



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-309370-21

Development	Erection of an 18m high monopole telecommunications support structure.
Location	Eir Exchange, Ballymahon Road, Glasson, Co. Westmeath.
Planning Authority	Westmeath County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	207175
Applicant(s)	Eircom Ltd
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Helen Claffey & others Alan & Nicola Claffey Edel Finneran
Observers	Residents Group
Date of Site Inspection	23 rd March 2021
Inspector	Dolores McCague

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1.1. The site is located at EIR Exchange, Ballymahon Rd, Glasson, Co Westmeath.
- 1.1.2. The site is along the N55 national secondary route on the northern outskirts of the village, where the land rises steeply northwards. It is set back from the N55 at a point where a parking area adjoins the roadway, and accessed via a pedestrian entrance.
- 1.1.3. A speed limit for Glasson of 80kph applies.
- 1.1.4. The site is given as 0.02ha.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1.1. The application is for permission to erect an 18m monopole telecommunications support structure together with antennas, dishes and associated telecommunications equipment all enclosed in security fencing.
- 2.1.2. Existing infrastructure at the transmission site at Farranamoreen Td, 630m to the north, is to be discontinued.
- 2.1.3. Vodafone transmit from a 12m timber communications pole at the rear of the Glasson eir exchange. It is unsuitable for sharing.
- 2.1.4. The applicant sees no other solution and certainly no better solution to improving eir's capacity and coverage and to achieving common sense synergies, than to provide for a replacement telecommunications mast within EIR's Glasson compound.
- 2.1.5. The drawings provided indicate multiple items of equipment at two levels, slightly above the equipment on the nearby wooden pole.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority decided to grant permission subject to 11 conditions, including:

2 The developer shall allow, subject to reasonable terms, other licensed mobile telecommunications operators to co-locate their antennae onto the subject structure.

Reason: In order to avoid the proliferation of telecommunications structures in the interests of visual amenity.

6 No advertisement or advertisement structure shall be erected or displayed on the proposed structure or its appendages or within the curtilage of the site without a prior grant of planning permission.

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

7 A low intensity fixed red obstacle light shall be fitted as close to the top of the mast as practicable and shall be visible from all angles in azimuth. Details of this light, its location and period of operation shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development

Reason: In the interests of public safety.

The reasons for the decision, which differs from the planning recommendation, are: improved connectivity is identified as a National Strategic Outcome critical to strengthen the economy and communities, in the NFP, the established use of the site as a telecommunications exchange and the existing monopole with transmission equipment, the proposed monopole will not be significantly different, this is a rural area, with a number of one-off houses in the vicinity, rather than a residential area per the Guidelines and the last resort requirement does not apply.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The planning report on the file recommends refusal on the grounds that:

Due to its proximity to residential development it would be contrary to national guidelines.

Its location within a prominent and constrained site where it will breach the skyline when viewed from long and short distance views would be visually intrusive and contrary to policy P-ICT5.

The applicant has not fully assessed or submitted details on alternative locations or demonstrated that this is a last resort location or detailed the method of site selection.

The report includes:

The application site is at road level in an area that is rising in elevation locally, situated on the outskirts of Glasson village with long distance views of the surrounding hinterland. The existing EIR exchange is constrained and devoid of any landscaping. The site immediately abuts a single storey residential dwelling to the north (dwelling c 9m from proposed mast) sited within the open countryside. There are a significant number of residential dwellings in close proximity to the application site and c11 dwellings within 300m radius of the site.

Currently the existing 12m timber pole is visible from the immediate approach to the site but generally stays below the backdrop of dwellings and treelines when viewed from the approach roads. Having regard to the simplified components of the existing structure i.e. a simple 12m timber pole structure together with the low profile nature of the exchange building, the visual impacts of the existing development are considered to be minimal.

