An Coimisiún Pleanála

# Direction
# CD-022594-26
# ABP-321996-25

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 28/10/2026.

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

**Planning Commissioner:** Marie O'Connor **Date:** 04/11/2026

Marie O'Connor

**DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER**

**Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to the pattern of development in the vicinity, the design, height and scale of the proposed development within a suburban streetscape and its relationship with adjoining and neighbouring buildings in the immediate vicinity, it is considered that the proposed development fails to comply with the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, in particular the objectives of the height strategy set out in Table 3 of Appendix 3 and the provisions of the Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines for Planning Authorities issued by the Department of Housing, Planning and Local Government in December, 2018 in which there is a requirement for taller buildings to form a positive response to the overall built environment as part of contributing to the urban neighbourhood and

streetscape. The proposed development would be visually obtrusive and would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

**Note:**

The Commission shared the opinion of the Inspector that the amendments proposed in the revised 86 unit scheme, with an increase in height from 3 to 4 storeys at the northern end of both blocks, submitted to the Commission in response to the Section 132 notice would represent a material alteration to that proposed under the public notices and would warrant wider public consultation. The Commission shared the view of the Inspector that the revised 86 unit proposed development would represent a more appropriate height and scale for the site. However, given the nature of the amendments proposed the Commission agreed with the inspector that although the tallest part of both Block A and Block B have been reduced the particular disposition of the volume and thus the visual impact of the main body of the blocks remains problematic.