



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-307505-20

Development	Erection of a 30m high telecommunications mast carrying antennas and dishes enclosed in security fencing with access track.
Location	Knocknagarhoon, Kilkee, Co Clare
Planning Authority	Clare County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	20147
Applicant(s)	Hibernian Cellular Networks Ltd.
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Hibernian Cellular Networks Ltd.
Observer(s)	Community of Knocknagarhoon, Trusclieve & Tullig. Killballyowen Development CLG.
Date of Site Inspection	22/10/2020
Inspector	Gillian Kane

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1.1. The subject site is approx. 9km southwest of Kilkee in south-western Clare. The site, part of a larger agricultural field, is located on the northern side of the L6012, a narrow country road running along the coastline of the Loop Head peninsula. The site is elevated, rising north from the road, towards a peak and then sloping down towards the coastline. A number of one-off houses are located on the southern side of the road.
- 1.1.2. Immediately to the east of the site, in the adjoining field, is a small, fenced compound with a single mast and a control building. Further south-east of the site (approx. 3km) are two wind turbines (60m) with 35m blade height.
- 1.1.3. The Wild Atlantic Way (Loop Head Peninsula) runs along the R487 further south of the subject site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1.1. On the 2nd March 2020, planning permission was sought for the erection of a 30m high telecommunications support structure carrying antenna, transmission equipment and ground-based equipment, all enclosed within security fencing and an access track of 10m.
- 2.1.2. A planning report submitted with the appeal states that the proposed mast is to address an Eir coverage blackspot on the Loop Head peninsula. It notes that there is an adjoining Irish Aviation Authority (IAA) structure accommodating Eir and Vodafone but that it is not suitable for sharing.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. On the 11th June 2020, the Planning Authority issued a notification of their intention to REFUSE permission for the following reasons:

- 1 Having regard to
 - i) the elevated and visually prominent location of the site within an open landscape where natural screening is limited,

- ii) the proximity of the site to the recorded and archaeological monument CL065-006,
- iii) DoEHLG 'Telecommunications Antenna and Support Structure, Guidelines for Planning Authorities 1996 (as updated by PL07/12 with regard to siting)
- iv) the location of the site in an area designated as a 'Settled Landscape' in the Clare County Development Plan 2017-2023, as varied whereby it is an objective of the Plan under CDP13.2 to require "that sites have been selected to avoid visually prominent locations" and "that site layouts avail of existing topography and vegetation to minimise visibility from scenic routes, walking trails, water bodies, public amenities and roads"
- v) the visibility of the proposed mast from the Scenic Route designated within the Clare County Development Plan 2017-2023, as varied, whereby it is an objective of the Plan under CDP13.7 to "ensure that proposed developments take into consideration their effects on views from the public road towards scenic features or areas and are designated and located to minimise their impact".

It is considered that the proposed development by reason of height and siting would form a prominent feature on the landscape which would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area, would seriously injure the setting of the archaeological monument CL065-006, would contravene the provisions of the Development Plan including those objectives for "Settled Landscapes" and "Scenic Routes" and would thus be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report: Elevated location, 2 no. turbines 2km east, visible from the site.

Site is adjacent to a recorded monument and a scenic route. Notes the query regarding consent to the making of the application and states that the application should be assessed on its merits. Insufficient analysis of alternatives undertaken. Visual impact of proposed mast, in a location adjoining scenic routes (Wild Atlantic Way) will be significant. Proposed mast would be highly prominent and visible over a wide area. Lack of screening in the area. Proximity (80m) of subject site to recorded

monument would have a significantly negative visual impact. Recommendation to refuse permission.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.3.1. **Irish Aviation Authority:** No observations on this application.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

3.4.1. A letter from a third-party stating to be the landowner of the subject site states that he wishes to **withdraw his consent** to the making of the application. This is accompanied by a letter from his legal agent.

3.4.2. The **applicant** responded to this letter, stating that the landowner indicated consent to the making of that application and notwithstanding the withdrawal of same, the application must nonetheless be considered on its merits. The applicant states that the matter of landowner consent is a legal rather than a planning consideration.

3.4.3. Other **objections** to the proposed development raise the issue of the visual impact, the impact on property, business and tourism, that there is no gap in broadband coverage and fears regarding safety.

