



**An
Bord
Pleanála**

**Board Direction
BD-015692-24
ABP-317431-23**

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 22/02/2024.

The Board decided to refuse permission, generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, for the following reasons and considerations.

Reasons and Considerations

1. It is considered that the proposed development, by reason of its location within the riparian corridor of the River Griffeen, its proximity to the river and associated watercourse to the north of the subject site, and having regard to the inadequate details provided with the application and appeal, including the absence of a hydromorphological assessment of the river and riparian corridor, would fail to protect the integrity of the riparian corridor. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to GI3 Objectives 2 and 3 and Section 12.4.3 of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028 and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. It is considered in the absence of a comprehensive architectural heritage and visual impact assessment, that on the basis of the information submitted with the application and appeal, the Board cannot be satisfied that the proposed telecommunications infrastructure by reason of its height, design and siting would not result in a visually dominant feature that would have a significant adverse impact on the character, setting, special interest of the Protected

Structure Esker House (Ref. 101) and its curtilage. In this regard, it is considered that the proposed development, on the basis of the information submitted with the application and appeal, would be contrary to Section 12.3.7 (iv), NCBH19 Objectives 1 and 2 of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Note 1:

The Board the recommendation of the Inspector to refuse permission on the basis of a lack of information regarding options with respect to co-location with other existing and permitted masts in the vicinity of the site. Specifically, the Board noted the commentary of the inspector regarding a separate, recent grant of permission, however as noted by the Inspector, that permitted mast is over 1 km from the subject site. Having considered the totality of the documentation on file, including the submissions of the planning authorities and all parties and observers, the Board considered that a refusal on this issue was not warranted in this instance.

Note 2:

The Board noted the judgement of the Inspector whereby he did not consider that there is a visual impact on the setting of the protected structure. The Board recognised the judgement of the Inspector in this regard. However, having considered the totality of the documentation on file, the Board concluded that the architectural heritage and visual information submitted by the applicant was insufficient to reach such a conclusion. For example, a broader assessment of the protected structure, in terms of its context with more modern structures already built in its curtilage, along with additional images from parkland areas showing the relationship in views of the proposed mast with the protected structure (and associated more modern structures in its curtilage) would be considered necessary to reach a final determination on the potential impact of the proposed development on the protected structure.

Board Member



Chris McGarry

Date: 04/03/2024