



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-309405-21

Development	Construction of a 30 metre lattice tower enclosed within a 2.4 metre high palisade fence compound.
Location	Corgullion Townland, Carrick on Shannon, Co Roscommon.
Planning Authority	Roscommon County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	PD/20/473
Applicant(s)	Cignal Infrastructure Limited
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First-Party
Appellant(s)	Cignal Infrastructure Limited
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	13 th April 2021
Inspector	Stephen Ward

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1.** The appeal site is located in the rural townland of Corgullion, Co. Roscommon, at a distance of c. 4km southeast of Carrick-On-Shannon and c. 4km southwest of Drumsna. The Sligo – Dublin Railway line runs east to west at c. 100m to the north of the site. Further north of this is the River Shannon, which forms part of the Leitrim – Roscommon county border. The Flagford – Arva – Louth 220kv power lines also run in an east-west direction at a distance of c. 250 metres south of the site. The wider surrounding area is otherwise characterised by undulating agricultural land interspersed by one-off houses.
- 1.2.** The site comprises a relatively flat linear section which is to be annexed along the northern boundary of a larger agricultural holding. It has a stated area of 1,104m², with an overall length of c. 310m and a width of 3m for the vast majority of that length. The northern and western site boundaries adjoin the existing field boundaries, which are comprised of trees and hedgerows. The site is accessed by a narrow cul-de-sac local road.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1.** The proposed development comprises the erection of a 30m high multi-user lattice telecommunications structure. The structure will carry antennas and dishes and will be enclosed within a 2.4m high palisade fence compound. Ground based equipment cabinets will be provided for the proposed and future operators. A turning circle and an access track (c. 3m wide by 300m long) will also be provided.
- 2.2.** In addition to the standard planning application documentation and drawings, the application was accompanied by photomontages depicting the visual impact of the proposed development from 12 different view locations; a Technical Justification report; and a planning report addressing the visual impact of the proposed development, heritage impacts, and the planning policy context.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

By order dated 14th January 2021, Roscommon County Council (RCC) issued notification of the decision to refuse permission for the following reason:

The proposed development, which is within the study area for the Carrick-on-Shannon to Dromod Road Project currently being considered by the National Road Design Office, is likely to hinder the development of route corridor options, would be premature pending the route corridor selection process and would accordingly be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. The report of the Planning Officer (8th January 2021) can be summarised as follows:

- Having regard to the CDP policy framework and national guidelines, development of this nature is generally considered acceptable.
- The application outlines that the development has been designed to improve the coverage and capacity of wireless broadband services for the area, will allow multiple network operators, and that suitable alternative options (including co-locating) have not been identified.
- The proposed structure will form a substantial visual feature, but it is acknowledged that this type of infrastructure requires a particular height / elevation to operate effectively.
- The proposed development would not give rise to any significant traffic safety concerns. However, the site is located within the constraints area for the N4 Carrick-on-Shannon to Dromod Project currently being considered by the National Roads Regional Office. It is considered that the application is premature until such time as a preferred route has been established.
- It is recommended to refuse permission in accordance with the RCC notification of decision.

3.2.2. A report from the National Roads Design Office confirms that the site is located within the constraints study area for the N4 Carrick-on-Shannon to Dromod Project. Options for the project are not developed at this time and any proposed development within the area is reviewed in the context of suitability for the development of potential options. Given that there is potential in this area to develop an option for the N4 realignment, the application is deemed premature until such time as a preferred route has been established, which is anticipated to be in Q3 2021.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

The Irish Aviation Authority confirmed that it has no requirement for obstacle lighting in this case.

3.4. Third-Party Observations

None.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Appeal Site

There would not appear to be any planning history relating to the site.

4.2. Similar Cases

The following cases relate to similar circumstances and may be relevant to the Board's consideration of this appeal:

ABP Ref. PL12.235135 - Leitrim County Council decided to refuse permission for a 30 metre high antenna support structure at Mountcampbell, Drumsna, County Leitrim, for reasons including the location of the site within the constraints study area for the N4 Carrick-on-Shannon to Dromod Scheme and prematurity pending selection of a preferred route. However, the Board decided (15th March 2010) to grant a temporary 4-year permission. The Inspector in this case highlighted the significant length of time involved in selecting a route and the fact that a similar structure had recently been granted on an adjoining site on a temporary basis.

ABP Ref. PL18.241306 – Monaghan County Council had decided to refuse permission for a 24m high monopole on the basis of its location within lands identified as a route for the proposed re-alignment of the N2 road (Clontibret to Northern Ireland Border Scheme) and prematurity pending the final determination of the scheme. However, the Board decided (11th March 2013) to grant a temporary 5-year permission on the basis that it would not prejudice the planning and implementation of the road scheme (N2). The Board noted that the planning of the scheme was suspended at the time.

ABP Ref. PL16.241621 – On 31st May 2013, the Board upheld the decision of Mayo County Council to refuse permission for a 30 metre high telecommunications multi-user monopole support structure on the basis that the proposed site conflicts with an area under consideration for a section of the N5/N26/N58 Turlough to Bohola Road Project and prematurity pending the determination of a road layout. In this case the Planning Authority had stated that the site was located in an area which could be considered for at least three potential route options.