4.0 **Relevant Planning History**

4.1.1. None on the subject site.

5.0 **Policy Context**

5.1. **Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures - Guidelines for Planning Authorities (1996)**

5.1.1. These Guidelines set out national planning policy in relation to telecommunications structures and address issues relating to, inter alia, site selection; minimising adverse impact; sharing and clustering of facilities; and development control. The Guidelines are generally supportive of the development and maintenance of a high quality telecommunications service.

5.1.2. The elements of the Guidelines relevant to this appeal are:

- to avoid an unnecessary proliferation of masts, owners would be expected to facilitate co-location of antennae with other operators.

- Visual impact is among the more important considerations which have to be taken into account.
- Great care will have to be taken when dealing with fragile or sensitive landscapes:
 - Along major roads or tourist routes, masts may be visible but yet are not terminating views. In such cases it might be decided that the impact is not seriously detrimental.
 - Similarly, along such routes views of the mast may be intermittent and incidental, in that for most of the time viewers may not be facing the mast. In these circumstances while the mast may be visible or noticeable, it may not intrude overly on the general view or prospect.

5.2. **Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures and DoECLG Circular Letter PL07/12**

- 5.2.1. The 2012 Circular letter set out to revise sections 2.2. to 2.7 of the 1996 Guidelines. Section 2.6 of the Circular letter refers to Health and Safety Aspects and reiterates the advice of the 1996 Guidelines that planning authorities should not include monitoring arrangements as part of planning permission conditions nor determine planning applications on health grounds. Planning authorities should be primarily concerned with the appropriate location and design of telecommunications structures and do not have competence for health and safety matters in respect of telecommunications infrastructure. These are regulated by other codes and such matters should not be additionally regulated by the planning process.

5.3. **Clare County Development Plan**

- 5.3.1. The subject site is located in a Settled Landscape, with a Heritage Landscape immediately to the north. The R487 to the south of the site is a designated scenic route. Policies of relevance are:
- 5.3.2. **CDP8.44 Telecommunications Infrastructure:** It is an objective of the Development Plan: To facilitate the provision of telecommunications services at appropriate locations within the County having regard to the DoEHLG

'Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures, Guidelines for Planning Authorities 1996 (as updated by PL07/12 of 2012)'.

- 5.3.3. **CDP13.7 Scenic Routes:** It is an objective of Clare County Council: a To protect sensitive areas from inappropriate development while providing for development and change that will benefit the rural community; b To ensure that proposed developments take into consideration their effects on views from the public road towards scenic features or areas and are designed and located to minimise their impact; c To ensure that appropriate standards of location, siting, design, finishing and landscaping are achieved.
- 5.3.4. **CDP13.2 Settled Landscapes:** It is an objective of the Development Plan: To permit development in areas designated as 'settled landscapes' that sustain and enhance quality of life and residential amenity and promote economic activity subject to: • Conformity with all other relevant provisions of the Plan and the availability and protection of resources; • Selection of appropriate sites in the first instance within this landscape, together with consideration of the details of siting and design which are directed towards minimising visual impacts; • Regard being given to avoiding intrusions on scenic routes and on ridges or shorelines. Developments in these areas will be required to demonstrate: • That the site has been selected to avoid visually prominent locations; • That the site layouts avail of existing topography and vegetation to reduce visibility from scenic routes, walking trails, water bodies, public amenities and roads; • That design for buildings and structures reduce visual impact through careful choice of forms, finishes and colours, and that any site works seek to reduce visual impact.
- 5.3.5. **CDP13.5 Heritage Landscapes:** It is an objective of the Development Plan: To require that all proposed developments in Heritage Landscapes demonstrate that every effort has been made to reduce visual impact. This must be demonstrated for all aspects of the proposal – from site selection through to details of siting and design. All other relevant provisions of the Development Plan must be complied with. All proposed developments in these areas will be required to demonstrate: • That sites have been selected to avoid visually prominent locations; • That site layouts avail of existing topography and vegetation to minimise visibility from scenic routes, walking trails, public amenities and roads; • That design for buildings and structures

minimise height and visual contrast through careful choice of forms, finishes and colour and that any site works seek to reduce the visual impact of the development.

