

DEPUTY PLANNING OFFICER

APPLICATION NO. PROPOSAL	WEB1897/26 PROTECTED STRUCTURE: RETENTION & PERMISSION: The development will consist/consists of retention permission for reduction in width of the existing vehicular entrance on Leinster Road West from 5.50 metres to 4.0 metres. It also includes the retention of new 2.0 metre high rendered block piers finished with granite capping in lieu of the previous red brick piers. Retention of the new rendered 1.9 m high block wall separating the front and rear gardens incorporating 2.1m high rendered block piers with granite capping.
	Planning permission to erect new electrified wrought iron gates (4.0m wide x 1.8m high) to vehicular entrance on Leinster Road West. Planning permission to erect new high metal framed, timber panel gates (3.6m wide x 2.0 metre high) in wall separating the front & rear gardens.
LOCATION	117, Leinster Road, Dublin 6, D06 W205
APPLICANT	Thomas O'Grady
DATE LODGED	18-Apr-2026
ZONING	
APPLICATION TYPE	Permission

1.0 Site InspectionTuesday 19 **May 2026**, site notice in place.**2.0 Description of Site and Surroundings**

The site consists of an existing single storey over raised basement villa style semi-detached house situated on the south side of Leinster Road, on the corner with Leinster Road West, in a Z2-zoned residential conservation area. The existing house is a protected structure. The house has an existing vehicular entrance from the side road, which leads to a car parking area in the front garden. The front boundary, consisting of railings, has a hedge behind it and appears intact, with the exception of an area which previously accommodated a pedestrian gate. Around the corner, the side boundary forward of the building line consists of a low wall, with a stone wall in the area behind the building line. The adjoining house at No. 118 has a vehicular entrance from Leinster Road, consisting of a gate which is similar in style to the boundary railings. The existing house also has a rear garden, which extends back to the boundary with No. 1 La Bas Terrace which is part of Leinster Road West. The house also has a side garden, which includes a small shed but does not extend as far south as the rear garden. The site has a stated area of 0.08 hectares (800m²).

3.0 Proposed Development

The proposal is for retention of a reduction in the width of the existing vehicular entrance on Leinster Road West from 5.5 metres to 4 metres, new 2 metre high rendered block piers finished with granite capping in lieu of the previous red brick piers and a new rendered 1.9m high block wall separating the front and rear gardens incorporating 2.1m high rendered block piers with granite capping.

Permission is also sought to erect new electrified wrought-iron gates (4.0m wide x 1.8m high) to the vehicular entrance on Leinster Road West and new high metal framed, timber panel gates (3.6m wide x 2.0 metre high) in the wall separating the front & rear gardens.

4.0 Zoning

- The site has zoning objective Z2 - to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas'
- There is a protected structure on the site.

5.0 Pre-Application Consultations

None stated.

6.0 Relevant and Recent Planning History

Subject site:

- 0544/25: Section 5 application in relation to narrowing of existing entrance at road, erection of new piers and gate at road, removal of existing gate at side of house and erection of new piers and gate at side of house. Deemed not exempt.
- 1362/01: Permission refused for retention of change of use from first floor residential to use as a creche/Montessori school/structured day care service for children for more than 3.5 hours per day, supervised by trained personnel. The building is a protected structure.
- 3926/00: Permission granted for change of use from two residential units to use as a creche/Montessori school/structure daycare services for children for more than 3.5 hours per day, supervised by trained personnel. The building is a protected structure. The decision to grant permission was overturned by An Bord Pleanála on appeal and permission was refused.

7.0 Relevant Enforcement History

E0825/25: Open enforcement file relating to new entrance created without planning permission.

E05234/01: Enforcement file relating to a creche use at top floor level, with permission for use of the lower floor only. File closed due to ceasing of use.

8.0 Consultations

Internal Consultees

Drainage Division: Report received; no objection subject to compliance with code of practice.

Transportation Planning Division: Report received; recommend refusal of permission.

Conservation Officer: Report received; recommend seeking further information. Conditions recommended in the event of permission being granted.

Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Éireann: Not received.

National Transport Authority (NTA): Not received

Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII): Not received

The Heritage Council: Not received

An Taisce: Not received

Dept of Housing, Local Government & Heritage: Not received

9.0 Submissions/Observations /Representations

Two third party observations have been received. The main issues raised are as follows:

- The gate piers are too high and not in keeping with the neighbourhood where any traditional gate piers are usually less than 2m high.
- The gate piers should be reduced in height.
- The height of the wall separating the front and rear gardens needs to be considered.
- The electrified wrought-iron gates are too high for a protected structure in a residential conservation area and compared with neighbouring gates.
- The gates should be double gates in a traditional design and opening outwards.
- Sliding electrical gates should not be permitted.
- The front garden should be restored.
- The proposed metal framed timber panelled gates are excessive in scale and width – is it proposed to turn the rear garden into a car park?
- The pillars should be marginally higher than the existing wall and therefore lower than the 2m proposed.

These submissions have been considered in the overall assessment of the proposed development.

10.0 Relevant Policies, Objectives and Standards Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028

Z2 – ‘to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas’.

Section 14.7.2 - Residential Conservation Areas

Policy BHA9 – Conservation Areas

Policy BHA2 – Development of Protected Structures

Appendix 5 – Transport & Mobility: Technical Requirements

- Section 4 – Car Parking Standards
 - Section 4.3 – Parking in Front Gardens
 - Section 4.3.1 – Dimensions and Surfacing
 - Section 4.3.4 – Sustainable Urban Drainage
 - Section 4.3.5 - Treatment of Front Boundaries
 - Section 4.3.6 - Landscape Treatment of Front Gardens
 - Section 4.3.7- Parking in the Curtilage of Protected Structures, ACAs and Conservation Areas

10.1 Relevant Government Guidelines

‘Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities’ DHLGH (2011).

11.0 Planning Assessment

Having reviewed the documentation submitted, including the submissions/observations received in relation to the proposed development, and inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional and national policies and guidance, it is considered that the main issues for assessment relate to:

- Principle of Proposed Development / Compliance with Zoning
- Access, Movement and Parking
- Impact on Residential And Visual Amenity (including conservation area)
- Impact on Protected Structure

11.1 Principle of Proposed Development

The proposal is for retention of a reduction in the width of the existing vehicular entrance on Leinster Road West from 5.5m to 4m, with new 2m high rendered block piers finished with granite capping in lieu of the previous red brick piers and a new rendered 1.9m high block wall separating the front and rear gardens, incorporating 2.1m high rendered block piers with granite capping.

Permission is also sought to erect new electrified wrought-iron gates (4.0m wide x 1.8m high) to the vehicular entrance on Leinster Road West and new metal framed, timber panel gates (3.6m wide x 2m high) in the wall separating the front & rear gardens.

Under the current Dublin City Development Plan (2022-2028) the site has zoning objective Z2 – ‘to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas’. Section 14.7.2 states that Z2-zoned areas consist of extensive groupings of buildings and associated open spaces, with an attractive quality of architectural design and scale, such that they require special care in dealing with development proposals which affect both protected and non-protected structures in such areas. The general objective is to protect the area from unsuitable new developments or works that would have a negative impact on its amenity or architectural quality. The principal land-use encouraged is housing but a limited range of other uses can be considered, with the guiding principle being to enhance the architectural quality of the streetscape and the area, and to protect the residential character of the area. Z2-zoned areas do not have a statutory basis, but are recognised as areas that have conservation merit and importance and warrant protection through zoning and policy application.

No floor plans have been submitted for the existing house and no details of the existing use have been given. The site history shows two refusals of permission for a creche in the building, both in the early 2000s. Permission was refused by An Coimisiún Pleanála for change of use of two residential units within the building to a creche, following a grant of permission by Dublin City Council. Permission was also refused for retention of change of use from first floor residential to use as a creche/Montessori school. Although the enforcement file from 2001, relating to a creche

use at the upper level, referred to permission for a creche at the lower level, this appears to be the permission which was overturned by An Bord Pleanála in November 2001. The enforcement file was subsequently closed on the basis that the use had ceased. The authorised use of the building therefore appears to be residential. Full details of the existing use would be required to ascertain whether the house is in use as a single dwelling or in multiple occupancy.

