



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-322811-25

Development	Replace illuminated advert with illuminated digital advert and remove two adverts on land adjacent to 45 Dolphins Barn Road
Location	109 Rathgar Road, Dublin 6
Planning Authority	Dublin City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	WEB1680/25
Applicant(s)	JcDecaux Ireland Limited
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	JcDecaux Ireland Limited
Observer(s)	Brigitte de la Malene - Rathgar Residents Association
Date of Site Inspection	2 nd September 2025
Inspector	Tony Quinn

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located on the Rathgar Road, close to its intersection with Highfield Road, Orwell Road and Rathgar Avenue. The existing advertising display to be replaced is situated on the northern site boundary of Christ Church Presbyterian Church, which is a protected structure (RPS 7082). The display is situated opposite a number of commercial units and the four storey Sherborne apartment block on the Rathgar Road.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development consists of the replacement of 1No. internally illuminated 6.4m x 3.4m advertising display with 1 No. digital 6.28m x 3.4m advertising display at 109 Rathgar Road and the permanent removal of 2 No. 6.3m x 3.3m advertising displays on the Grand Canal bank at Dolphins Barn Bridge, adjacent to 45 Dolphins Barn Road, Dublin 8.
- 2.2. At the site visit there were 3 freestanding advertising hoardings at the Dolphins Barn Road location, one of which was currently being used for advertising. The third hoarding is proposed for decommissioning in connection with planning application WEB1705/25, which was granted planning permission on 12th Aug 2025.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

Decision

- 3.1. The City Council refused permission on 23rd May 2025 on two grounds.
- 3.2. The first reason stated that by reason of its location adjacent to a Protected Structure and its scale, dominant proportions and visibility, it would be inconsistent with Section 15.15.2.3 (Protected Structures), Policy Objective BHA2 (Development of Protected Structures), and Policy BHA9 (Conservation Areas) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022- 2028, and would in general be inconsistent with Policy CCUV45 (Advertising Structures) and Appendix 17 (Advertising and Signage Strategy) of the development plan.

- 3.3. The second reason for refusal stated that the Council was not satisfied on the basis of the information submitted that the advertising displays proposed for removal represented a sufficient planning gain with regard to the rationalisation of external media advertising within the public realm and the proposal is therefore not in accordance with Appendix 17 (Advertising and Signage Strategy) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.

Planning Authority Reports

Planning Report

- 3.4. The planning report states that the application is in the grounds of a protected church (RPS 7082) and on lands zoned Z15 for Community and Social Infrastructure.
- 3.5. Attention is drawn to earlier refusals by the Board and by the local authority on the same site (App Ref: PL29S.206139, PA Ref: 5692/03).
- 3.6. Subsequent to these refusals the report highlights two cases of enforcement in 2016/2017 (E0275/17 and E0570/16) in respect of the site, which were closed on the basis that back lighting and the hoarding were exempted development.
- 3.7. The planning report states that “it would have liked” the proposed decommissioning of the two signs at the Grand Canal to have been located in the Rathgar area.
- 3.8. It states that the proposal is not on a radial route but in Zone 6, which is predominantly residential in character and where advertising would be visually inappropriate. It also states that it is contrary to Policy BHA2 in that it will not conserve and enhance the protected structure and will negatively impact its special character and appearance.
- 3.9. While the absence of a road objection is noted, refusal is still recommended as per the wording in the decision notice.

Other Technical Reports

Transportation Planning Division Report

- 3.10. The Transportation Planning Division Report concluded that it had no objection to the proposal on traffic/pedestrian safety grounds subject to technical conditions relating to the timing, illuminance and nature of display. Conditions relating to the submission of a Construction Management Plan and financial costs on the part of the applicant are also recommended.

The Report makes the following comments:

- The previous refusal in 2003 (5692/02) was not transport related.
- The proposed display is similar in scale and brightness to the existing display.
- The display is mounted 2.3m above ground level but does not overhang the footpath. ESB/IT cabinets are proposed to the front of the sign on the public footpath but are set back and will not interfere with pedestrian/cycle movement.
- A 50km/h speed limit applies to this major arterial route.
- Advertisements will be displayed once every 10 seconds by fade transition. Maximum luminance will not exceed 250 candelas per sqm.
- The Report notes that the advert will be turned to sleep mode for a minimum of 4 hours each night, though they did not recommend this as a planning condition.

Drainage Report

- 3.11. The Drainage Report equally offered no objections to the proposed development subject to developer compliance with the Greater Dublin Regional Code of Practice for Drainage Works.

