



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL92.248107.

Development	Construction of a 27m high telecommunications support structure, carrying antennae and transmission dishes, and associated equipment.
Location	Timoney, Knock, Roscrea, Co. Tipperary.
Planning Authority	Tipperary County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	16600653
Applicant(s)	Three Ireland (Hutchinson) Ltd.
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party vs. Refusal
Appellant(s)	Three Ireland (Hutchinson) Ltd
Observer(s)	Padraig Browne
Date of Site Inspection	1 st June 2017
Inspector	Ciara Kellett

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located in the townland of Timoney, Co. Tipperary, c.150m south of the M7 motorway and c.5km due east of the N62 Regional Road. It is c.7km south-east of Roscrea. The River Nore runs to the north-west and the Nore Bridge is c.1.8km from the site. The area is rural in character and there are a small number of dwellings and farm buildings along the road leading to the subject site. The site is accessed from a minor county road which is very narrow and in poor condition in places.
- 1.2. A recently constructed dwelling is located to the front of the landholding. There are two other structures to the rear of the dwelling. There are long distance views across the countryside from the landholding. There are no other dwellings in the immediate vicinity of the landholding. The observer states that his landholding bounds the site to the south-east.
- 1.3. The Nore Valley Bogs Natural Heritage Area (Site Code 001853) is located less than 1km to the west of the site. A two storey castle type structure which is listed in the Record of Protected Structures (ref. S382), is located in the observers landholding to the south-east of the site. This structure is also listed on the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage ref. 22401805.
- 1.4. Appendix A includes maps and photos of the site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. It is proposed to construct a 27m high telecommunications support structure carrying 3 no. panel antennas and 2 no. RT link dishes, together with equipment cabinets within a compound surrounded by palisade fencing. The compound will be 15m x 15m. It will be accessed using the existing entrance to the dwelling on the landholding. A new 3m wide track will run along the south-east boundary of the landholding to the location of the compound, which is in the furthest north-east corner of the landholding.
- 2.2. The area to which the application relates is stated as being 0.0225Ha. Information on the overall size of the landholding including the dwelling has not been supplied. The distance between the mast and the rear of the dwelling is approximately 240m.

- 2.3. The compound is designed to allow for multiple operator's equipment and cabins. The mast has been designed to accommodate multiple operators.
- 2.4. It is stated that the purpose of the development is to provide additional local coverage and capacity to specific sections of the M7 Limerick - Dublin Road, between junction 21 and 22, where coverage and capacity deficiencies are being experienced. A Radio Technical Justification Report accompanies the application.
- 2.5. Following the request for Further Information, photomontages were provided.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1 Decision

The Planning Authority decided to refuse permission for two reasons.

1. *The proposed site is located on a poorly aligned roadway, whereby it has not been demonstrated that sightlines can be achieved in accordance with the standards set out in section 10.9.1 of the North Tipperary County Development Plan 2010 (as varied). Therefore, on the basis of the plans submitted, the Planning Authority is not satisfied that the development would not endanger public safety by reasons of traffic hazard.*
2. *Having regard to the siting and height of proposed development and the proposed landscape plan, the Planning Authority considers that the proposed telecommunications support structure and security fencing would be dominant and visually obtrusive in the receiving landscape. It is considered that the proposed development, if permitted, would impact upon the existing visual amenities and landscape character of the area. The proposed development would be contrary to the provisions of Policy LH1 of the North Tipperary County Development Plan 2010, as varied and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The application was subject to a request for Further Information. Therefore, there are a number of planning and technical reports on file. They can be summarised as follows:

- First Report considers that the location is not within an Amenity Area designation or Protected View, and considers that it does not detract from same.
- With respect to the design and layout, considers the proposed structure will not seriously detract from the visual amenity of the area. Considers that the applicant should be required to provide landscaping at the site, and the lower part of the structure should be painted green.
- Considers the principal of a telecommunications mast acceptable in this location.
- An additional note is added to the First Planning Report requesting Further Information with respect to clarification of the extent of the landholding and use of existing buildings on the site, availability of sightlines in accordance with the Development Plan, photomontages of development as viewed from the motorway, and a landscape plan for the entirety of the subject site.
- Following the response to the Further Information request, the Planning Report notes that there appears to be no planning permission or Section 5 Declarations for the workshop or agricultural shed. Considers that to allow further development within the landholding which appears to have unauthorised development would not be in accordance with proper planning. Considers that sightlines are not available, the proposed planting scheme is inadequate and the landscape plan does not include proposals for the existing site boundaries.
- Planner recommends refusal for two reasons.