The proposal for alterations to the vehicular access arrangements to a residential building can be considered in principle within the Z2 zoning, subject to compliance with the standards and policies set out in the development plan, and to the proposal having no undue adverse impact on the residential and visual amenities of the surrounding area or on the setting of the existing building which is a protected structure.

11.2 Access, Movement and Parking

The proposal relates to an existing 4m wide vehicular entrance from Leinster Road West to the front garden of the house, accessing a car parking area in front of the house. The entrance is from the side road, but is forward of the front building line. The front boundary, remains intact. It is stated that the proposal is for retention of the reduction in the opening from 5.5m to 4m. It is unclear whether the previous 5.5m wide opening was ever authorised; however, according to street view images it was in situ since prior to 2009. The previous entrance had two red brick piers, while the new entrance has two 2m high concrete block piers. It is also proposed to retain a new rendered 1.9m high block wall separating the front and rear gardens, incorporating 2.1m high rendered block piers with granite capping. Permission is also sought for new electrified wrought iron gates (4.0m wide x 1.8m high) to the existing vehicular entrance, and for new metal framed, timber panel gates (3.6m wide x 2.0 metre high) in the wall separating the front and rear gardens.

Section 4.3 of Appendix 5 of the Dublin City Development Plan (2022-2028) sets out policies and standards in relation to car parking in front gardens. The report from Transportation Planning Division (TPD) notes that Section 4.3.1 of Appendix 5 states that vehicular entrances should 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 planning authority will have regard to the road and footway layout, the impact on on-street parking provision (formal or informal), traffic conditions and sightlines. For a single dwelling, the opening should be at least 2.5m or at most 3m wide. The basic dimensions to accommodate the footprint of a car within a front garden are 3m x 5m, with adequate space also required for manoeuvring and circulation.

The TPD report notes that third party observations raise concerns relating to the proposed height of the entrance gates and the proposed electrified wrought-iron gates. The existing vehicular entrance from Leinster Road West is noted. Leinster Road West is a two-way local residential street with a mix of controlled on-street parking, including pay and display parking, permit parking and local parking restrictions, including double yellow lines, in the vicinity of the site. There are no street trees, utility poles or other significant items of street furniture that would materially impact on the proposal.

The report acknowledges that the proposal would reduce the width of the existing entrance from 5.5m to 4m; however, this still exceeds the maximum permissible width for a single vehicular entrance which is 3m, as set out in Section 4.3.1 of Appendix 5. TPD therefore does not support the retention of the proposed 4m wide entrance and also has concerns regarding the height of the associated entrance piers and electrified gates, in terms of potential impacts on driver visibility and safe ingress and egress of vehicles. Vehicular entrances are required to be designed so as to avoid the creation of a traffic hazard or conflict with pedestrians and to maintain adequate visibility for road users. In this regard, the proposed boundary treatment associated with the vehicular entrance is considered excessive in height in proximity to the access arrangement.

TPD have no objection to the retention of the rendered block wall separating the front and rear, or to the proposed metal framed timber panel gates within the internal boundary wall separating the front and rear garden areas, as these would not give rise to external transportation or traffic safety concerns; however, it is not clear why 3.6m wide vehicular gates are required for access to the rear garden. Overall, the report recommends refusal of permission, for reasons relating to the excessive height of the pillars and gates, which would result in reduced sightlines, and would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard, and to the width of the entrance which exceeds the development plan maximum. This recommendation is in accordance with development plan provisions.

11.3 Impact on Residential and Visual Amenity

The site is situated in a residential conservation area which includes Leinster Road, Leinster Road West, Kenilworth Square and surrounding areas, most of which comprise terraces of two and three-storey houses dating from the nineteenth century. Section 14.7.2 of the development plan states that the planning authority will encourage development which enhances the setting and character of conservation areas. Policy BHA9 is '*to protect the special interest and character of all Dublin's Conservation Areas – identified under Z8 and Z2 zoning objectives and denoted by red line conservation hatching on the zoning maps*'. Development within or affecting such areas must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible.

