



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

# Inspector's Report

**ACP-323721-25**

## **Development**

RETENTION PERMISSION: For existing front elevation signage.

## **Location**

13-16 Redmonds Hill, Aungier Street,  
Dublin 2 D02 RP46.

## **Planning Authority**

Dublin City Council.

## **Planning Authority Reg. Ref.**

WEB2581/25.

## **Applicant(s)**

3Dental Ltd.

## **Type of Application**

Retention Permission.

## **Planning Authority Decision**

Refuse Retention Permission.

## **Type of Appeal**

First Party.

## **Appellant(s)**

3Dental Ltd.

## **Observer(s)**

None.

## **Date of Site Inspection**

17<sup>th</sup> November, 2025.

## **Inspector**

Aiden O'Neill.

## Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description .....	3
2.0	Proposed Development .....	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision .....	3
4.0	Planning History .....	5
5.0	Policy Context .....	7
5.1	Development Plan .....	7
6.0	EIA Screening .....	11
7.0	The Appeal .....	11
8.0	Assessment .....	15
9.0	AA Screening .....	17
10.0	Water Framework Directive .....	18
11.0	Recommendation .....	19
12.0	Reasons and Considerations (1) .....	19
13.0	Conditions .....	20
14.0	Reasons and Considerations (2) .....	21
	<b>Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening .....</b>	<b>22</b>

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1 The proposed development site, 0.054ha in area, comprises a two-storey building with mezzanine floor, fronting onto, and accessed from, Redmond's Hill, with feature central protruding glazed section to the front elevation, located within a mixed-use urban block of between 2-4 (plus setback) storeys in height, to include Bishop's Square which fronts onto Kevin Street Lower. There is a Tesco express at ground floor level, and a two-storey café. 3Dental occupies the majority of the upper floor.
- 1.2 The proposed development site is located to the west of Redmond's Hill. To the north is a terrace of two-storey buildings generally in commercial use at ground floor and residential above. Further north is TU Dublin on Aungier Street. To the east is the Cuffe Street Flats. To the south is Kevin Street Lower and Cuffe Street. A bus stop is located on the opposite side of Redmond's Hill.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1 The proposed development consists of a retention planning application for existing front elevation signage including: (1) Sign No. 1 illuminated block white lettering sign (4.179m x 0.750m) above 1st floor windows; (2) Sign No. 2 Decal sign (4.179m x 0.750m) fixed inside existing glazing above 1st. floor; (3) Sign No. 3 board sign (4.794m x 0.650m) over front entrance & service entrance; & (4) Sign No. 4 includes 3 x orange board signs (3.960m x 0.650m) with white lettering fixed at 1st floor level to external window frames. There are 6no. signs in total to be retained.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1 Decision**

The Planning Authority refused permission on 28<sup>th</sup> August, 2025 for 1no. reason as follows:

1. The retention of the proposed signage, by reason of their location on Redmond's Hill, within a designated Conservation Area and due to the

quantum, design, size, colour and positions of the signage, would conflict with the relevant policies in respect of advertising signage, as set out in Section 15.17.5 and policy BHA9 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028. The signage results in significant visual clutter which constitutes a strident and visually discordant feature at this location that detracts from the visual quality, character and conservation status of the street. The proposed retention of the development would set an undesirable precedent for similar developments, would devalue property in the vicinity and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

### 3.1.1. Conditions

N/A

## 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the Planner dated 27<sup>th</sup> August, 2025 notes the following:

- The Shopfront Design Guidelines (2001) allows for signage on the fascia panel only to avoid visual clutter. The quantum of signage on the fascia is excessive and results in visual clutter.
- The application site is located within a Conservation Area and the retention of signage will not protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting.
- Sign no.3 is located above the main entrance and contains the name of the business, contact details for the main 3Dental business, the location base for the business and telephone number. Section 15.17.5 Shopfront and Façade Design, states that only the name and street number of the business should be on the fascia panel. Sign no. 3 is overly cluttered and contributes to a visually cluttered façade.
- The proposed signage for retention is considered to be excessive, would contravene section 15.17.5 and policy BHA9 of the 2022-2028 Dublin City Development Plan and the Shopfront Design Guidelines 2001. Retention of this signage would result in a visually cluttered façade.

- The planner's report is the basis for the decision to refuse retention permission.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

The report of the Engineering Department – Drainage Division dated 23<sup>rd</sup> July, 2025 recommended permission subject to conditions.

### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

None.

## 4.0 Planning History

4.1 PA Ref. No. 2458/15: Permission granted on 1<sup>st</sup> July, 2015 to extend the mezzanine area (55.92) to new medical/dental unit (as granted under planning grant No.3641/14).

4.2 PL29S.243301 (PA Ref. No. 2141/14): Permission was granted on 1<sup>st</sup> September, 2014 subject to conditions for signage associated with the permitted ground floor retail unit and will comprise of the provision of 3 no. navy aluminium fascia panels (3.96m x 0.99m each) with associated internally illuminated fret cut signage on the northern most panel and vinyl applied lettering on the most southern panel, and the provision of 2 no. double sided internally illuminated projection signs (0.8m x 0.5m). The Commission omitted the PA condition requiring the removal of the 2no. projecting signs and the colour of the fascia panels.PL 29S.241076 (PA Ref. No. 2561/12): Permission was granted on 25<sup>th</sup> January, 2013, upholding the notification to grant planning permission by Dublin City Council on 27<sup>th</sup> August, 2012 for a two-storey mixed use development on this previously cleared site (1,021sqm gross) comprising; (a) a two-storey café unit (199sq.m); (b) first floor office unit with own door access from street level (423.3sq.m); (c) ground floor unit (376 sqm. gross) with ancillary alcohol sales area and (d) signage, plant and all ancillary site development works.

Condition 2 states that:

Prior to commencement of development, details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes, inclusive of fascia treatment and signage, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

Condition 5 states that:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001-2010, no advertising signs (including any signs to be installed to be visible through the windows), advertising structures, banners, canopies, flags or other projecting elements shall be displayed or erected on the building or within the curtilage or attached to the glazing without a prior grant of planning permission.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

4.3 PA Ref. No. 3475/05: Permission granted on 8<sup>th</sup> March, 2006 for development at 13, 14-16, 17, 17A, 18-20 (incl) Redmond's Hill and 24a (formerly 24) Bishop Street, Dublin 2. The developments will consist of variations to previously approved plans (Reg. Ref. 5867/03), for construction of a six storey over basement building, and will comprise; revisions to internal layout of levels 1 to 5 to amalgamate the three approved office suites into a single office suite on each floor providing an additional 580sq.m of office space in total; revisions to internal layout of ground floor to form two retail units from three approved units and proved an additional 33 sq.m of retail floorspace; revisions to the basement layout to provide an additional 5 no. car parking spaces (increase in car parking area of 72 sq.m approx.) associated alterations to circulation storage and plant facilities; total increase in gross floor area of building of 205 sq.m approx; construction of a new pedestrian 'bridge' at level 3 connecting to the adjoining Bishop's Court development to the west; omission of terrace at first floor level at the rear of the building; and minor alterations to external elevations including glazing on the south elevation at level 4.

4.4 PA Ref. No. 5867/03: Permission was granted on 30<sup>th</sup> March, 2004 for a development comprising of the demolition of the existing houses on the site and the construction of a six storey over basement building. The ground floor would accommodate retail uses, a café and sandwich bar. The upper floors would comprise of 3,300sq.m. of offices use with an access at ground level. 24 car parking spaces are proposed at basement level. The proposed development was

modified by additional information to include a revised design of the exterior and a modulated development of three discrete units each with its own frontage and street access.

4.3 PA Ref. No. 3641/14: Permission was granted on 26<sup>th</sup> January, 2015 subject to conditions for the change of use of existing first floor office area (221.8 sq.m) to new medical/ dental use, incorporating new mezzanine area (31.5 sq.m). Condition no. 6 states that notwithstanding the provisions of the Planning & Development Regulations 2001(As Amended), no advertisement signs (including any signs installed to be visible through the windows); advertisement structures, banners, canopies, flags, or other projecting element shall be displayed or erected on the building or within the curtilage, or attached to the glazing without the prior grant of planning permission.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

4.4 There is a live enforcement file on site, E1295/24, relating to signage.

## **5.0 Policy Context**

### **5.1 Development Plan**

#### **Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028**

In the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, the site zoned Objective Z5 – City Centre, the objective of which is to consolidate and facilitate the development of the central area, and to identify, reinforce, strengthen and protect its civic design character and dignity. Permissible uses includes medical and related consultants. It is also included in the Aungier Street Conservation Area.