The proposed mast however comprises a significant 18m high monopole structure with associated antennae's and dishes which is proposed to be located within 9m of an existing dwelling. There is no planning history pertaining to the subject site and it is assumed the existing development is pre-1963. Notwithstanding same, it is considered that the proposed development will significantly intensify the use of this constrained site within a locally populated area and located unduly close to a residential dwelling.

Due to the prominent nature of the site, complete lack of enclosure/planting and the proposed height/scale of the proposed monopole, it is considered that it will breach the skyline when viewed from long and short distance views, will be visible above the roof of houses along the N55 and will have an overbearing impact on the boundary of neighbouring property and adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

- Policy

- Circular letter PL07/12
- The 1996 Guidelines.
- Circular letter 03-18
- CDP 2013-2019 – policies - EC POL 25, EC POL 33, EC POL 34, EC POL 35 and EC POL 38. Development Management Standards Sec 11.12.
- No pre planning consultation took place.

This recommendation was overruled by the Director of Services and the decision to grant permission issued.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Area Engineer – no objection.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. TII - TII considers it at variance with official policy:

The site if the proposed development is located within an area considered for a future national road scheme. The proposed development could prejudice plans for the design of this scheme and hence the application is premature pending the determination of this route. A grant of permission in this instance is considered to be at variance with the provisions of the DoECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads, Guidelines for Planning Authorities Jan 2012 S2.9.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. Third party observations on the file have been read and noted.

4.0 Planning History

13/7050 permission granted to Eircom Ltd for 4m wide entrance gates and ancillary site works. Details have been supplied by the planning authority and include:

It is proposed to remove the existing concrete post and rail fence and to construct a new vehicular entrance spanning 4m wide and to construct a concrete boundary wall (1.2m) to march existing adjacent boundary wall. The applicant proposes removing

the existing gravel surface to the front boundary of the site and replace with macadam to provide for a layby/entrance to the site.

A further information request included for a Road Safety Audit, which was carried out by JB Barry & Partners Consulting Engineers (for Glasson RSU (remote switching unit) Exchange) and included with this in the further information response is the design response of Kavanagh Mansfield & Partners Consulting Engineers (including auto tracking for a light van) with recommended alterations to the proposal: the setting back of the wall to provide a dwell area, and to allow vehicles to drive in, turn and drive out. It was noted that the parking area can only accommodate one parked vehicle and that Eircom have measures in place which ensure that only one vehicle is on site at any time. There is no requirement on an RSU site to have more than one technician attend at the site at any time. A photograph of the site at that time is provided in the planner's report.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Planning Framework

5.1.1. Policies are supportive of the need for good telecommunications infrastructure.

Addressing Connectivity

Connectivity in the 21st Century is of fundamental significance as the digital revolution continues to influence how our society and economy function. The provision of high speed digital infrastructure is critical to realising potential employment opportunities and facilitating innovation.

For rural Ireland, broadband is essential enabling infrastructure that affords rural communities the same opportunities to engage with the digital economy as it does to those who live in our cities and towns.

National Policy Objective 24 - Support and facilitate delivery of the National Broadband Plan as a means of developing further opportunities for enterprise, employment, education, innovation and skills development for those who live and work in rural areas.

5.2. **Development Plan**

5.3. Westmeath County Development Plan 2014-2020 is the operative plan. Relevant provisions include:

10.15.2 Telecommunications

An efficient telecommunications system is important in the development of the economy. The de-regulation of the industry has brought choice and competition but has given rise to duplication and overprovision of certain facilities.

The Planning Authority will have regard to the guidelines issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage & Local Government, 'Planning Guidelines for Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures' (1996) and Circular Letter PL 07/12. The assessment of individual proposals will be governed by the guidelines and the controls scheduled in the Development Management section of this plan.

It is the policy of Westmeath County Council:

P-ICT1 To support the delivery of high capacity Information Communications Technology Infrastructure, broadband connectivity and digital broadcasting, throughout the county, in order to ensure economic competitiveness for the enterprise and commercial sectors and in enabling more flexible work practices e.g. teleworking.