Section 4.3.7 of Appendix 5 of the development plan sets out standards and policies for vehicular entrances within the curtilage of protected structures and in conservation areas. Section 4.3.7 notes that features such as boundary walls, railings and gardens make an important contribution to the character and setting of protected structures, ACAs and conservation areas and poorly designed parking can therefore have a negative impact on the special interest and character of these sensitive buildings and areas, leading to erosion of the character and amenity of the area, particularly where the historic plinths, decorative railings and gates, historic gate piers, and historic ground surfaces are still intact. Where site conditions can accommodate car parking without significant loss of visual amenity and/or historic fabric, proposals for limited off-street parking will be considered.

The vehicular entrance to be retained is 4m wide and is situated on Leinster Road West, accessing the front garden from the side where the boundary consists of a low wall, with two 2m high concrete block piers. There is a traditional style lamp standard a short distance from the northern pier. The entrance leads to a hard surfaced area directly in front of the house. The surface treatment is not stated, but appears to be tarmac. The drawings show new 1.8m high gates which resemble traditional railings. These were not in situ at the time of inspection. A hedge is shown behind the boundary wall. At the time of inspection, there was a hedge behind the front (northern) section of wall but not behind the southern section. The main front boundary railings remain, with a high hedge behind.

Having regard to the criteria set out in Section 4.3.7, there are concerns in relation to the design and scale of the vehicular entrance and associated block piers which are proposed for retention. While it is accepted that the proposal provides for a reduction in width relative to the previous entrance on the site, the 4m width significantly exceeds the recommended maximum width of 2.6m. While the previous red brick piers were suburban in style and incompatible with the streetscape, the existing 2m high block piers are considered to be excessive in scale and out of character of the building, setting an undesirable precedent.

11.4 Impact on Protected Structure

The existing house is also a protected structure. Development plan policy BHA2 is that development will conserve and enhance protected structures and their curtilage. The report from the Conservation Officer (CO) notes that the existing building is a three-bay, single-storey over raised basement semi-detached house, built c.1860, on a corner site at the junction of Leinster Road with Leinster Road West and set back from the road with a front, side and rear garden. Vehicular access is currently provided through the recently constructed unauthorised entrance from Leinster Road West, which is the subject of an open enforcement file (see site history). Historic railings survive at the front boundary to Leinster Road, currently concealed from view by a hedge, with a visible gap in the railings where the historic pedestrian gate was located. The front garden has been altered since the original arrangement and comprises a plain flat grass lawn at the northern end, which is now disconnected from Leinster Road, and a large tarmac car parking area in front of the protected structure, with a lowered area giving access to the lower ground floor level.

The report notes that the planning status of the previously existing 5.5m wide modern vehicular entrance, low brick piers, and cement rendered block wall on Leinster Road West is not clear, while it is also not known whether there was an earlier screen wall between the front and rear gardens adjoining the west elevation of the protected structure; however, the recently constructed high block wall adjoining the protected structure and the 3.6m wide vehicular entrance, between high piers, which replaced a weathered timber fence and previous pedestrian gate, are

unauthorised. While the previous arrangement did not enhance or positively contribute to the setting of the protected structure, the height of the boundary wall and piers generally reflected the height of the historic boundary railing along Leinster Road, while the timber fence may have related to the height of the historic rubble stone boundary wall to the side garden along Leinster Road West.

The CO report notes that it is not clear when the earlier alterations to the garden arrangement, western boundary and front entrance and the subdivision of the side garden, were instigated, although they have been in existence since 2009 or earlier as seen on street view images. A historic map shows the historic entrance, front, side and rear garden arrangement, with the side garden appearing as a separate walled garden plot extending down to No. 1 Leinster Road West.