The decision was in accordance with the Planner's recommendation.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- **District Engineer:** No response
- **Environment Section:** Notes that the mast is of a modern type i.e. narrow (less visual impact). Considers chosen location offers excellent camouflage from a vantage point on either the motorway or surrounding domiciles. No objection subject to conditions relating to landscaping.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- **Health Service Executive:** No objection subject to conditions
- **Dept. of Arts, Heritage, Regional, Rural and Gaeltacht affairs:** No objection subject to conditions.
- **IAA:** No objection.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Two third party submissions were made, both at initial application stage and following the response to the Further Information stage. The submissions referred to risk to health of animals, devaluation of property, capacity of road, and impact of access track on land. This will be dealt with in more detail in Section 6.3 below.

4.0 Planning History

Other planning applications on the landholding include:

- **Reg. Ref. 5124821:** Outline permission for a dwelling granted permission in July 2002.
- **Reg. Ref. 03510471:** Permission for a two storey dwelling granted permission in June 2003.
- **ABP Reg. PL22.229406, TCC Reg. Ref. 07511442:** Permission for retention of revised house position and elevations, site layout, site boundaries, and domestic garage granted by the Board in December 2008.

In the vicinity:

- **Reg. Ref. 08511196:** Development of a borrow pit including restoration, to be used as fill material for the N7 road scheme, granted permission in August 2009 located just to the north-east of the site.
- **Reg. Ref. 14600104:** Retention of existing open slatted tank and concrete yard and new agriculture structure to the north-west of the subject site, granted permission in September 2014.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The site is subject to the policies and objectives of the North Tipperary County Development Plan 2010 as varied. Chapter 7 refers to Landscape, Water Quality and Heritage, Chapter 9 refers to Communications and Chapter 10 to Development Standards.

Section 7.2 of Chapter 7 refers to Landscape.

Policy LH1: Landscape Management and Protection

It is the policy of the Council to facilitate new development which integrates and respects the character, sensitivity and value of the landscape in accordance with the designations of the County Landscape Character Assessments (or any review thereof).

Timoney, or any area surrounding it, is not designated as a primary or secondary amenity area according to Figure 7.1. Appendix 4 of the Plan lists Scenic Views. There are no views listed in the vicinity of the site.

Section 7.5 refers to the Built Heritage of the County. **Policy LH13** states with respect to Protected Structures:

It is the policy of the Council to encourage the sympathetic restoration, re-use and maintenance of protected structures thereby ensuring their conservation and protection. In considering proposals for development, the Council will have regard to the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities, (DAHG 2011) or any amendment thereof, and proposals that will

have an unacceptable impact on the character and integrity of a protected structure or adjoining protected structure will not be permitted.

The Record of Protected Structures lists a structure that is located in the adjacent landholding south-east of the subject site. The structure (ref. S382) is described as:

Two storey castle-type structure. Three storey tower with castellation. Rendered with architrave overhead doors and windows. Extensive stone walls in surrounding area. Tudor revived ruin. Formerly the home of Parker Hutchinsons

The National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH) also lists the structure, ref. 22401805.

