

**Board Direction BD-018552-24 ABP-319769-24** 

The submissions on this file and the Inspector's report were considered at a Board meeting held on 23/12/2024.

The Board decided to refuse permission, generally in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, for the following reasons and considerations.

## **Reasons and Considerations**

1. Having regard to the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures Guidelines for Planning Authorities issued by the Department of Housing, Planning and Local Government in 1996 (as updated by Circular Letter PL 07/12), the location of the site in 'Rural Policy Zone 2' and an Area of High Scenic Quality under the Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027, Policy Objectives IU 41 and IU 42 and Section 13.18.3 (Telecommunications Structures) of the development plan, it is considered that the applicant did not provided a sufficient assessment of suitable alternative locations and that the proposed development would be contrary to the stated policy in respect of the orderly development of telecommunications throughout the county and the requirement to co-locate antennae support structures and sites where feasible. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## Notes:

(i) The Board considered that the information provided with the application had not satisfactorily addressed the potential visual impact of the proposed

ABP-319769-24 Board Direction Page 1 of 2

development having regard to the photomontages submitted with the application and appeal and the location of the proposed development in an Area of High Scenic Quality. While ordinarily this would warrant further consideration and a request for further information, in this instance given the substantive reason for refusal above, it was decided not to pursue these matters under the current appeal.

- (ii) Having regard to the second reason for refusal recommended by the Inspector, the Board considered that the proposed development would not result in a significant intensification of traffic and, following construction, would not require frequent access and, as such, would not endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard.
- (iii) The Board considered that the proposed development is a project for the purposes of the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive. However, the Board concluded that the proposed development does not fall within a class of development set out in Part 1 or Part 2 of Schedule 5 to the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, and, therefore, no preliminary examination, screening for environmental impact assessment, or environmental impact assessment is required.

Board Member Many Gyrrie Date: 23/12/2024

ABP-319769-24 Board Direction Page 2 of 2