Section 11.5.3 of the Plan in relation to built heritage assets, states that Red-Hatched Conservation Areas, as well as Z8 Georgian Conservation Areas, Z2 Residential Conservation Areas, are extensive throughout the city. Whilst these areas do not have a statutory basis in the same manner as protected structures or ACAs, they are recognised as areas that have conservation merit and importance and warrant protection through zoning and policy application.

Designated Conservation Areas include extensive groupings of buildings, streetscapes and associated open spaces and include (parts of) the medieval/walled city, the Georgian Core, the 19th and 20th century city, and the city quays, rivers and canals.

The special interest/value of Conservation Areas lies in the historic and architectural interest and the design and scale of these areas.

Therefore, all of these areas require special care in terms of development proposals. The City Council will encourage development which enhances the setting and character of Conservation Areas.

Policy objective BHA9 seeks to protect the special interest and character of all Dublin's Conservation Areas. Development within or affecting a Conservation Area must contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting, wherever possible.

Section 15.14.6 of Volume 1 of the Plan in relation to Medical and Related Uses states that medical and related uses includes a wide range of services such as GP surgeries, medical centres, primary medical care facilities, dentists, beauty and aesthetic clinics, vets etc. all of which comprise of similar design standards and requirements.

Section 15.17.5 of Volume 1 of the Plan in relation to Shopfront and Façade Design states that attractive facades and shopfronts have the ability to rejuvenate the streetscape and create an attractive public realm environment. Relevant guidance in the Plan on shopfront signage includes the following:

- Be located at fascia level.
- The signage relating to any commercial ground floor use should be contained within the fascia board of the shopfront.
- The lettering employed should be either on the fascia, or consist of individually mounted solid letters mounted on the fascia. The size of the lettering used should be in proportion to the depth of the fascia board.
- Corporate signs will only be permitted where they are compatible with the character of the building, its materials and colour scheme and those of adjoining buildings.
- Advertisements and signs relating to uses above ground floor level should generally be provided at the entrance to the upper floors, in a form and design

which does not detract from or impinge upon the integrity of the ground floor shopfronts, or other elevation features of the building.

It is further stated that proposals for shopfront signage shall have regard to the contents of the Retail Design Manual, 2012, Dublin City Council's Shopfront Design Guide, 2001. This states that shopfronts are one of the most important elements in determining the character, quality and perception of retail streets. In relation to signage, the main objective of signage is to identify a premises and its occupants, and shopfront designs should provide for identification as an integral part of that design. In order to avoid visual clutter, the number of attachments to a premises should be minimised.

### Fascia Signs

- Only the name and street number of shop should be on the fascia panel.
- The detail of the sign – its form, scale, colour and materials – should be complementary to the design of the shopfront.
- Signs comprising individually mount lettering or hand painted letter are the most popular and generally appropriate solutions.
- Box signs, particularly where they are internally illuminated, are generally unacceptable.
- Letter design should be simple and legible.
- The dimensions of the fascia should dictate the size and height of the letters.
- Letters of more than 400mm will not normally be acceptable.
- The material for the letters should complement the materials in the shopfront.
- Illumination should be discreet, either by concealed neon tubing where the fascia detail permits, or by rear illumination of the individual letters.

### Projecting signs

- In general, projecting signs will not be permitted in order to avoid clutter in the streetscape.
- In exceptional cases, where they are considered appropriate by reason of the out-of-the-way location of the premises, they should be designed more as

artistic features, using high-quality materials and design.

- The use of symbols associated with a particular use is more acceptable for this type of signage.

Policy Objective CCUV12 seeks to require a high quality of design and finish for new and replacement shopfront signage and advertising. Dublin City Council will actively promote the principles of good shopfront design as set out in Dublin City Council's Shopfront Design Guidelines and Chapter 15.

Section 1.1 of Appendix 6 of Volume 2 of the Plan lists Richmond Hill as a street with historic (antique) granite kerbing together with any associated historic features such as historic and traditional gratings, historic gutter setts, decorative manholes and other covers, which, in accordance with Policy BHA 18(a) of the Plan, is to be protected, conserved and reintroduced under the programme for areas with historic ground/street surfaces, together with any associated historic features:

Section 2.2 of Appendix 6 of Volume 2 of the Plan in relation to Historic Granite Kerbing and Associated Features to be Protected, Conserved and Reintroduced In accordance with Policy BHA 18(a) of the Plan states that the following paved areas and streets with historic (antique) granite kerbing are historic and traditional gratings: historic gutter setts, decorative manholes and other covers.