Section 9.9 of Chapter 9 of the Plan refers to Communications. **Policy TI14** states:

It is the policy of the Council to facilitate proposals for masts, antennae and ancillary equipment in accordance with Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structure: Guidelines for Planning Authorities, DEHLG, 1996. Development proposals will be facilitated, where it can be established that there will be no significant adverse impact on the surrounding areas and the receiving environment, particularly in the following locations:

- (i) Primary and secondary amenity areas or locations that would be detrimental to designated listed views.*
- (ii) Within significant views or setting of national monuments or protected structures.*

Section 9.10 of the Plan outlines specific objectives which includes objective **SO09-6**:

It is an objective of the Council to work with and support key stakeholders to secure the implementation of the National Broadband Plan and seek to ensure that fast and effective broadband facilities are available in all parts of the county.

Table 10.1 in Chapter 10 lists Sightline Requirements. Roads that are less than 4.25m wide, and all local tertiary roads, are to have a sightline of 70m.

5.2. Landscape Character Assessment of Tipperary 2016

The general area is identified as ‘The Plains’ and located within the Templemore Plains. The Landscape Character Area is described as ‘*The Templemore plain forms a large, gently undulating lowland area framed by Devilsbit and Borrishnoe Mountain to the west and extending to Roscrea in the north and the county boundary with Laois to the east*’.

With respect to Land-Use Compatibility, it notes that the Development Management Policy should be to continue to facilitate development that continues established patterns of use and settlement.

With respect to the Landscape Condition, Appendix II notes that ‘*The large tracts of raised bog (Timoney Bog and Monaincha Bog) confer maximum sensitivity on this immediate landscape outside Roscrea for ecological reasons. In terms of visual quality, this bog hinterland has been substantially impacted on by the extension of the residential areas of Roscrea and indeed the presence of large tracts of commercial coniferous forestry which encroach on this area.*’¹

It further notes that, ‘*In the context of the County Landscape Capacity, this is a high capacity/ low sensitivity, Landscape i.e. Change or Development generally acceptable – subject to all other relevant objectives and policies - as it may beneficially alter, enhance or reinforce landscape character and value (e.g. the landscape is robust in its character, undergoing change or the precedent for such and similar development is set and the landscape is capable of absorbing considerable change without detriment)*’².

5.3. Telecommunication Guidelines

The aim of the “Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures – Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 1996” is to offer general guidance on planning issues so that the environmental impact is minimised, and a consistent approach is adopted by the various planning authorities.

Section 4.3 of the Guidelines states with respect to Visual Impact:

¹ LCA for Tipperary App II p.24

² LCA for Tipperary App II p.24

Some masts will remain quite noticeable in spite of the best precautions. The following considerations may need to be taken into account:

- *Along major roads or tourist routes, or viewed from traditional walking 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*
- *There will be local factors which have to be taken into account in determining the extent to which an object is noticeable or intrusive – intermediate objects (buildings or trees), topography, the scale of the object in the wider landscape, the multiplicity of other objects in the wider panorama, the position of the object with respect to the skyline, weather and lighting conditions, etc.*

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

The site is located c. 5.5km from the Slieve Bloom Mountains SPA (Site Code 004160), c. 10km from the Slieve Bloom Mountains SAC (Site Code 000412), c. 6km from the River Nore SPA (Site Code 004233), c. 10km from the Coolrain Bog SAC (Site Code 002332), c. 13km from the Knockacoller Bog SAC (Site Code 002333), and c. 13km from River Barrow and River Nore SAC (Site Code 002162).

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal against the decision of the Planning Authority to refuse permission has been submitted by the applicant. In summary, it states:

- Consider the reasons for refusal given by the Council were unreasonable and failed to consider the totality of the information submitted.