- 5.3.6. **CDP15.8 Sites, Features and Objects of Archaeological Interest:** It is an objective of Clare County Council: a To safeguard sites, features and objects of archaeological interest generally; b To secure the preservation (i.e. preservation in situ or in exceptional cases preservation by record) of all archaeological monuments included in the Record of Monuments and Places as established under Section 12 of the National Monuments (Amendment) Act, 1994, and of sites, features and objects of archaeological and historical interest generally (in securing such preservation, the Council will have regard to the advice and recommendations of the Department of the Arts, Heritage, Regional, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs); c To permit development only where the Planning Authority is satisfied that the proposals will not interfere with: • items of archaeological or historical importance; • the areas in the vicinity of archaeological sites; • the appreciation or the study of such items. d To have regard to the government publication 'Framework and Principles for the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage 1999' in relation to protecting sites, features and objects of archaeological interest; e To advocate for greater financial assistance for the maintenance and improvement of features of archaeological interests in County Clare.

5.4. **EIA Screening**

- 5.4.1. Having regard to nature and scale of the development there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

6.0 **The Appeal**

6.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

- 6.1.1. An agent for the applicant has submitted a first party appeal against the decision of the Planning Authority to refuse permission. The grounds of the appeal can be summarised as follows:
- The subject site is the most appropriate location for the proposed development.

- Significant enhancements to mobile and broadband services outweigh any potential visual impact, which has been overstated by the Planning Authority.
- Other permitted developments in the area are more prominent and intrusive on the landscape.
- The subject site was chosen to address a 4g coverage blackspot on the Loop Head peninsula.
- The Boards attention is drawn to the locational, technical and operational justification for the proposed development set out in the application cover letter.
- The applicant operates c. 60 no. telecommunications sites throughout the country does not understand what 'alternative technologies' the Planning Authority planning report refers to.
- The adjoining cable stayed mast is outdated technology. The existing mast cannot cater for the microwave link dish – photo submitted.
- A freestanding tower provides much greater stability and rigidity for transmission equipment.
- The provision of a mast or multiple masts at lower levels would necessitate structures in excess of 30m high, creating a greater visual impact, at a greater cost.
- The IAA's aviation requirements are satisfied by the existing mast. There is no reasonable expectation that they would undertake the investment proposed by the applicant.
- In addition to Eir, Ripplecom has confirmed it would relocate to the proposed mast. Three other providers have also indicated that they would use the mast.
- The presence of a long-standing cable stayed mast on the adjoining property demonstrates the suitability of the subject site for the proposed development.
- It is submitted that the appeal site and the existing mast are neither prominent nor intrusive features. The concrete equipment building and palisade fencing are not visible in distant views. Therefore, the appeal site is not visible.

- The dominant features on the landscape are the 2 no. wind turbines permitted by the Board at 60m in height with blade diameter of 70m and one-off housing. The size and movement of the turbines draw the eye from far and creates an intrusive visual impact. The proposed development would neither dominate nor intrude onto the open landscape.
- The ruins of Knocknagarhoon Castle are 100m to the south, of which there is no physical evidence. The IAA cable mast is significantly closer to the ruins, which are not signposted or marked. The castle is shown only on OS mapping and as being “in ruins”. There is no evidence the proposed development would affect the archaeology of the area or the subterranean setting. The applicant will comply with an archaeological monitoring condition.
- The visual impact of the existing mast and the subject site from the L2008 is stated to be low, with the greatest impact from the wind turbines. At the junction of the L2008 and the R487, the existing mast is visible but the dominant features are the wind turbines and an adjoining house. The route is not a scenic route and there are no amenities for the public. The potential for visual impact is low.
- The R487 does directly face the appeal site. The existing mast is visible but not a prominent feature. Knocknagarhoon hill and the immediate environs do not contain any buildings or structures that create visual dominance. The proposed mast which is lower than the existing would create a low and acceptable visual impact.
- The existing mast is not visible for the first 600m of the L6012. The adjoining electricity line and poles are the dominant feature. Approaching from the other direction the mast is visible but not as noticeable as the electricity poles or the one-off housing. The impact of the proposed mast would be localised and consistent with that of the existing mast. The Applicant is willing to use graded colouring on the lower 10-12m of the mast to reduce visual impact.
- The majority of the scenic routes are 2km from the appeal site which reduces any visual impact. The appeal site is not distinguishable on the landscape and the existing mast cannot be described as highly prominent.