## **5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines**

### **Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2004**

Section 12.3 of chapter 12 of the Guidelines states that new lettering and signage should be required to respect the character of the protected structure and its setting and, where relevant, the character of an ACA.

## **5.3. Natural Heritage Designations**

The proposed development site is c. 3.49km to the west of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (Site Code: 004024), the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210), and the South Dublin Bay pNHA (Site Code: 000210); and 1.68km west of the Grand Canal pNHA (Site Code: 002104).

## **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 report.

## **7.0 The Appeal**

### **7.1 Grounds of Appeal**

A detailed First Party appeal has been prepared, which sets out the following grounds:

- The proposed development is located in a commercial area of Dublin City which is characterised by street level signage.
- This appeal pertains to necessary signage erected to serve a community-based dental practice, and seeks to overturn the decision of DCC, fully or in part, to allow for the retention of this signage needed to allow patients to find the premises.
- 3Dental is an Irish dental practice chain, recognised as one of the country's most modern and affordable providers of comprehensive dental care.
- The previous dental business that occupied the premises maintained significant signage by way of:
  - Covering the central glazed part of the building with large-scale stick-on poster style signage; and
  - Providing board signage above and alongside the front pedestrian door.
- 3Dental replaced the previous signage with more restrained and more appropriate signage. They did not realise that planning permission would be required, and immediately sought retention permission having been advised

of Condition 5 attached to PA Ref. No. 2561/12 & appeal PL29S.241076 which removed exempted development rights.

- The DCC decision suggests that there should be no signage on the front elevation of the building in. Consideration should have been given to:
  - The siting of the dental practice within a busy commercial and retail street where front elevation signage is not only common, but standard.
  - How this is a building which has always had various signage on its front elevation.
  - That the premises supports a community health care use - to find the site, patients need some signage. No signage at all would cause the practice to be hard to find
- The new signage represents a significant improvement on the previous appearance of signage.
- It is requested that all the signage be retained. Failing this, they ask that their business not be left without any signage.
- The signage is appropriate for this building, does not detract from the area or the zoning, and supports the viability and sustainability of the business.
- The signage at Nos. 13-16 Redmond's Hill is similar in appearance to those signs' which arise at 3Dental practices at Red Cow and in Galway and Limerick. There are many buildings along Aungier Street, Wexford Street, Camden Street and George's Street. Tesco Express has taken up the ground level signage at the building and it also has a small projecting sign. The building to the south contains Aungier Street Clinic at first floor at this has been permitted a large sign to notify the community of its presence.
- No reference is made to the scale of the dental practice which is larger than the Tesco Express on only the ground floor which is served by multiple large signs and a projecting sign.
- The DCC Planner's Report takes the position that only a shopfront can have signage.

- The Planner's Report does not offer an individual assessment of each sign. The only assessment is a cumulative assessment which finds against all the signage.
- The subject building is located in a Conservation Area but not in an Architectural Conservation Area.
- The question arising for ACP is whether the signage proposed for retention would have any impact on a small section of one part of one of DCC's many Conservation Areas.
- The subject signage pertains to a non-historic building sited close to many buildings, including Technical University Dublin, which are also not historic.
- Objective BHA9 is not designed to be wholly restrictive.
- The signage does not significantly detract from the character of the area or its setting to warrant making the dental facility less viable by wholly removing all sign.
- The signage does not impact any historic architectural detail or important features.
- The subject building is a relatively new commercial building designed to contain ground level, first floor, and second floor businesses. This type of building commonly has uses on its upper floors which require signage. Such signage is common.
- The Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 seeks to support the vitality and vibrancy of its streets.
- ACP is asked to balance the Conservation Area sensitivity of the site against its context, the permitted use as a two-storey dental practice, and the need for businesses in Dublin City to allowed to remain viable and sustainable.
- The Z5 zoning supports a dental practice at this location in the central area. This land use helps to reinforce and strengthen the central area. It is a use which contributes to the character and dignity of the area.
- Signage is permitted in principle under the Z5 zoning.