- The proposed development and associated traffic movements will not endanger public safety or become a traffic hazard.
- Apart from the construction duration of one-week, traffic movements to the site will be 2/3 trips annually. Modern base stations are designed so that they can be remotely accessed to fix faults.
- The entrance has been operational since 2003 and there has been no issue regarding traffic safety – the entrance was deemed acceptable by the Council on three separate occasions when granting permission previously.
- The site will not be visually obtrusive or contravene policy LH1 of the Plan. The proposed development will be visible from certain locations but will not seriously injure the visual amenity of the area.
- The proposed compound will benefit from mature hedging and trees (approx. 17m high).
- Photomontages submitted at Further Information stage demonstrate that the structure will not be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area.
- Views along the motorway will generally be fleeting and intermittent for motorists.
- A revised landscape plan showing additional planting has been submitted with the appeal.
- The structure will have no impact on the surrounding dwellings due to the topography, separation distances and natural vegetation.
- When viewed within the wider landscape which contains the Monaincha Wind Farm which is located to the north of the site, the proposal will appear a slim pencil like feature.
- Notes that the site was chosen because of specific radio engineering and planning factors. The site is not located in a sensitive/protected area, or in close proximity to dwellings or schools.
- Alternative options were considered including co-locating. Existing masts are too far away leaving the only option being to build a new free standing mast.

- Failure to secure this site will result in coverage issues along the M7 and the local area for the foreseeable future.

6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

The Planning Authority is satisfied that the decision to refuse permission was appropriate and address each reason for refusal.

- With respect to sightlines, it is considered that to allow further development of a commercial nature would require adequate sightlines. The previous assessments were for a residential site only.
- Adequate sightlines to meet the current Plan standards of a setback of 4.5m and sightline of 70m in both directions are required.
- The photomontages submitted illustrate that the proposed structure will be visible from the M7 motorway.
- Applicant was requested to submit landscape scheme for the entirety of the site and consider scheme submitted inadequate.
- Consider that due to the significance of reason no.1 for refusal, conditioning landscaping was not available. The development was considered to be dominant and visually obtrusive in the receiving landscape and therefore the second reason was given.

6.3. **Observations**

An observation was submitted by one of the parties who made a submission to the Planning Authority. In summary, it includes:

- Reference to the updated Landscape Plan submitted as part of the appeal to the Board. Concerned about the access track which runs the full length of the boundary ditch between both landholdings.
- Drawing marked up indicating that the access track width of 3m is wider than the distance between the access track and the boundary ditch.

- At no stage of the application has the applicant given any detail as to the type or nature of construction of the track, or what is to be used for the protection of the track once completed.
- Concerned that any excavations or general construction could harm and damage the root structure of the ditch. No attempt has been made to take the ditch into account.
- If any type of fencing is used to protect the track, it could hamper the upkeep and general maintenance of the party boundary ditch.
- Considers that it would be no use supplementing the landscaping on one hand, and damaging the boundary ditch on the other. The landscape plan should work with what is there already.
- The development should be redesigned or relocated away from the party boundary.

7.0 **Assessment**

I consider the key issues to be addressed in this appeal are set out below and a new issue is included. The issue of appropriate assessment also needs to be addressed.

The structure is proposed to be in excess of 100m from the nearest dwelling which I consider to be acceptable.

The issues can be dealt with under the following headings:

- Traffic and Sightlines
- Landscape and Visual Impact
- Access Track and Boundary Ditch
- Architectural Heritage – new issue
- Appropriate Assessment

7.1. **Traffic and Sightlines**

Reason no.1 for refusal related to the site being on a poorly aligned roadway, where it had not been demonstrated that sightlines could be achieved. In the appeal

submitted by the applicant, it is stated that construction related activities will take a week and maintenance visits will only be required 2/3 times a year.

The Planning Authority has concerns with the use of the existing dwelling entrance and reference is made to the workshop and agricultural shed located to the rear of the dwelling. The Planning Authority considers that to allow further development of a commercial nature would require adequate sightlines.

From my observations during my site visit, the condition of the road would lead me to believe that the road is very lightly trafficked. It is a very narrow road and grass is growing in the middle of it. There are very few dwellings and farm buildings along the road, and it is unlikely to attract much non-local traffic.

The applicant has stated that construction related activities will be for a week's duration. I consider that a Construction Management Plan could be a condition of a grant of permission and traffic management a key part of any plan.

I am satisfied that operational activity, requiring 2/3 visits per year, will not result in any significant increase in traffic that could be deemed to endanger public safety by reasons of traffic hazard, as stated in reason no.1 for refusal.