Prescribed Bodies

There is an electronic record on file of the planning authority seeking the views of Uisce Eireann, who did not respond. There is no record of other prescribed bodies having been consulted.

Third Party Observations

- 3.12. Two third party objections to the local authority are on file – one made by a person on behalf of the Rathgar Residents Association and one made by an individual from Sandymount on behalf of two unnamed elderly occupants of the apartments opposite. There is also a letter of support from the site owner, namely the church.
- 3.13. The following grounds of objection are stated on behalf of the Residents Association:

- The Board refused a scrolling display in 2004 on the grounds of intensification of use and visual prominence in a residential conservation area and next to a protected structure.
- There is a similar advert facing in the same direction by the same company 50m away at 91 Rathgar Road.
- The sign faces residential properties and will injure their amenities.
- The applicant's assertion that it will lead to a reduction in signage is misleading.
- The removal of signage at Dolphins bar is of no assistance to the Rathgar area.

The objection made on behalf of the elderly residents states that:

- Light from the existing sign shines into their bedrooms and this will be exacerbated by digital advertising 24 hours a day.
- The existing sign does not have planning permission and should be refused.
- The sign advertises the sale of alcohol which is contrary to initial advice given by the church.

- The current display is a box structure when once it was a flat board.

3.14. In contrast to the above, the Church expressed its support for the proposed development on the grounds that the advertising revenue helps maintain the church and its outreach activities as a whole.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. There is no record of planning permission having been granted for this advertising display, which apparently dates from the 1980s.
- 4.2. An application (PA Ref:5692/03) and an appeal (PL29S.206139) to replace it with a scroll-down display were both refused in 2003/2004. The Board determined that it would constitute an intensification of use of this prominent site, would be out of character and would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area. No policy in the Development Plan was cited, though it was located in a residential conservation area at that time.
- 4.3. As noted in the planner's report, there were two instances of enforcement action against the advert regarding the hoarding (E0570/16) and back-lighting (E0275/17), both of which were closed as exempted development.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. Under the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 the site is located in zone Z15 'Community and Social Infrastructure', which has the zoning objective to protect and provide for community uses and social infrastructure'. Advertisement and advertising structures are neither permissible uses nor open for consideration in this zoning. Paragraph 14.3.1 of the Development Plan states that there will be a presumption against uses not listed as permissible or open for consideration in eight zonings including Z15.
- 5.1.2. Balanced against this, and as acknowledged in the planner's report, it can be inferred from Section 14.5 of the Development Plan that the proposed development

is a non-conforming use. It states that the extension and improvement of such uses will be assessed on their merits, with particular regard made to their impact on the amenities of premises in the vicinity.

- 5.1.3. Appendix 17 of the Development Plan outlines the advertising and signage strategy for the City and details specific guidance for Digital signage. It identifies 6 zones of advertising control. It states that *“any upgrading and/ or replacement of existing outdoor advertising (e.g. trivision, scrolling, electronic, digital) will only be permitted if it is acceptable in amenity/ safety terms and an agreement is made to decommission at least one other display panel in the city and to extinguish the licence for that panel. The purpose of this measure is to ensure that other operators do not use the site. Where such an arrangement is not feasible, consideration may be given to replacement signage which would be of a significantly smaller scale; sensitive to the setting; and, of high quality, robust design and materials.”*
- 5.1.4. Reference to Figure 1 of Appendix 17 indicates that the subject site is located within Zone 6 which *“...consists of areas predominantly residential in character where outdoor advertising would be visually inappropriate.”* However, within this zone, it is also acknowledged that there are areas of commercial land-use which may have the potential to accommodate outdoor advertising.
- 5.1.5. Appendix 17 of the Development Plan also states that applications for digital signage should comply with the following design criteria:
- *Set out the details for the material, finishes and colours of the signage structure.*
 - *The maximum luminance of the advertisement display between dusk and dawn shall not exceed 300 candelas per square metre.*
 - *Only static images without movement shall be permitted, i.e. no animation, flashing, three dimensional effects, noise, smoke or full motion video shall be permitted without a prior grant of planning permission.*
 - *No more than one advertisement shall be displayed every ten seconds.*
 - *The mechanism of changing the digital advertising display shall be by means of a fade transition of the display at intervals of 10 seconds or more.*