- Under permission reg. ref. 3614/14, DCC found that the dental practice would "contribute to the vitality of the area" and supported it. In making this decision the issue of signage was not resolved. This application seeks to resolve this.
- The subject building was designed to be commercial floor area on all levels. This approach to providing a building with mixed uses all of which need to be acknowledged by way of signage in the streetscape, to ensure their viability, is supported by policies and objectives of the Plan.
- The signage was carefully designed and sited to fit in a bespoke manner on what is a commercial building with a Tesco Express and cafe at ground level both of which have signage.
- The signage does not detract from the "visual quality, character and conservation status of the street".
- Signage at medical and dental facilities does not set a precedent for the signage required for retail or restaurant type uses.
- DCC has offered no basis for its argument that the signage is currently, and would in the future, devalue property in the vicinity.
- The DCC decision applies traditional shopfront design policies and objectives to a building which is not traditional in design.

## 7.2. Applicant Response

N/A

## 7.3. Planning Authority Response

None.

## 7.4. Observations

None.

## 7.5. Further Responses

None.

## **8.0 Assessment**

8.1. Having examined all the application and appeal documentation on file, and having regard to relevant policy, I consider that main issues which require consideration in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal.

8.2 The main appeal issues are as follows:

- The need for signage having regard to the nature of the use and having regard to the policies of the Plan.

8.3 The need for signage.

8.3.1 The First Party Appeal seeks to overturn the refusal of permission for 6no. signs attached to the front elevation of 13-16 Redmond's Hill, Aungier Street, in Dublin 2.

8.3.2 I have considered the detailed case made that the premises is a permitted medical use over 2 floors plus mezzanine in an established commercial building which was previously occupied by a medical use which had a number of signs including a large sign on the central projecting glazed section of the front elevation.

8.3.3 I have also considered the argument put forward that there is existing signage on the ground floor uses of the building, that all shopfronts in the vicinity have signage, and that a medical use requires signage to assist customers in finding the premises.

8.3.4 It is further argued that the signage to be retained is more appropriate than that erected by the previous medical use.

8.3.5 It is also acknowledged that the planning history for the building de-exempts signage and hence the requirement for permission, albeit for retention permission in this instance.

8.3.6 The applicant also considers that undue weight has been attached to the building's location in a Conservation Area (not an Architectural Conservation Area) rather than the permitted medical use. It is further argued that the policies applied by the Planning Authority relate to shopfront signage, whereas the entire building is in mixed retail/café/medical use.

8.3.7 Having visited the site and examined the range of uses in the vicinity of the site, and having examined the site's planning history and the details provided in the appeal, I

would be inclined to agree with the arguments put forward by the applicant that there would be an expectation that a medical use, particularly one that occupies above-ground floors, would require signage, and that the provision of signage would be accepted in principle, in supporting the sustainability of such uses in a vibrant City Centre location.

8.3.8 The key matters to address are the quantum of signage and the location of the proposed development site in a Conservation Area.

8.3.9 In terms of the quantum of signs, the applicant proposes 6no. signs. It is considered that, notwithstanding the acceptability of signage for the medical use, the provision of 6no. signs for 1no. medical use is excessive by any standard.

8.3.10 I do not agree with the Planning Authority that permission should be refused and that all 6no. signs should be removed.

8.3.11 I have had regard to the advice of Policy CCUV12 and Section 15.17.5 of Volume 1 of the Plan in relation to Shopfront and Façade Design, in particular that:

- Corporate signs will only be permitted where they are compatible with the character of the building, its materials and colour scheme and those of adjoining buildings.
- Advertisements and signs relating to uses above ground floor level should generally be provided at the entrance to the upper floors, in a form and design which does not detract from or impinge upon the integrity of the ground floor shopfronts, or other elevation features of the building.

8.3.12 In this context, I would recommend that that Sign no. 3 (Board sign over front entrance) is permitted and that Sign nos. 1 (block lettering fixed to the upper front wall), 2 (Decal sign fixed to the inside face of glazing) and 4 (3no. board signs) are omitted from the front elevation.

8.3.13 I do not consider the large block lettering that characterises Sign Nos. 1 and 2 to be appropriate, or acceptable in visual terms. Equally the colouring of the 3no. board signs (Sign No. 4) at first floor level is also unsatisfactory.

8.3.14 In my opinion, the above recommendation aligns with the advice contained in Section 15.17.5 of Volume 1 of the Plan, and also has regard to the location of the

building in a Conservation Area, the policy in the current Development Plan (BHA9) for which requires development to contribute positively to its character and distinctiveness.

8.3.15 This recommendation of a reduction in the quantum of existing signage will also allay any concerns the Planning Authority has regarding the devaluation of property in the vicinity raised in its reason for refusal.