The two third party submissions to the Planning Authority referred to concerns about potential damage to the road during construction with the possible use of large vehicles. I consider that a Construction Management Plan could also address this and ensure that any potential damage to the road is made good by the applicant.

I note that there is no submission from the District or Roads Engineer on the file.

In conclusion, I am satisfied that due to the minimal number of annual trips during the operational period, the subject proposal will not result in a traffic hazard. I am also satisfied that a condition requiring the applicant to agree a Construction Management Plan with the Planning Authority would ensure that traffic is managed during construction to ensure that public safety is not endangered.

7.2. Landscape and Visual Impact

Reason no.2 refers to the impact the proposed development would have on the receiving landscape. The Planning Authority considers that the development would impact upon the existing visual amenities and landscape character of the area.

Photomontages were submitted by the applicant as part of the response to the request for Further Information. Two locations were chosen from the M7 motorway. The site is less than 150m south of the M7 and the proposal will be visible. The motorway is relatively level with the surrounding landscape at this section and no berms have been built on the south side of the motorway. In accordance with Policy LH1, the question arises whether or not it *integrates and respects the character, sensitivity and value of the landscape in accordance with the designations of the County Landscape Character Assessments*. Communications Policy T114 notes the Council will support development where it can be established that there will be no significant adverse impacts on primary and secondary amenity areas or locations that would be detrimental to designated listed views.

There are no amenity area designations or listed views anywhere near the proposed location. The Landscape Character Assessment 2016 considers this area to be 'robust' and capable of absorbing change subject to other considerations.

I note that the Environment Section of the Council considered that the chosen location will offer '*excellent camouflage from a vantage point on either the motorway or surrounding domiciles*' due to the proximity to hedgerow and mature trees of c.17m in height.

The Telecommunications Guidelines provides advice with respect to visibility along public roads, when considering proposals which will remain quite noticeable in spite of the best precautions. It states that '*views of the mast may be intermittent and incidental, most of the time viewers may not be facing the mast*'.

My site visit included driving along the motorway near the proposed development. I am satisfied that while the development will be visible, viewers will not be facing the mast and it will not overly intrude on the general view. The most dominant feature in the landscape is the recently constructed Monaincha Windfarm, and this is the view most travellers along the motorway will see.

The applicant states that the proposal is for a modern slim line structure. I note that the proposal includes 3 no. panel antennae and 2 no. RT link dishes. The Planning and Development Regulations provide for substantial exemptions for the addition of antennae and radio dishes. Having regard to the location of the mast and the fact that it will be visible from the M7, I consider it reasonable to recommend to the

Board, should the Board consider granting permission, that the addition of any new antennae or dishes should be subject to a requirement to obtain planning permission. This would provide the Planning Authority an opportunity to consider if the addition of further antennae would be visually excessive, and result in the structure becoming a dominant feature in the landscape.

The applicant submitted a landscape plan as part of the appeal, detailing additional tree planting which I consider will supplement the existing landscaping.

The applicant notes that within the wider landscape, the Monaincha Windfarm is located to the north of the proposed site. As noted above, this will be the dominant feature.

There are very few dwellings in the vicinity, and the dwellings to the south and north are enclosed within substantial hedgerows and mature trees. Local views from the dwellings will be limited. The nearest dwelling is on the landholding and it will be visible from this dwelling.

In conclusion, I accept that the proposed structure will be visible from the M7 motorway but having regard to the sensitivity and value of the landscape, which contains no primary or secondary amenity areas or scenic routes, I consider that the impact is not seriously detrimental and with appropriate landscaping the visual impact can be minimised to ensure that the proposal is not contrary to the provisions of policy LH1.

7.3. Access Track and Boundary Ditch

The observer states that his landholding adjoins the proposed development site and the access track runs parallel to his boundary. The boundary currently comprises a ditch and a well-established hedgerow. The observer is concerned that during construction of the access track, damage could be done to the hedgerow. The observer also notes that no details have been provided with respect to the construction or type of track proposed and whether a fence is to be erected or not along the line of the track.