- It is submitted that the Planning Authority's assertion that the proposed development would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area is erroneous. The appeal site does not comprise a terminating view and the proposed development would not have a detrimental visual impact.
- The Board is requested to grant permission.
- The appeal is accompanied by a copy of the Planning Report submitted with the application, a letter from Eir, Ripplecom and Three.ie indicating their support for a tower and photos.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- 6.2.1. Requests the Board to uphold the Planning Authority decision to refuse permission.

6.3. Observations

6.3.1. Kilballyowen Development CLG

- The not-for-profit community organisation is involved in Loophead Tourism. Supports the decision of the Planning Authority.
- The visual impact on Loop Head and Knocknagarhoon has not been adequately considered.
- The proposed development is not in compliance with the Telecommunications Guidelines or the policies of the development plan.
- The whole Loophead Peninsula is a single Landscape Character Area LCA 21. The applicant did not address the visual impact. Their statement that the Planning Authority's assessment of the visual impact is overstated is rejected.
- Tourism will be a viable economic base for the area. However, the provision of physical IT infrastructure must also protect natural and cultural heritage.
- Several trails and 'ways' have been developed to exploit this asset. Three trails use the road in front of the mast. The proposed mast would detract from the visual amenity of the area. Knocknagarhoon would no longer be 'remote and detached' as referenced in the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA).
- Given the extent of the visual impact of the proposed development, the heritage landscape objective should take precedence. It is submitted that the applicants mitigation would have a negligible impact.

- The proposed development does not comply with section 4.3 of the Guidelines, which permits masts on tourist routes as it is visible for a 2km radius and a prominent feature terminating a views for over 600m. This impact is dismissed by the applicant and the Planning Authority who confine their assessment to the impact from the scenic route only.
- The IAA mast has been in existence since the 1960's and the wind turbines since 2003. These are not a justification for the proposed development as they pre-date the heritage & cycle trails and the heritage landscape designation.
- The turbines are not visible west of Knocknagarhoon.
- The coastal scenery of the area is 'unspoilt' and an important part of the tourist attraction of the area. the proposed mast would dominate the view of the hill and would be contrary to development plan policy.
- The proposed development disregards the view from the hill-top site, the height of the tower, the lattice structure, the proximity of the site to tourist routes, the absence of photomontages, the lack of pre-application consultation and the lack of consideration of alternative.
- The Board is requested to refuse permission.

6.3.2. **Community of Knocknagarhoon, Trusclieve & Tullig:**

- The close farming community have grave concerns about the visual impact of the proposed mast.
- The Observers reject the appellants submission that the Planning Authority's archaeological concerns are without foundation.
- The subject site is not the appropriate location for the proposed development. Improvements to mobile and broadband services would not outweigh the visual impact of the proposed development.
- The applicant suggestion of a dearth of broadband coverage is rejected. There are multiple providers in the area and multiple sites at lower altitude.
- The Planning Authority have not overstated the visual impact of the proposed development.
- The northern boundary of the site is 57m from the visible outline of the archaeological site of the ruins of the signal tower of the Napoleonic era, dating to 1815. The applicant has misrepresented this distance as being 100m.