The applicant has submitted a conservation method statement, consisting of a single page which states that the proposal will have no impact on the protected structure. The CO report notes that no AHIA has been submitted and the unauthorised works do not show any evidence of the conservation expertise required for appropriate works to the boundary of this protected structure. The previous arrangement also had a significant adverse impact on the architectural character of the protected structure and its relationship with the receiving streetscapes, including the loss of the historic gate to the front entrance from Leinster Road. While it is accepted that these works occurred a number of years ago, it is unacceptable to carry out unauthorised works to a protected structure without the input of a conservation professional or consultation with the planning authority to avoid further erosion of the character and setting of the protected structure and the historic streetscape.

The CO report notes the provisions of the 2011 Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines, as quoted in Section 4.3.7 of Appendix 5, which state that changes within the curtilage of a building, including alterations to the boundary, are works that materially alter the character of the building, while relocating a gateway may destroy a carefully designed relationship between the entrance and the main building, with features including boundary walls, railings and gardens making an important contribution to the character and setting of protected structures, ACAs and conservation areas. For all works involving protected structures, in order to protect their fabric, character, setting and integrity, it is expected that a conservation expert with proven conservation expertise is employed to complete the appropriate assessment of the significance of the structure, and to design and specify appropriate works of sufficient quality to the boundary of this protected structure. Having regard to the RIAI Skills Matrix, a Grade 2 Conservation Architect would be required in this case.

It is also noted that minimal information is provided (drawing and photographs) on the previous and existing vehicular entrance and fence/wall/piers between the front and side gardens, with insufficient critical dimensions for comparison purposes. Dimensions should be given for the setback of the former timber fence from the corner of the protected structure, the height of the previous timber fence and top of the string course on the protected structure, the heights of the historic coursed rubble stone wall, the height of the existing block wall and previously existing piers, the height of the historic railings along the Leinster Road boundary and the position and width of the former entrance.

A contiguous west elevation would also be required for both the previously existing and current arrangement, clearly showing the position and height of the previously existing timber fence and the recently executed wall and gate piers, with key dimensions. Photographs of the previous and existing arrangements would also be required, which should include the wider context of the protected structure and its curtilage and boundaries onto Leinster Road and Leinster Road West. An existing and proposed overall site plan would also be required to facilitate a proper assessment of the proposal. Sufficient information would be required to describe the previously existing works and recently constructed works and to demonstrate the impacts of the proposal on the setting and architectural character of the entirety of the protected structure, its curtilage and adjacent protected structures and the residential conservation area.

The CO report also notes that both the previous width (5.5m) and the recently amended width (4m) of the gates significantly exceed the maximum 3m width set out in Section 4.3.1 of Appendix 5 and the maximum 2.6m width in the case of protected structures, ACAs and conservation areas, as set out in Section 4.3.7 of Appendix 5. It is also unclear why a 3.6m wide gate is required between the front and side gardens in place of what would have been a pedestrian gate, and this

width would be disproportionate within what is a relatively narrow and small side garden in close proximity to the protected structure and surviving historic boundary wall.

The CO also considers that the height and width of the recently developed unauthorised vehicular entrance and piers on the western boundary to Leinster Road West are excessive and give rise to an unacceptable adverse and injurious visual impact on the setting of the protected structure, particularly as the remainder of the boundary is relatively low. The existing arrangement is not supported, and it is recommended that the entrance width is reduced to comply with the requirements of Sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.7 unless extenuating circumstances can be demonstrated. The height of the gate and gate piers should also be reduced to reflect the height of the previously existing block wall and piers on Leinster Road West and the historic railings on Leinster Road.

The recently constructed wall, piers and entrance between the front and side (rear) gardens are also considered to give rise to an unacceptable adverse and injurious visual impact on the architectural character and setting of the protected structure and the historic rubble stone wall. The wall between the front and side gardens would need to be redesigned and reduced in height to avoid an awkward junction with the historic wall. The proposed gate and piers should also be revised and reduced in width to reflect a more appropriate connection between the gardens, and to reduce the adverse and injurious visual impact on the architectural character and setting of the protected structure and the historic stone wall.

