conservation Area remains in force, and the reason for refusal refers to the impacts of the development on the character of the ACA, and the contravention of Development Plan objectives to protect the built heritage of the city. In my view,

whether or not permission reg ref 23/42045 has been implemented is not salient to the current assessment.

- 8.6. The ACA specifically refers to the front boundaries of the properties on the road, noting that the houses have a variety of styles and shapes, but the brick and stone front walls with attractive ironwork give a unified expression to the road. In the centre of the ACA, plot sizes are broad, accommodating larger semi-detached houses. These houses have vehicular entrances which make up a relatively small fraction of their front boundary, with substantial lengths of masonry capped brick walls topped with railings and interspersed with matching piers. At the north-west end of the ACA, the materials are similar, but with some narrow plots, due to the development of short terraces of three. At the south-east end, plots are narrower still, with the development of a terrace of twelve houses. Materials are more modest, with rendered walls and piers and simple trefoil railings. This section of the ACA has been more vulnerable to erosion of character, with boundary treatments in poor repair, and the insertion of a driveway removing a greater proportion of the boundary treatment, due to the shorter stretch of boundary treatment per plot.
- 8.7. I note the development management guidance set out at Section 11.145 of the Development Plan. Having regard to the development to be retained in this instance, I note the conservation officer's concerns regarding the loss of fabric and the changes to the layout and form of the boundary and garden. The old boundary treatment had a single masonry pier on the shared boundary to the east, with finials to either end of the wall and railings. The new boundary retains the existing pier, provides a short stretch of wall of an increased height, and two new piers on either side of the vehicular entrance. I note the expanse of hard standing and the condition of the finish with liners rising through the gravel surface. The railings that have been reinstated have broken and flaking paint, with no conservation or maintenance undertaken to address this issue to prevent water being trapped and rust forming. No information has been provided on the suitability of the material in which they are fixed. The appellant refers to the development as a conservation-led development, but provides no details to substantiate this.
- 8.8. I do not consider this development to be a conservation-led one, and I consider the impacts on the ACA to be negative. I recommend a refusal of retention permission.

8.9. Car parking and traffic safety (new issue)

- 8.9.1. The Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets sets out a number of benefits of on-street parking over off-street parking. It narrows the carriageway and has a traffic calming effect. It provides a buffer between pedestrians and vehicles, and eliminates the risks from vehicles driving or reversing across the footway. It helps prevent pavement parking and kerb mounting. The carriageway here is some seven metres in width, and the removal of car parking would increase the effective design speed of the road, to the detriment of its residential character.
- 8.9.2. Additionally, on-street parking provides efficient turnover of parking provision, as spaces are not allocated to particular individuals, but useable by all residents and visitors as they become free. On this latter point, the appellant notes that there is considerable demand for on-street parking. I note the nearby park and the dry cleaners across the road have no dedicated parking. The development to be retained conflicts with an existing short stretch of on-street parking, which would preclude its use by all but the smallest of vehicles. This on-street parking area is not shown in the correct location on the submitted site plan drawing, and would be affected.
- 8.9.3. Such developments can have knock-on impacts, creating increased demand for driveways and vehicular entrances by neighbouring residents, due to a decrease in on-street parking, with incremental impacts both on the character of the street and on the residential amenity of neighbours without the capacity for private parking.
- 8.10. Regarding traffic safety, DMURS sets out that on a road with a 50 km/h design speed which includes a bus route, 49 metres visibility splay is required in either direction, from a point 1.8 metres back from the carriageway, to ensure an adequate level of mutual visibility between drivers on the road and the driver entering the road. The road is quite straight, and this standard can be achieved. However, I note the newly erected piers are c. 1.6 metres (over five foot) in height, and would obscure the view of the footpath of any driver exiting the site. This is far in excess of the stated height of 1080 mm tall on the elevation drawings. Pedestrian comfort and safety is a critical consideration in the assessment of any new vehicular entrance, notwithstanding the visibility splay required for vehicles. I have concerns regarding the potential for traffic hazard in this busy area. I note there was no report on the file from the transport department. The planning report on the file does note the parking standards in the

Development Plan, but the assessment limits itself to conservation issues. The Commission may wish to seek the views of the Local Authority on the issue of traffic safety. However, given the substantive reason for refusal, it may not be considered necessary to pursue the matter.

8.11. Other issues

- 8.12. The appellant refers to the planner's report acknowledging that the reinstatement of the gate and railings could be addressed by condition. I did not find any such text in any of the planners' reports. A condition to reinstate the previous boundary treatment would be tantamount to a refusal, and would not be appropriate.
- 8.13. The appellant cites a number of addresses as precedent. Although they have not provided any reference numbers in the appeal, they did so in the planning statement with the original application. A number of these precedents are located on Highfield West, in the *University College Cork (UCC), College Road and Magazine Road ACA*. I note that the Specific Built Heritage Objectives for that ACA make no reference to Highfield West or to the boundary treatments on that road. As such, I consider those decisions to be of limited relevance. Additionally, a number of the decisions were granted under previous development plans, and reflect the policy context of the time. Permission to create a vehicular entrance at 9 Grandview Terrace was granted under reg ref 01/25491, under the Cork Corporation plan of the time.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on any European site. The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European site(s). No further assessment is required for the project. No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive.

- 10.2. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, it is concluded that the proposal will not result in any risk of deterioration in the status of any water body, including surface waters (rivers and lakes), groundwater, transitional waters, or coastal waters. This applies to both qualitative and quantitative status, and in respect of temporary and permanent effects.
- 10.3. In addition, the proposed development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the protection, maintenance, and improvement of water body status, as required under the Directive.
- 10.4. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend that retention permission be refused.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

The vehicular access and parking area to be retained would, by reason of the removal of original railings, gate, plinth wall, and front garden area, would materially affect the character of the Victoria Road Architectural Conservation Area, contrary to Strategic Objective 7, Objective 8.17, Objective 8.22, Objective 8.23, and 8.24 of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-28. The development to be retained would, therefore, 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.”

Natalie de Róiste

Planning Inspector

29 June 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501032-CC-26
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of amendments to boundary, new vehicular entrance.
Development Address	8 Grandview Terrace, Victoria Road, Cork.
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?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☐ 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)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
☒ 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?	

☒ 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.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
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 ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3) [Delete if not relevant]
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3) [Delete if not relevant]

Inspector: _____

Date: _____