



Planning and Development Acts 2000 to 2022

Planning Authority: Dublin City Council

Planning Register Reference Number: 4310/23

APPEAL by Robert O’Riordan and Sean McConnon care of Manahan Planners, Town Planning Consultants of 38 Dawson Street, Dublin against the decision made on the 9th day of October, 2023 by Dublin City Council to refuse permission for the proposed development.

Proposed Development: The proposed development consists of the inclusion of an LED digital display sign (three metres high by 4.50 metres wide by 150 millimetres deep) which will carry a series of alternating static advertisement (six per minute), at 1B Mountjoy Street, and the replacement of the existing illuminated advertising sign (three metres high by six metres wide by 600 millimetres deep) and first and second floor level at 51 Donnybrook Road, Dublin. If granted, the permission would be on the basis of decommissioning in line with the outdoor advertising policy of Dublin City Council, two outdoor signs located.

Decision

REFUSE permission for the above proposed development in accordance with the reasons and considerations set out below.

Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the location of the site in Donnybrook Village, it is considered that the proposed development, due to its size, would be visually intrusive, would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area, would be out of character and, therefore, would not be sensitive to the setting. The proposed sign would not be in accordance with Appendix 17 of the Dublin City Council Development Plan 2022-2028 in respect to replacement signs and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

In deciding not to accept the Inspector's recommendation to grant permission, the Board concurred with the planning authority that the proposed sign would be visually intrusive, would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area, would be out of character and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

The Board considered the development plan, the land use zoning for the site, policy CCUV45 and Appendix 17. The Board also considered the reduction in the size of the sign proposed relative to the size of the existing sign was not sensitive to its setting, having regard to the size of the sign relative to the façade of the building, particularly the width of the building.

The Board also noted that the applicant had not demonstrated that the existing sign has been in place for seven years, provided details of the use of the structure opposite that has windows above ground level fronting the gable, or provided evidence that licences were in place for the signs that the applicant proposed to remove at Mountjoy Street. Having regard to the substantive reasons for refusal the Board did not pursue these issues.



Mary Henchy

Member of An Bord Pleanála

**duly authorised to authenticate
the seal of the Board.**

Dated this 17th day of June 2024.