- The Observation is accompanied by an Archaeological Report and maps showing the extent of the archaeological site.
- The Applicants lack of consideration for the site displays a lack of appreciation and respect for the landscape. The fact that the ruins are subterranean is further reason to protect them.
- It would be less intrusive on the landscape to erect several masts at a lower level rather than one at the highest point with no vegetation coverage. This is contrary to the development plan which requires visibility from scenic routes to be minimised.
- The L6012 route is popular with cyclists, walkers and motorists and is part of the Loop Head Cycleway.
- Knocknagarhoon can be seen throughout the Loop Head Peninsula. The visibility of the proposed mast would be contrary to Objective CDP13.2 of the development plan which requires that sites should be selected to avoid visually prominent locations.
- The applicant did not consider other locations, stating that Eir chose the site as being the cheapest option. Economics can not be more important than landscape.
- Visitors use the top of the hill – the field adjoining the subject site to see the views. The subject site is a prominent site in an open landscape, Knocknagarhoon Hill is the highest point in the peninsula.
- The naked eye views the mast as more than a ‘pencil-line’. The proposed lattice type structure is not comparable to the existing IAA mast. Although the proposed mast would be 6m shorter than the IAA mast, it would be six times larger in bulk and would be fully visible in every direction. This would be exacerbated by the 6 no. 600mm dishes.
- The vegetation shown on the applicants plans would not provide any screening.
- The wind turbines are 100m lower below the appeal site and should not be used as a precedent for the proposed development. They cannot be compared as they are only visible east of Knocknagarhoon hill. The proposed mast at 30m above the skyline would both dominate and intrude.
- The attempted camouflage of the turbines has not been successful. It would not work on the bulky latticed mast whose backdrop is only sky.

- The Clare Wind Energy Strategy (volume 5, page 27, table 2a) lists Loop Head Peninsula as being excluded from the strategy due to the number of natural heritage designations, high landscape impacts, spectacular peninsular landform and potential tourism and recreation. The existing masts would not receive planning permission today.
- The Planning Authority were correct in finding that the proposed development would have a detrimental and seriously injurious impact on the visual amenities of the area.
- The applicants claim that the site is not a scenic vantage point is rejected as being untrue. The site offers extensive panoramic views of the Peninsula and to all directions. That there are no facilities for people to gather does not stop the public from using the site to see the full vista.
- The subject site forms part of a local coastal walkway from Trusclieve to Goleen. The magnificent natural beauty of the path would be desecrated by the proposed mast.
- Knocknagarhoon Hill is the highest point on the Peninsula and as such constitutes a terminating view in every direction. It is visible from the cliff walk in Kilkee, being a natural focal point.
- The IAA mast is visible from all directions but does not dominate as it is a light stayed structure incapable of supporting equipment. The size and bulk of the proposed mast and equipment would dominate, intrude and create a negative visual impact in the unspoilt landscape.
- Many tourists chose to use the L6012 instead of the R487 when driving the coastal route to take greater advantage of the scenery. The proposed development would damage the scenery and the tourism it creates.
- The elevated nature of the subject site makes it unsuitable for the proposed development. The visual impact of the proposed development has been understated by the applicant.
- The Board is requested to refuse permission.
- The Observation is accompanied by an Archaeological Report on the significance of Knocknagarhoon Hill and a number of photographs.

7.0 Assessment

7.1.1. I have examined the file and the planning history, considered national and local policies and guidance, the submissions of all parties and inspected the site. I have assessed the proposed development and I am satisfied that the issues raised adequately identify the key potential impacts and I will address each in turn as follows:

- Legal Interest / Land Ownership
- Visual Impact
- Archaeology

7.2. Legal Interest / Land Ownership

7.2.1. I note section 5.13 of the Development Management Guidelines regarding issues relating to the title of land. The guidelines are clear, the planning system is not designed as a mechanism for resolving disputes about title to land or premises or rights over land; these are ultimately matters for resolution in the Courts. As section 34(13) of the Planning Act states, a person is not be entitled solely by reason of a permission to carry out any development.

7.3. Visual Impact

7.3.1. The visual impact of the proposed mast on the landscape and the adjoining scenic route forms the basis of the Planning Authority's reason for refusal.

7.3.2. The appellant submits that the visual impact is over stated and that the existence of the adjoining IAA mast and the two wind turbines are the dominant features in the landscape. They submit that the proposed mast, at a lower height than the adjoining mast would not unduly impact the landscape or the adjoining scenic route.

7.3.3. The subject site is one of the most elevated sections of the peninsula, with extensive and expansive views in all directions from the top of the field of the subject site. That the landscape would be altered by the propose mast is indisputable, any development would create a visual impact. The crux of the issue is whether that impact would be negative or neutral.