8.3.16 I recommend a split decision in this instance: the grant of permission for Sign no. 1, and the refusal of permission for Sign nos. 1, 2 and 4.

## **9.0 AA Screening**

- 9.1. I have considered the RETENTION PERMISSION for existing front elevation signage at 13-16 Redmonds Hill, Aungier Street, Dublin 2 D02 RP46 in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.2. The proposed development site is c. 3.49km to the west of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024), and the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210).
- 9.3. The proposed development comprises RETENTION PERMISSION for existing front elevation signage at 13-16 Redmonds Hill, Aungier Street, Dublin 2 D02 RP46.
- 9.4. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.5. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (Site Code: 004024), and the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code: 000210) in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- The modest scale of the works and the nature of the development

- Location - distance from nearest European site and lack of connections

9.6 Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

9.7 I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

9.8 Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (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 in an established city centre environment at Redmond's Hill, Aungier Street, Dublin 2. The nearest relevant water body is the Poodle code IE\_EA\_09PO30800, c. 0.683km to the west, the status of which is 'At Risk'.

10.2 The proposed development consists of RETENTION PERMISSION for existing front elevation signage at 13-16 Redmonds Hill, Aungier Street, Dublin 2 D02 RP46.

10.3 No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal. I have assessed the proposed development for RETENTION PERMISSION for existing front elevation signage at 13-16 Redmonds Hill, Aungier Street, Dublin 2 D02 RP46, 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.

10.4 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature and scale of the development proposed.
- Distance from the nearest relevant water body.

## 10.5 Conclusion

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 the Commission

- (a) GRANT of permission for the proposed development, except as set out at (b) below, based on the reasons and considerations marked (1) under and subject to the conditions set out below.
- (b) REFUSE permission Sign nos. 1 (block lettering fixed to the upper front wall), 2 (Decal sign fixed to the inside face of glazing) and 4 (3no. board signs), based on the reasons and considerations marked (2) under

## 12.0 Reasons and Considerations (1)

Having regard to policy CCUV12 (Shopfront Design), Section 15.17.5 of Volume 1 and policy objective BHA9 (Conservation Areas) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028, and subject to compliance with the conditions below, the retention of Sign no. 3 (Board sign over front entrance) provided at the entrance to the upper floors, is of a form and design which does not detract from or impinge upon the integrity of the ground floor shopfronts, or other elevation features of the building; would be appropriate to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in which the building is located; and would be in the interests of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 13.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application on 4<sup>th</sup> July, 2025, 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 and the development shall be retained, carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>This decision permits Sign no. 3 only. Sign nos. 1, 2, and 4 are to be removed within one month of the date of the Commission's Order. Revised drawings providing for compliance with this requirement shall be submitted to the Planning Authority for approval within three months of the date of the Commission's Order.</p> <p>Reason: To comply with the policies of the Plan and to protect the character and visual amenities of the Conservation Area.</p>
3.	<p>No additional advertisement or advertisement structure, the exhibition or erection of which would otherwise constitute exempted development under the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, or any statutory provision amending or replacing them, shall be displayed or erected on the building unless authorised by a further grant of planning permission.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>

## 14.0 Reasons and Considerations (2)

The retention of Sign nos. 1 (block lettering fixed to the upper front wall), 2 (Decal sign fixed to the inside face of glazing) and 4 (3no. board signs), Sign no. 3 (Board sign over front entrance) would not be in compliance with policy CCUV12 (Shopfront Design), Section 15.17.5 of Volume 1 and policy objective BHA9 (Conservation Areas) of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022 – 2028, and would not be in the interests of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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.

---

Aiden O'Neill

Planning Inspector

5<sup>th</sup> December, 2025

## Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	ACP-323721-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	RETENTION PERMISSION: For existing front elevation signage.
<b>Development Address</b>	13-16 Redmonds Hill, Aungier Street, Dublin 2 D02 RP46.
<b>IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX /OR LEAVE BLANK</b>	
<p><b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?</b></p> <p>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,</li> <li>- Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<p><b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b></p>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in <b>Part 1</b> .  <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q 1	
<p><b>1. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 2</u>, 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?</b></p>	

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.  <b>No Screening required.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.  <b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.  <b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b>  <b>OR</b>  <b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b>	
<b>2. 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)?</b>	
<b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 5<sup>th</sup> December, 2025