An Coimisiún Pleanála

Commission Direction
CD-001450
PL-501685-DS-26

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a meeting held on 23 October 2026.

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

Planning Commissioner: Mary Gurrie

Mary Gurrie

Date: 29/10/2026

DRAFT WORDING FOR ORDER

Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the special architectural quality of the subject site within its wider context, and its role as a central landscape element to the unified design, setting and character of the adjoining designated Z2 conservation area and the protected structures of Mount Pleasant Square that surround it, the Commission considers

that it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed development, including the proposed acoustic canopy and the design and height of same, would not result in an adverse effect on the special interest and the architectural heritage of the place by reason of visual obtrusiveness, or that it would be adequately screened throughout the year by the trees proposed to be retained. The proposed development would be contrary to policy BHA9 (Conservation Areas) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 which requires development within or affecting a Conservation Area to contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and to take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Notes:

1. The Commission noted the inspector's second recommended reason for refusal. Having regard to the revised Report on Proposed Floodlighting Installation submitted at further information, the urban setting of the proposed development and the proposed hours of operation, the Commission was satisfied that the proposed lighting would not give rise to adverse impact on the residential amenity of surrounding properties and did not consider that a refusal of permission was warranted on this basis.

2. The Commission noted the inspector's third recommended reason for refusal but considered that any shortcoming on the quality of the bicycle parking spaces could be addressed by condition and that a refusal of permission was not warranted on this basis.

3. The Commission noted the inspector's fourth recommended reason for refusal. While the Commission had concerns about the lack of assessment of

the screening effect of the trees on site as outlined in the reason for refusal above, having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, the revisions made at further information stage, including the reduction from three padel courts to two padel courts and the retention of the trees along the boundary, the Commission considered that the loss of three trees within the site did not warrant refusal of permission and that the protection of the existing trees could be addressed through a construction management plan.