7.3.4. The site is located at the boundary of 'Settled Landscape' and the 'Heritage Landscape to the immediate north. The scale of Map13A or Map C of the

development plan is not such that one could definitively stated where the boundaries start, however I note that the Planning Authority are satisfied that the site is within the less sensitive settled landscape. The sensitivity or significance of a designation does not start immediately on the boundary. As can be seen from the subject site where it would be impossible to identify on the ground where the more sensitive designation commences. It is considered reasonable to assess a development against the more sensitive of the designations.

- 7.3.5. The Development Plan policy for both settled and heritage landscapes requires that sites are selected to avoid visually prominent locations and that existing vegetation and typology is used to screen development. CDP13.5 referring to Heritage Landscapes, also requires that the design of structures minimise height and visual contrast.
- 7.3.6. CDP13.7 of the development plan refers to scenic routes. It seeks to protect sensitive areas from inappropriate development, to ensure that development takes into consideration their effects on views from the public road and that development is designed to minimise their impact. As noted by all parties, the subject site is not on a scenic route but is visible from the route (R486).
- 7.3.7. The position of the applicant is that an elevated location is necessary to ensure the greatest coverage. This is understood. As is the need to have a lattice type structure, capable of supporting the necessary equipment.
- 7.3.8. That need cannot occur at the expense of the amenity of the subject area however. The development plan is clear, development in scenic areas can occur provided the impact of the development on the area has been minimised. It is considered that no such effort has been made with the subject application. The applicants offer to add grading to the base of the mast would have a site-specific impact only. At wider views, the backdrop of the mast is largely sky and given the ever-changing nature, it is difficult to mitigate against a visual impact.
- 7.3.9. I note the applicants submission that the landscape is dominated by other man-made structures, namely the wind turbines and the adjoining IAA mast. I accept the position of the Observer that as a single pole-like structure, the visual impact of the IAA mast is less than the lattice plus equipment impact of the proposed development. I note that the wind turbines are not visible across the peninsula. On

the date of my site visit, they became apparent only on the eastern side of the hill. I do not accept that either the turbines or the IAA mast dominate the subject landscape.

- 7.3.10. Regarding the designated scenic route, it is correct that the subject site is not located directly on the route. The site, is however clearly visible from a large section of the route – to the north, south and east. The development plan recognises that there is a need to protect and conserve views adjoining public roads throughout the County where these views are of high amenity value. The view of the subject site and the view from the subject site are undoubtedly of high scenic amenity, and are worthy of protection. The subject site and adjoining fields offer a panoramic expanse of skyline and coast. It is considered that the introduction of a man-made feature at this location would significantly injure the visual amenity of this relatively unspoilt area.
- 7.3.11. I do not accept the applicants justification that the subject site is the only possible location and that other alternative locations for this important infrastructure cannot be found. It is considered that the visual impact of the proposed development would be significantly negative and the extent of that impact would be wide-ranging.

7.4. Archaeology

- 7.4.1. The subject site adjoins the location of the Recorded Monument CL065-006 Signal Tower. The exact location of the site is disputed by all parties to the appeal. The subject site is indicated as being within Knocknagarhoon Castle site on the Cassini 6inch map and within the general location of in the Historic 25inch map. The report of one of the Observers explains that the site was more likely a Signal Tower than a castle and that the hilltop may have been inhabited for a significant time. The Observers report submits that the extent of the site is unknown and sub-surface archaeology likely exists over a wide area.
- 7.4.2. I note objective CDP15.8 of the development plan which seeks to safeguard sites, features and objects of archaeological interest, in situ or in exceptional cases by record. The applicant has indicated a willingness to accept a condition requiring archaeological monitoring of any development. Should the Board decide to grant permission, it is recommended such condition be attached.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1. I recommend permission be REFUSED for the following reason:

Having regard to

(a) the guidelines relating to telecommunications antennae and support structures which were issued by the Department of the Environment and Local Government to planning authorities in July, 1996, (as updated by PL07/12 of 2012)

(b) the height, scale and location of the proposed development in an area that is of high scenic amenity,

(c) CDP13.2, CDP13.5 and CDP13.7 of the Clare County Development Plan 2017-2023 which seek to protect settled landscapes, heritage landscapes and scenic routes respectively from inappropriate development,

it is considered that the proposed development would be visually obtrusive and would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area and the wider Loop Head Peninsula. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Gillian Kane
Senior Planning Inspector

16 November 2020