ABP Ref. PL61.245381 – On 31st May 2015, the Board upheld the decision of Galway City Council to grant retention permission for 24-metre-high telecommunications support structure. A 2-year temporary permission was applied to enable the impact of the development to be re-assessed having regard to the location of the development adjacent to an Emerging Route Corridor for the N6, a major national road infrastructure project.

ABP Ref. PL04.307200 – Cork County Council had decided to grant permission for a telecommunications support structure (to replace existing). The Planning Authority noted its location within the proposed N20 Route Protection Corridor but considered that the mast could be easily removed if required to facilitate M20 works. However, the Board decided (25th November 2020) to refuse permission on the basis that it would be premature pending the determination of a road layout for the M20 and would be at variance with the recommendations of the Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines.

5.0 Policy & Context

5.1. National & Regional Policy

Project Ireland 2040

- 5.1.1. The National Planning Framework (NPF) acknowledges that telecommunications networks play a crucial role in enabling social and economic activity. For rural Ireland, it states that 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 aims to 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.
- 5.1.2. National Strategic Outcome 2 (NSO2) relates to 'Enhanced Regional Accessibility' and states that better accessibility to the Northern and Western region will enable unrealised potential to be activated and prepare for the potential impacts of 'Brexit'. The upgrading of northern sections of the N4 is identified in this regard.
- 5.1.3. The National Development Plan 2018-2027 (NDP) sets out the significant level of investment which will underpin the overarching message of the NPF and drive its implementation over the relevant period. With regard to NSO2, the objective is to complete road linkages so that every region and all the major urban areas, particularly those in the North-West, which have been comparatively neglected until recently, are linked to Dublin by a high-quality road network.
- 5.1.4. The 'N4 Carrick on Shannon' scheme is included in a list of 22 national road network schemes that will be progressed through pre-appraisal and early planning to prioritise projects which are proceeding to construction in the NDP.

NWRA Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy 2020-2032

- 5.1.5. Section 6.5 of the RSES deals with 'Broadband Connectivity' and highlights the importance of improving coverage in rural areas. Regional Policy Objective (RPO) 6.36 supports the roll-out of the National Broadband Plan. Section 6.6 deals with the 'Smart Region' and RPO 6.52 aims to facilitate infrastructural needs, including immediate priorities for access to ultra-fast and rural broadband initiatives.

- 5.1.6. RPO 6.7 supports the National Development Plan investment commitments to progress the N4 Carrick on Shannon to Dromod scheme through pre-appraisal and early planning in the short term. Thereafter, the objective is to proceed to construction and delivery within the lifetime of the RSES. Section 3 outlines key future priorities for Carrick on Shannon as a 'Key Town' in the region, including support for the development of the N4 By-Pass.
- 5.1.7. The Shannon Blueway is recognised as one of a number of a natural recreational trails that provide scenic routes into rural Ireland. RPO 5.20 aims to support and facilitate the continued development of the region's Blueways along existing waterways and through the reopening of disused waterways. RPO 5.2 seeks to protect, manage and conserve the quality, character and distinctiveness of landscapes and seascapes.

Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (1996)

- 5.1.8. These guidelines, hereafter referred to as the Telecommunications Guidelines, set out the criteria for the assessment of telecommunications structures. Section 3.2 sets out that an authority should indicate in their Development Plan an acceptance of the importance of a high-quality telecommunications service, as well as any locations where telecommunications installations would not be favoured or where special conditions would apply. Such locations might include high amenity lands or sites beside schools.
- 5.1.9. 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. Whatever the general visual context, great care will have to be taken when dealing with fragile or sensitive landscapes. The sharing of installations and clustering of antennae is encouraged, as co-location would reduce the visual impact on the landscape according to Section 4.5 of the Guidelines.

Circular Letter PL07/12 – Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures

- 5.1.10. Issued in 2012, this Circular Letter revises elements of the 1996 Guidelines. In summary, the revisions are as follows:

- Temporary permissions should only be used in exceptional circumstances where particular site / environmental conditions apply.
- Separation distances between telecommunication structures and sensitive receptors should not be incorporated into statutory plans.
- Bonds for the removal of structures should not apply.
- A register of approved structures should be maintained.
- Clarification that Planning Authorities do not have competence to assess health and safety matters as these matters are regulated by other codes.

Spatial Planning and National Roads - Guidelines for planning authorities (2012)

- 5.1.11. These guidelines set out planning policy considerations relating to development affecting national primary and secondary roads, including motorways and associated junctions, outside the 50-60 kmh speed limit zones for cities, towns and villages. The guidelines aim to facilitate a well-informed, integrated and consistent approach that affords maximum support for the goal of achieving and maintaining a safe and efficient network of national roads in the broader context of sustainable development strategies, thereby facilitating continued economic growth and development.
- 5.1.12. Section 2.9 deals with the protection of alignments for future National Road projects. It states that a development or local area plan should identify any land required for future projects, including objectives that retain required lands free from development and to ensure that any adjacent development of sensitive uses are compatible with the construction and long-term operation of the road. Development objectives, including the zoning of land, must not compromise the route selection process, particularly in circumstances where road scheme planning is underway and potential route corridors or upgrades have been identified.