The drawings indicate that a palisade fence is proposed around the compound area only. There is no other fencing identified on the drawings. The fencing has been kept to a minimum and I consider this acceptable.

There is very little detail on the drawings with respect to the access track and what it will look like in the long term. The proposed turning area adjacent to the compound is referenced on the drawing as being hardcore, and I would consider that the access track should be a similar material to minimise the visual impact. Protective measures can be put in place to ensure that there is minimal damage to the ditch and hedgerow during the construction of the track. I agree with the observer that any proposed landscape plan for the area should supplement what is already there, and every effort should be made to avoid damage to the existing hedgerows and trees. I consider that the details of protection of the trees and hedgerows can be detailed as part of the Construction Management Plan.

In summary, I consider that with appropriate protective measures in place which can be conditioned as part of the grant of permission, I consider that there will not be a significant impact on the existing boundary ditch and hedgerow.

7.4. Architectural Heritage – new issue

The observer notes in his original submission to the Planning Authority that a Protected Structure makes up a very large feature on his property. Timoney Park is listed as Protected Structure ref. S382 in the North Tipperary County Development Plan. This structure would appear to be c. 300m as the crow flies to the south-east of the site. The observer notes that there is a continuous wall that marks the boundary between the townlands of Timoney and Tinderry. It is stated that part of the wall passes out of the observer's property and into the proposed site of the mast.

The walls are listed in the description of the Protected Structure ref. S382 '*.....extensive stone walls in surrounding area*'. During my site visit, I noted that the Protected Structure itself is not visible from the public road. Its condition cannot be determined from the road. There are many very mature trees in the vicinity which would also minimise views of the telecommunications structure from within the area of the Protected Structure. There appears to be no obvious signs of the wall near the telecommunications mast proposed location.

I am satisfied that the proposed telecommunications structure will not have a significant impact on the context or setting of the Protected Structure.

7.5. **Appropriate Assessment**

Having regard to the nature and scale of development proposed and to the nature of the receiving environment, no appropriate assessment issues arise and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

8.0 **Recommendation**

8.1. I recommend that planning permission should be granted subject to conditions for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

9.0 **Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to:

- a) National strategy regarding the improvement of mobile communications services and the *Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures – Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 1996* issued by the Department of the Environment and Local Government,
- b) The location of the proposed development which is not in, or adjacent to, a primary or secondary amenity area or near a listed view,
- c) The general topography and landscape features in the vicinity of the site,
- d) The low levels of traffic predicted which are not considered to endanger public safety by reasons of traffic hazard,
- e) The separation distance and landscaping between it and the Protected Structure, and
- f) The existing pattern of development in the vicinity,

it is considered that subject to conditions, the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area, would not endanger public safety, and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted on the 16th January 2017 and by the further plans and particulars received by An Bord Pleanála on the 2nd March 2017, 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. The transmitter power output, antenna type and mounting configuration shall be in accordance with the details submitted with this application and, notwithstanding the provisions of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, and any statutory provision amending or replacing them, shall not be altered without a prior grant of planning permission.

Reason: To clarify the nature and extent of the permitted development to which this permission relates and to facilitate a full assessment of any future alterations.

3. Surface water drainage arrangements for the proposed development shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

4. Details of the proposed colour scheme for the telecommunications structure, ancillary structures [and fencing] shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area.

5. Landscaping of the site shall be carried out in accordance with a landscaping scheme, which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with

the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area.

6. The site shall be reinstated on removal of the telecommunications structure and ancillary structures. Details relating to the removal and reinstatement shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Reinstatement shall be deemed to include the grubbing out of the access track created in association with the development permitted herein.

Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area.

7. The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of traffic management during the construction phase, details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste, as well as protective measures to be employed during the construction of the access track with respect to the ditch and boundary hedgerow.

Reason: In the interests of public safety and residential amenity.

Ciara Kellett
Inspectorate

2nd June 2017