- 5.1.6. Policy BHA2 of the Development Plan seeks to conserve and enhance protected structures and their curtilage. To this end, ten guidance criteria are listed which collectively aim to prevent proposed development negatively impacting the special character and appearance of Protected Structures.
- 5.1.7. Figure 7.1 of the Development Plan identifies Rathgar as an urban village and the first reason for refusal cites the relevance of Policy CCUV45 relating to Advertising Structures. It reads as follows: *“To consider appropriately designed and located advertising structures primarily with reference to the zoning objectives and permitted advertising uses and of the outdoor advertising strategy (Appendix 17). In all such cases, the structures must be of high-quality design and materials, and must not obstruct or endanger road users or pedestrians, nor impede free pedestrian movement and accessibility of the footpath or roadway.”*
- 5.1.8. Policy BHA9 of the Development Plan pertains to Conservation Areas and states that *“Development within or affecting a Conservation Area must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness.”*

5.2. National Policy

There are a number of National Policy Objectives of the National Planning Framework relevant to this proposal. These include:

- National Policy Objective 17 - Enhance, integrate and protect the special physical, social, economic and cultural value of built heritage assets through appropriate and sensitive use now and for future generations.
- National Policy Objective 60 - Conserve and enhance the rich qualities of natural and cultural heritage of Ireland in a manner appropriate to their significance.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

There are no natural heritage designations at, or in the vicinity of, the subject site.

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of this report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The first party grounds of appeal are as follows:

- This is an upgrade of an established use rather than an application for new development.
- The site is located in the Z3 advertising zone for radial/orbital routes. Note by Inspector - this is inaccurate and will be clarified in the assessment section of this report.
- The site is not in the curtilage of a protected structure. An architectural report submitted with the appeal highlights the historical 25 inch map of 1888-1913. It indicates an enclosed perimeter for the church and lodge which excludes the site and parking to the rear.
- The backdrop to the signage consists of trees as opposed to the church.
- The site has been used for advertising for over 60 years. Note by Inspector – no evidence going back this far is on file to corroborate this assertion.
- The proposed decommissioning of the two adverts on the Grand Canal is part of a wider citywide strategy to remove signs while modernising others. The removal of these two displays will result in a net reduction in the Council area of 36m² of signage.
- The sign is located on the footpath on the outer edge of the Z15 zoning. It is an established commercial use situated on a transitional zone between residential and community and social infrastructure. Note by Inspector – while the sign

overhangs the footpath its fixings are located within the fenceline of the church parking.

- Citing the Professional Lighting Guide (PLG 05) the maximum recommended luminance for a City Centre site (Zone E4) is 300 cd/m². Note – this is not a City Centre site according to the Development Plan. Accordingly, in lighting terms, it is located in an E3 suburban location, though the maximum luminance of 300 cd/m² still applies.
- Eight examples of permission for replacement advertising in Dublin are provided, one of which related to a protected railway bridge structure and another to a railway bridge within the curtilage of protected structures.
- Reference in the Reason for Refusal to Policy Objective BHA9 for Conservation Areas does not apply as the site is not located in a Conservation Area.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

There is no record on file of the planning authority having made any observations on the appeal.

7.3. Observations

An initial observation submitted by the Rathgar Residents Association was returned as invalid due to the lack of name and address details. It was resubmitted and accepted as valid. It was essentially a resubmission of the objection made at Council level and addressed earlier in Section 3.13 of this report.

7.4. Prescribed bodies

Given that the proposed development may have an impact on a protected structure the Board invited submissions from the Heritage Council, Failte Ireland, Development Applications Unit, An Taisce and An Comhairle Ealaíon. No submissions were received.

8.0 **Assessment**

Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, and having inspected the site and having regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are as follows:

- Principle of development
- Architectural heritage
- Residential amenity
- Traffic and pedestrian safety

Each of these subject matters is considered below.

Principle of Development

- 8.1. The sign is an established non-conforming use and has been at this location for over 30 years. Chapter 14 of the Development Plan states that all such uses, where legally established (the appointed day being 1 October 1964) or where in existence longer than 7 years, shall not be subject to proceedings under the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) in respect of the continuing use. Its planning history records a number of enforcement incidents in 2016/2017 both of which were closed on the grounds that exempted development applied. The Development Plan further states that extensions to, or improvements of, premises accommodating such uses shall be considered on their merits. The proposed development is not an extension and it is debateable, from the perspective of amenity, whether it constitutes an improvement. However, it is considered that a replacement advertisement is similar in nature to these types of modification and accordingly it should be considered on its merits.
- 8.2. The appellants assert on the basis of a highly scaled zoning map that the proposed development is located on the edge of the footpath and outside land zoned for Z15 uses. However, the application was submitted with a letter of consent from the

Church and the current fixings are fenced in from the footpath, both of which would tend to confirm that zoning Z15 applies to the site.