P-ICT2 To support the co-ordinated and focused development and extension of broadband infrastructure throughout the county.

P-ICT3 To co-operate with the Department of Communications, Energy and Natural Resources and public and private agencies where appropriate, in improving high quality broadband infrastructure throughout the county.

P-ICT4 To achieve a balance between facilitating the provision of telecommunications infrastructure in the interests of social and economic progress, and sustaining residential amenity and environmental quality.

P-ICT5 To ensure that the location of telecommunications structures should minimise and / or mitigate any adverse impacts on communities, public rights of way and the built or natural environment.

P-ICT6 To encourage co-location of antennae on existing support structures and to require documentary evidence as to the non availability of this option in proposals for new structures. The shared use of existing structures will be required where the numbers of masts located in any single area is considered to have an excessive concentration.

P-ICT7 To facilitate the provision of telecommunications infrastructure throughout the county in accordance with the requirements of the “Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures – Guidelines for Planning Authorities” July 1996 and Circular Letter PL 07/12.

14.11.2 Telecommunications - An efficient telecommunications system is important in the development of the economy. However, in considering location requirements, the Planning Authority will take the following factors outlined by the Department of the Environment and Local Government’s “Planning Guidelines for Telecommunications Antennae and Supports Structures” (1996) and Circular PSSP 07/12.

- Co-location agreements are desirable for the granting of planning permission. Where new facilities are proposed applicants will be required to satisfy the Council that they have made a reasonable effort to share facilities or to locate facilities in clusters.
- Where particular site or environmental conditions apply, the lifespan of the structure shall be limited.
- When the structure is no longer required, it shall be demolished, removed and the site re-instated at the operators’ expense.

5.4. Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoE 1996)

5.4.1. These guidelines, which remain current, include:

Topography and population density will dictate to a large extent the location of the base station. While each base station has its own locational requirements it must also fit into the national network.

In rural areas, and in many suburban situations, because of the low rise nature of most of our suburban buildings and structures a supporting mast or tower is needed. As technology develops, the number and size of antennae may change, becoming more efficient and less obtrusive.

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 of 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.

Only as a last resort should free-standing masts be located within or in the immediate surrounds of smaller towns or villages. If such location should become necessary, sites already developed for utilities should be considered and masts and antennae should be designed and adapted for the specific location. The support structure should be kept to the minimum height consistent with effective operation.

In the vicinity of larger towns and in city suburbs operators should endeavour to locate in industrial estates or in industrially zoned land...

Only as a last resort and if the alternatives suggested in the previous paragraph are either unavailable or unsuitable should free-standing masts be located in a residential area or beside schools. If such a location should become necessary, sites already developed for utilities should be considered and masts and antennae should be designed and adapted for the specific location. The support structure should be

kept to the minimum height consistent with effective operation and should be monopole (or poles) rather than a latticed tripod or square structure.

5.5. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.5.1. The site is located c.0.8km direct line distance from Lough Ree SAC (site code:000440) and c1.2km direct line distance from Lough Ree SPA (site code:004064).

5.6. EIA Screening

- 5.6.1. Having regard to the limited nature and scale of the proposed development and the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity, the absence of any connectivity to any sensitive location, 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. Three third party appeals have been made against the planning authority's decision to grant permission, by Helen Claffey & others, Alan & Nicola Claffey, and Andrew Hersey Planning on behalf of Edel Finneran. The issues raised include:
- The elevated position on approach to Glasson Village.
 - On a national road with 80km speed limit, which is not a true reflection of average speeds on the road.
 - Site measures just 8.8 x 22m and is just 2.2m from the edge of the national road.
 - The pole will be c20m from road edge.
 - A road safety audit is required.
 - No sightlines have been provided; minimum sightlines are not available.

