

**Board Direction BD-014296-23 ABP-314492-22** 

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 24/10/2023.

The Board decided to refuse the S.254 licence, for the following reasons and considerations.

## **Reasons and Considerations**

The board noted the importance of the need for information and communications
Technology is strongly supported by policy expressed in Section 14.20.9 of the
Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 and that the stated policy also recognises the
advantages of a high-quality ICT structure must be balanced against the need to
safeguard the rural and urban environment.

It is considered that the proposed telecommunications structure development to accommodate a single operator, notwithstanding that it is stated to make provision to accommodate dual operators and therefore facilitate co-location/sharing of infrastructure, would when taken in combination with another similar development for a telecommunications monopole structure, c.25m south of the appeal site (ABP Ref: 314637-22 appeal case refers), contribute to a proliferation of telecommunications infrastructure in the area. Permitting the proposed development in this specific context would be contrary to stated policy and objectives of the statutory development plan for the area including Objective DMS0222 (Co-location of antennae) and Objective DMS0224 (Applications for Telecommunications Structures) and the related national policy expressed in Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures – Guidelines for Planning Authorities issued by the Department of the Environment 1996 as updated by Circular Letters PL 07/12 and

PL11/2020, respectively, in respect of co-location and avoidance of unnecessary proliferation of masts. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

In deciding not to accept the Inspector's recommendation to grant permission, the Board agreed with the inspector that the proposed development alone would not result in a significant negative visual impact on the surrounding vicinity or seriously injure the residential amenities of the area. However, the Board noted the proposed telecommunications structure development, when taken in combination with another similar development for a telecommunication monopole structure c.25m south of the appeal site, would contribute to a proliferation of telecommunications infrastructure in the area, that in turn would be contrary to stated policy expressed in the statutory development plan and at a national level, in respect of co-location and avoidance of unnecessary proliferation of masts. In relation to the site-specific context, the Board considered that the proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

**Board Member** 

Patricia Calleary Date: 25/10/2023