- 8.3. As explained above, this replacement advertisement display is not for a new sign which would be categorically contrary to zoning objective Z15, which has a presumption against uses such as advertisements that are not listed as permissible or open for consideration. To reiterate therefore it is contended that the proposed replacement should be assessed on its merits.
- 8.4. The site is located in Advertising Control Zone 6, which applies to predominantly residential areas where advertising would be visually inappropriate. However this site is located on the edge of Rathgar village, with commercial uses located nearby. The site location is not considered predominantly residential in character.
- 8.5. Guidance for Digital signage in Appendix 17 of the Development Plan states that the acceptability of a replacement advertisement will be contingent on its impact on amenity/safety, together with an agreement to decommission at least one other display panel in the city. The subject proposal seeks to decommission two other freestanding hoardings located alongside each other in front of the side gable return of a public house next to the Grand Canal. At the site visit only one of these advertising boards was being used, perhaps in recognition of the screening impact of foliage along the Grand Canal. It faces onto Parnell Road and is visible to traffic heading north on the R110 Crumlin Road. Given its location at the rear of roadside property this signage straddles Advertising Control Zone 6 and Zone 3.
- 8.6. Development Plan policy in relation to decommissioning other signs does not specify that these should be located in the same area as the replacement sign being proposed. They just have to be in the same Council area. While it is noted that the two signs on the Grand Canal are 3.7kms away from the subject site they are prominently located within the Council area and entitled to be considered for removal under the Development Plan. Their decommissioning will result in the removal of 36 sqm of advertising signage and this is considered a positive contribution to the rationalisation of such hoardings in the City.
- 8.7. Overall, therefore, it is not considered that the proposed replacement advertising at the edge of the village and on the fringe of a Z15 zoning is contrary to the zoning objectives and Advertising and Signage Strategy outlined in the Development Plan.

Architectural heritage

- 8.8. This application is not in a Conservation Area (CA) and does not have implications for any neighbouring CA. The Council's Conservation Officer did not consider the need to make a submission on this application. The appellant maintains that the sign is not located on ground that forms part of the historical curtilage of the Church and this seems to be verified by reference to historical maps. However, the car parking area to the rear of the advertising display now forms part of its present curtilage and to all intents and purposes it is reasonable to conclude that it is located within the curtilage of the protected Church, albeit on its fringe.
- 8.9. The existing sign is therefore currently a feature of Z15 zoning and of the curtilage/setting of this protected structure. A number of trees will continue to provide the backdrop to the signage and its dimensions will not increase. Indeed, the thickness of the box will be more slimline and will decrease by 265mm from 610mm to 345mm. The site visit demonstrated that the advert is mainly visible to short range views from the Rathgar Road on travelling north, with medium distant views from Rathgar junction appreciably screened by the church's boundary planting. The signage is not visible to traffic travelling south towards Rathgar Village. Viewed in this context, it is not considered that the replacement will have any more of a visual impact on the protected structure and its curtilage than that associated with the present signage. In other words, impact will be neutral. Accordingly, it is not considered that the proposed development will undermine the architectural, historical and cultural integrity of the protected structure and its curtilage.

Residential amenity

- 8.10. The advertising display is opposite commercial premises and the four storey Sherbourne apartments, the latter of which are recessed from the roadside and approximately 35m away from the sign. Many of the views of these apartments are screened by intervening tree cover on their roadside boundary. Given this separation distance and the presence of intervening tree cover it is questionable whether changing digital displays as opposed to a static display will noticeably injure the amenities of these residents. Its size will not change and it will be no brighter. Any increase in visual impact is therefore likely to be marginal and it is doubtful if it

constitutes sufficient grounds on which to refuse the application in terms of residential amenity. In addition, the applicant JCDecaux states that, in keeping with its sustainability objectives, the screen would be turned to sleep mode for four hours every night. It is considered that this can be made a condition of planning permission, with the hours between midnight and 4am considered the darkest and most appropriate time during which to apply the sleep mode.