- The N55 route selection process is ongoing.
- Per the April 2015 guidelines, at page 11, 5.1, the safety of road users and those carrying out site visits is paramount.
- EIR employees carrying out regular maintenance usually have vehicles up to 7m long and cannot use the parking space. They park on the edge of the road blocking sightlines for local residents.
- Condition 12 of appellant's permission states a requirement for 230m sightlines, when these vehicles are parked their sightline can be less than 50m.
- CDP 16.4
- Distraction to motorists.
- Health – new technology and therefore no studies on long term affects.
- S 4.3 of 1996 guidelines – only as a last resort should a freestanding mast be located in a residential area.
- 2010 appeal decision on a site in Co Cavan is referred to.
- Visual amenity – 19.5m overall height. The structure will be at window level of their first floor bedroom window. Will affect their views and cause shading. CDP is referred to in relation to shadowing.
- It will be an eye sore on the approach to Glasson.
- Impact on value of their property.
- Notice states lattice structure, drawings show a monopole, photo of site notice supplied.
- There are more suitable sites in the vicinity.
- The exchange was built as an analog exchange, before there was digital communication and long before the N55 was an extremely busy national route, and would not be built today.
- The proposed monopole is completely different to the structure on site.
- This is a rural residential area.

- The balance required by I-ICT4 is not being achieved.
- I-ICT5 minimise impact – there is no room or opportunity.
- The exchange is pre-1963 but the existing monopole appeared on site in the 1990s. There is a question re. planning permission.
- The use by Vodafone is questioned.
- There have been a number of serious accidents on this road.
- More dishes will mean more visits and increased traffic risk.
- The mast would make Glasson less attractive for residential development. Zoned land is 450m away and the wastewater treatment plant was upgraded in 2014 at the cost of €6.5m to accommodate population increase.
- NPO 18(b), to support proportionate growth of rural towns.
- Previous Board decisions are cited: 307490 Castleconnell, Limerick; and 305021 Watergrasshill, Co Cork.
- Appellant's dwelling is 9m from the proposed mast and there are 26 other residential properties within 500m. Appellants own a 3.45ha landholding, directly adjacent to the west, which they hope to have zoned and which would be de-valued by the proposed development.
- No visual impact or photomontage was supplied with the application. A photomontage is presented with the appeal.
- Applicant has not explored other locations, such as at Farrannamorreen.

6.2. Applicant Response

- 6.2.1. The applicant has not responded to the grounds of appeal.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- 6.3.1. The planning authority have not responded to the grounds of appeal.

6.4. Observations

A Residents Group, c/o Helen Claffey have submitted an observation on the appeal, which includes:

- Support for Edel Finneran's appeal
- I-ICT4 of county development plan which requires a balance between facilitating the provision of telecommunications infrastructure in the interests of social and economic progress, and sustaining residential amenity and environmental quality, is not achieved.
- I-ICT5 of county development plan is not met. The proposed development will significantly impact on visual amenity and devalue houses.
- The existing compound is pre '63 but the monopole and dishes/antennas is not, appearing in the 1990s. They question the planning status. They question why Westmeath County Council have referred to permitting an 18m lattice.
- They question whether eir have explored other sites and they question eir's agreement with Vodafone, which is at the expense of physical and mental health of families adjacent.
- They are concerned about the impact on roadway users, of additional parking on this busy road.
- The structure is not in keeping with their beautiful village. It will be an ugly intrusion on the landscape and will be visible from afar.

7.0 Assessment

- 7.1.1. The issues which arise in relation to this appeal are: appropriate assessment; the 1996 Guidelines, residential and visual amenity property value and health; the N55 route & traffic safety; the site notice; and site selection and development details, and the following assessment is dealt with under those headings.

7.2. Appropriate Assessment

- 7.2.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, I am satisfied that 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.