The report concludes that the previous and recent interventions, if permitted in their current format, would set an unacceptable precedent, and that this should be rectified through proper procedures. The report recommends seeking further information, to include a comprehensive AHIA and drawings showing a revised arrangement of the vehicular entrance onto Leinster Road West, removing and replacing the high gate piers with new piers to be slightly higher than the existing rendered block boundary wall, reducing the width of the entrance to between 2.6m – 3.0m in width and 1:20 drawings of mechanised double gates to match the existing historic railings along Leinster Road.

The CO considers that a revised design of the proposed gates and wall between the front and side (rear) gardens, would also be required, reducing the height of the wall and gate to suit the height of the historic coursed rubble stone wall onto Leinster Road West, with details of a sympathetic junction between the new boundary and the existing stone wall. If a contemporary timber gate is proposed, this should be designed to the highest standards and enhance rather than detract from the architectural character and setting of the protected structure. It would be preferable to provide a well-designed high-quality timber fence and gate in this location rather than the proposed over-scaled rendered concrete wall, piers and gate, which would detract from the architectural character of the protected structure.

While it is accepted that the CO wishes to address the issues of concern through a request for further information, the proposal is for retention of the as-constructed entrance and gate piers and new wall and it would therefore not be feasible to seek revisions by way of further information. Having regard to this, and to the serious concerns in relation to the excessive width of the entrance, the height of the piers, visibility and traffic hazard, in addition to the impact on the character and setting of the protected structure and the residential conservation area, it is considered that permission should be refused for retention of the gates and wall. The applicant would be advised to employ a conservation architect and consult with the CO prior to making a submission for an amended proposal, which should include an AHIA and drawings and details showing the proposed and previously existing arrangements, including contextual drawings.

While permission could be considered for the proposed new gates in the wall separating the front and rear gardens, the purpose of the gates is unclear and amendments would also be required to ensure an appropriate relationship with the protected structure and the existing stone boundary wall, as set out in the CO report. These could form part of a resubmitted application, submitted under the supervision of an appropriate conservation professional, which would include a revised proposal for the main vehicular gate. Having regard to this, it is considered that permission should be refused in this instance.

12.0 Screening for Appropriate Assessment

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, and the distance to the nearest European site, it is considered that significant effects are not likely to arise, either alone or

in combination with other plans and projects that will result in significant effects to any Natura 2000 area. A full Appropriate Assessment of this project is therefore not required.

13.0 Environmental Impact Assessment

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and the distance of the site from nearby sensitive receptors, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

14.0 Conclusion

Having regard to the zoning of the site and the provisions of the current Dublin City Development Plan (2022-2028), it is considered that the proposed development does not accord with the policies and objectives of the development plan or with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. It is therefore recommended that permission be refused.

15.0 Recommendation

Refuse Permission

It is recommended that permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The boundary wall to the vehicular entrance, including pillars and gates, at a height of 2.0 metres, together with the excessive entrance width of 4 metres, results in reduced sightlines and poor visibility for drivers exiting the site across a public footpath. The proposed development to be retained therefore gives rise to a traffic hazard and endangers public safety. Furthermore, the vehicular entrance width exceeds the maximum permitted for a single residential dwelling as set out under Section 4.3.1 of Appendix 5 of the Dublin City Development Plan (2022-2028). The development is therefore contrary to the provisions of the Development Plan and would set an undesirable precedent for similar development in the area, contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Having regard to the zoning objective for the site, which is Z2, to protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas, it is considered that the boundary treatment, including the excessive width of the vehicular entrance (4 metres), the height of the gate piers and gates, and the design of the internal boundary, would constitute an inappropriate and visually intrusive intervention within the curtilage of a Protected Structure. The proposal undermines the historic character and setting of the Protected Structure and detracts from the adjoining stone boundary wall. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies BHA2 and BHA9 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, Section 4.3.7 of Appendix 5, and the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines (2011). The development would, in itself and by the precedent it would set, seriously injure the visual amenities of the area and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.