Traffic and pedestrian safety

- 8.11. The Council's Roads Section does not consider it a risk to road safety and pedestrian/cycle movement on the footway. I agree with this finding given that the sign is only visible to traffic travelling north from the Rathgar intersection towards Rathmines. The presence of the junction also has a traffic calming effect which helps slow vehicle speeds in this direction.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed replacement advertising display in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.2. The subject site is located approximately 5 kms from the nearest European Sites, namely South Dublin Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA).
- 9.3. The proposed development comprises the replacement of a non-digital signage display with a digital display of similar dimensions.
- 9.4. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reason for this conclusion is the small scale nature of the development; together with its distance from the nearest European site.
- 9.5. I conclude that, on the basis of objective information, the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

- 9.6. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The subject site is located approximately 830m from the nearest un-culverted watercourse, namely the River Dodder.
- 10.2. The proposed development comprises the replacement of a non-digital advertising board with a digital advertising board.
- 10.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.4. I have assessed the proposed replacement advert and associated works and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- 10.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- the small scale and nature of the development; and
 - The distance from nearest water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections.
- 10.6. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend that planning permission be granted for the reasons and considerations outlined below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

This is an application to replace established illuminated signage displaying a static advert with digital illuminated signage displaying changing adverts. It is not a new advertising development which would be contrary to zoning objective Z15 relating to Community and Social Infrastructure, which has a presumption against such uses. Added to this, while the site is located in Advertising Control Zone 6, where advertising is considered visually inappropriate in residential areas, the site is located on the edge of Rathgar Village and is not wholly located in an area that is predominantly residential in character.

Appendix 17 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 outlines the advertising and signage strategy for the City and states that any upgrading and/ or replacement of existing outdoor advertising (e.g. trivision, scrolling, electronic, digital) will only be permitted if it is acceptable in amenity/ safety terms and an agreement is made to decommission at least one other display panel in the city. The replacement will be erected at the same location and will be of similar dimensions and will generally have the same level of brightness. Its location on the fringe of the curtilage of the protected church structure, together with the surrounding presence of boundary planting, help to counter arguments that the setting of the church will be adversely affected under Development Plan Policy BHA2 relating to protected structures. Two other visually prominent advertisement hoardings on the Grand Canal will be removed as part of this proposed development, which will contribute to the rationalisation of their numbers in the City.

In the light of the foregoing, therefore, together with the fact that there is always the fallback position of the existing signage remaining, it is difficult to accept the contention that a changing digital image will noticeably tip the scales in terms of inducing an adverse effect on the character and amenity of this area. Furthermore, the 35m separation distance and presence of intervening tree planting helps mitigate impact on the amenity of residents, notably those in the Sherborne apartments opposite. Therefore, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not be contrary to the policies,

zoning objectives and Advertising and Signage Strategy of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, or the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. Notwithstanding the exempted development provisions of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, or any statutory provision amending or replacing them, no additional advertising signs or structures shall be displayed or erected on the building or within the curtilage of the site unless authorised by a further grant of planning permission.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

3. The mechanism of changing the digital advertising display shall be by means of a fade transition of the display at intervals of 10 seconds or more. No more than one advertisement shall be displayed every ten seconds. Any change to the nature of the advertising display including a flick or scroll transition between advertisements, shall be subject to a prior grant of planning permission.

Reason: In the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

4. The proposed development shall incorporate the following:

(a) The maximum luminance of the advertisement display between dusk and dawn shall not exceed 250 candelas per square metres (cd/m²). The luminance level of the display shall be subject to review by the planning authority and following review, adjustments or amendments shall be carried out in accordance with the requirements of the planning authority.

(b) Only static images without movement shall be permitted, that is, no animation, flashing, three dimensional effects, noise, smoke or full motion video shall be permitted without a prior grant of planning permission.

(c) The advertisement display shall be turned to sleep mode for four hours every night between midnight and 4am.

Reason: To ensure the signs do not have any adverse effect on the amenity of the area or road safety.

5. Prior to commencement of development the developer shall remove, decommission and extinguish the license(s) for the two advertising hoardings on land adjacent to 45 Dolphins Barn Road and any advertising use of these display locations shall be submitted to a prior grant of planning permission. Details of the existing advertising displays to be removed, including location map and photographs of the structure, and a dated photographic record of their removal shall be submitted to the planning authority within one month of their removal.

6.0 Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with the planning authority, a Construction Management Plan, which shall be adhered to during construction. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including traffic management, construction access arrangements, hours of working, noise and dust management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity.

8. Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.



Tony Quinn
Planning Inspector

8th September 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-322811-25
Proposed Development Summary	Replace illuminated advert with illuminated digital advert and remove two adverts on land adjacent to 45 Dolphins Barn Road
Development Address	
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. ☐ No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
☒ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of	

proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector:  Date: 8th September 2025