7.3. The 1996 Guidelines, Residential and Visual Amenity Property Value and Health.

- 7.3.1. The 1996 guidelines are still current. The appellants refer to section 4.3 of the guidelines, that only as a last resort should a freestanding mast be located in a residential area.
- 7.3.2. They are concerned at the visual amenity impact of a 19.5m overall height. The structure will be at window level of appellant's first floor bedroom window. It will affect their views and cause shading. The county development plan is referred to. The balance between facilitating the provision of telecommunications infrastructure in the interests of social and economic progress, and sustaining residential amenity is not achieved. It will be an eye sore on the approach to Glasson and it will impact on the value of their property. This is new technology and therefore there are no studies on the long-term health affects. Residential areas are referred to in the 1996 Guidelines as being a location of last resort for antennae.
- 7.3.3. Standards for such equipment are prescribed and in terms of location vis a vis individual residential properties, there is no distance requirement specified in the 1996 guidelines. A residential area in the context in which it is used in the guidelines refers to designated residential areas which would occur in an urban location / settlement.
- 7.3.4. The guidelines also refer to visual impact and avoiding views: 2.3.1 Masts – Support Structures; that in the Development Plan, an authority should indicate any locations where, for various reasons, telecommunications installations would not be favoured or where special conditions would apply. Such locations might include, for example, lands whose high amenity value is already recognised in the development plan or sites beside schools which might give rise to local concerns,
- 7.3.5. It states that the visual impact is among the more important considerations which have to be taken into account in arriving at a decision on a particular application. In most cases the applicant will only have limited flexibility as regards location. 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.

- 7.3.6. There are a number of dwellings in the vicinity of the site and one in particular in close proximity to the proposed development. Having regard to the nature of the development it is not likely that it will cause shading, but it could be considered to have an overbearing impact.
- 7.3.7. The subject site is relatively prominent on the N55 north of Glasson and will be visible intermittently travelling north from the settlement. While the mast will be visible and noticeable, it will not, in my opinion, intrude overly on the general view. On balance I consider that the proposal will not unduly impact on the visual amenities of the area and is therefore acceptable.
- 7.3.8. There is no evidence to suggest that the proposed development would impact on property values.
- 7.3.9. As stated in the guidelines the health impacts of telecommunications facilities is dealt with under other codes.

7.4. N55 Route & Traffic Safety

- 7.4.1. The report to the planning authority from Transport Infrastructure Ireland states that TII considers the development to be at variance with official policy:

The site if the proposed development is located within an area considered for a future national road scheme. The proposed development could prejudice plans for the design of this scheme and hence the application is premature pending the determination of this route. A grant of permission in this instance is considered to be at variance with the provisions of the DoECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads, Guidelines for Planning Authorities Jan 2012 S2.9.

- 7.4.2. In my opinion it is most unlikely, given the location in close proximity to multiple dwellings, that any line for the future N55 would be affected by the proposed development.
- 7.4.3. The issue of traffic safety, is raised by the appellants. It is stated that EIR employees carrying out regular maintenance usually have vehicles up to 7m long and cannot

use the parking space. They park on the edge of the road blocking sightlines for local residents.

- 7.4.4. It is stated that there have been a number of serious accidents on this road; more dishes will mean more visits and increased traffic risk. The need for a road safety audit is also referred to.
- 7.4.5. The planning history of the site, supplied by the planning authority, includes a copy of a road safety audit and the designer's response, in respect of the previous development, 13/7050, for development which evolved into setting back, the front roadside boundary wall and surfacing a parking which has been provided at the front of the site. It is worth noting that the road safety audit noted that the parking area can only accommodate one parked vehicle and in this regard it accepted that Eircom had measures in place which ensure that only one vehicle is on site at any time; and that there was no requirement to have more than one technician attend at the site at any time.
- 7.4.6. In the current application, the proposal is intended to facilitate co-location of service providers and it cannot be guaranteed therefore that only one technician would attend at the site at any time. The Board must consider whether the increase in use would cause a traffic hazard. This issue was not raised by TII and the Area Engineer in his report has stated that he has no objection to the proposed development.
- 7.4.7. I consider that the proposed development would not generate any significant additional traffic and therefore on balance is acceptable in terms of traffic safety.

