

An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Direction
CD-021989-26
ABP-320514-24


The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 09/03/2026.

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

Planning

Commissioner:

Date: 12/03/2026


Mary Gurrie

DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER

Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the sensitivity and heritage value of the subject site, a protected structure located on a prominent corner on one of the key streets in Dublin's Georgian core, to the height, design and form of the proposed development, and to the articulation and relationship of the proposed blocks to the rear of the retained façade of the south wing and carriage arch, it is considered that the proposed construction of a 5-7 storey hotel within the curtilage of the protected structure would be overly dominant and overbearing in views to and from the protected structure and would detract from the prevailing height, scale and appearance of the surrounding streetscape. The proposed development would seriously injure the special character and appearance of the protected structure, contrary to Policy BHA2 of the Dublin

City Development Plan, 2022- 2028, and would fail to protect the special interest and character of the Georgian conservation area or to contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness contrary to Policy BHA9 (Conservation Areas) and would therefore, by itself and by the precedent it would create, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Notes:

Having regard to the nature and location of the proposed hotel use, it is considered that the applicant has not appropriately addressed the stated provisions of Policies CEE28 (Visitor Accommodation) in relation to the mix of uses and level of visitor accommodation in the area, or of Sections 15.14.1 (Hotels and Aparthotels) and 15.4.1.1 (Hotel Development) in relation to the provision of activity and publicly accessible facilities at street level. While ordinarily this would warrant further consideration and a request for further information, in this instance given the substantive reasons for refusal above, it was decided not to pursue these matters under the current appeal.