7.5. **Site Notice**

- 7.5.1. It is stated in a grounds of appeal that the notice erected on the site stated the development as a lattice structure, whereas drawings show a monopole; a photo of the site notice is supplied.
- 7.5.2. A photograph of the site notice erected on the site has been provided in the Area Engineer's report and matches the copy supplied as part of the planning application, the description used is 'monopole'.

7.6. Site Selection and Development Details

- 7.6.1. It is stated in a grounds of appeal that there are more suitable sites in the vicinity; and also the exchange was built as an analog exchange, before there was digital communication and long before the N55 was an extremely busy national route, and would not be built today.
- 7.6.2. Figure 1 of the document submitted with the application, indicates another eir facility at Farranamorreen, stated to be 630m from the subject site. It is stated that it does not provide adequate eir coverage across Glasson and for greatest functionality eir would house all its equipment within a single compound rather than split its infrastructure across separate sites some 630m apart; for this reason this structure must be discounted.
- 7.6.3. . The subject site is located in Glasson townland and Farrannamorreen is the adjoining townland to the north, less than 60m from the subject site, continuing uphill for some distance. The location indicated in Figure 1 of the application as Farranamorreen is a considerable distance further north. It is not clear where the other eir facility is located, its location cannot be identified from Figure 1. Neither is it possible, therefore, to comment on the statement that it does not, (or could not) provide adequate eir coverage across Glasson.
- 7.6.4. In the application documents, a map is provided (at Fig 2) which is stated to be a public viewer available from Comreg, showing nationwide outdoor coverage for a range of broadband operators and which 'demonstrates that eir 4G is entirely deficient in Glasson and requires new infrastructure to enable 4G rollout.'
- 7.6.5. While this map indicates deficiency in coverage, it does not necessarily point to a conclusion that the subject site is the optimal location for the proposed development.
- 7.6.6. In relation to the development at the subject site, the drawings provided indicate multiple items of equipment but no details of the transmitter power output or antenna type are given. Neither is it stated that there would be no conflict with the equipment on the nearby wooden pole 'with other operator's equipment', which is to remain in place.
- 7.6.7. No response has been received from the applicant to the grounds of appeal. The Board may consider that the issue of alternative sites has not been adequately

addressed in the application and that insufficient details of the proposed development have been provided.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1.1. In accordance with the foregoing I recommend that permission should be granted, for the following reasons and considerations and in accordance with the following conditions.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Westmeath County Development Plan 2014 - 2020, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development, which is necessary for the provision of high quality communications and information technology networks in the area, would not seriously injure the amenities of the area, and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1.	<p>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 11th day of November 2020, 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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
----	--

2.	<p>The developer shall allow, subject to reasonable terms, other licensed mobile telecommunications operators to co-locate their antennae onto the subject structure.</p> <p>Reason: In order to avoid the proliferation of telecommunications structures in the interests of visual amenity.</p>
3.	<p>Any equipment erected on the monopole shall not interfere with the existing telecommunications equipment on the site, except with the agreement of other users.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
4.	<p>No advertisement or advertisement structure shall be erected or displayed on the proposed structure or its appendages or within the curtilage of the site without a prior grant of planning permission.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area.</p>
5.	<p>A low intensity fixed red obstacle light shall be fitted as close to the top of the mast as practicable and shall be visible from all angles in azimuth. Details of this light, its location and period of operation shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of public safety.</p>

6.	When the structure is no longer required, it shall be demolished, removed and the site re-instated at the operators' expense. Reason: In the interest of clarity.
----	---

Planning Inspector

14 April 2021

Appendix 1 Photographs

Appendix 2 Westmeath Development Plan 2014-2020 extract.

Appendix 3 Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoE 1996) extract.