5.2. Local Planning Policy

Roscommon County Development Plan 2014-2020

- 5.2.1. Section 4.7 outlines the essential role of telecommunications investment in furthering the social and economic development of the county. Section 4.7.1 highlights the importance of broadband services and section 4.7.2 specifically addresses the 'Mobile Phone Network Development', stating that the necessary physical

infrastructure and structures must be developed in a strategic way that minimises impact on the environment. Telecommunications policy for the County is based on the Guidelines for Planning Authorities (1996) and any revisions to same.

- 5.2.2. Section 9.33 of the Plan provides criteria and requirements for the evaluation of telecommunications developments. Proposals should include a reasoned justification for the need for the development and should demonstrate that alternative locations and co-location arrangements have been considered.
- 5.2.3. Section 3.5 of the Plan recognises the importance of tourism to the local economy and identifies the need to capitalise upon the River Shannon corridor as one of its primary rural and natural resource-based tourism attractions. Objective 7.30 aims to maintain and preserve the aesthetic value of inland waterways and the waterway corridors from the impacts of dispersed and highly visible development.
- 5.2.4. In accordance with the Landscape Character Assessment the site is within a 'Drumlin Lakelands' landscape of 'Very High Value'. Objective 7.37 of the Plan seeks to minimise the visual impacts on areas classified as 'very high value' and, where necessary, require a visual impact assessment.
- 5.2.5. Section 4.1.3 states that the planned upgrade to the Carrick-on-Shannon to Dromod section of the N4 (portions of which fall within County Roscommon) has been suspended until further notice and may not be completed in the period of this CDP. While a Carrick-on Shannon By-Pass project is mentioned, the larger Carrick-on-Shannon to Dromod project is not included in Table 4.1 'Planned Motorway and National Road Projects', which is a list of projects to be facilitated in accordance with Objective 4.22 of the Plan. Policy 4.14 aims to reserve national road corridors free from development as appropriate where they appear in the Plan.

Leitrim County Development Plan 2015 - 2021

- 5.2.6. While the appeal site is located entirely within County Roscommon, I have considered the provisions of the Leitrim County Development Plan for context given the nature of the case and the proximity of the site to the county boundary along the River Shannon.
- 5.2.7. Section 4.11.8 sets out the importance of improving telecommunications networks and services. The Council will support the provision and expansion of broadband

capacity and telecommunications infrastructure will be supported on condition that it will not adversely impact on visual/residential amenity, natural beauty or archaeological heritage, or give rise to public health concerns. Section 5.4.9 provides further guidance on the location and evaluation of proposals.

- 5.2.8. Section 3.2 (Tourism Sector) highlights the importance of the Shannon River system and aims to capitalise on this valuable tourism resource. In terms of landscape character, the area directly north of the River Shannon is designated as an area of 'High Visual Amenity'.
- 5.2.9. The Core Strategy (section 2.1.8) identifies the upgrade of the N4 Carrick on Shannon to Dromod (including the Carrick on Shannon Bypass) as a key priority and states that a preferred route has been chosen. Policy 54 and Objective 30(b) aim to complete this project within the lifetime of the Plan. Policies 55 and 56 aim to ensure that proposed developments do not prejudice the implementation of any identified/proposed road scheme and to preserve, free from development, proposed road realignments / improvement lines and associated corridors. The Plan includes a map (map 4.4) of the preferred route for the N4 Carrick on Shannon to Dromod scheme.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

There are no designated sites within 5km of the appeal site and no Natura 2000 sites within 10km.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The issues raised in the first-party appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The requirement for the development is detailed in the Technical Justification report submitted with the application and it will provide a significant improvement to voice and broadband services to the area for multiple operators. The closest other site is 4.2km away and cannot provide the necessary coverage for the target areas.

- Widespread social and economic changes have highlighted the need for improved and extensive telecommunication capabilities. More recently, there has been a steep increase in usage as a result of remote working associated with the COVID-19 pandemic.
- The appeal maintains that the proposed development is in accordance with national, regional and local planning policy.
- The N4 road project is at an early stage and in the absence of any preferred routes, which is not expected until Q3 2021, it is yet to be confirmed if the route will affect the subject site. The applicant is happy to accept a temporary 5-year permission which would eliminate conflict with possible future routes. In the event that it does impact on a preferred route, the development will be removed at the applicant's expense.
- The appeal refers to a Galway City Council case (ABP Ref. No. PL 61.245381) and contends that a temporary 2-year retention permission for a mast was supported on grounds that it would not conflict with the delivery of a preferred route for the N6 road project.

6.2. Observations

None received.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority did not respond to the grounds of appeal.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Introduction

7.1.1. Having regard to the documentation submitted in connection with the application and the appeal, and having inspected the site, I consider that the main issues for assessment are as follows:

- The principle of the development

- Visual Impact
- Impact on the N4 road realignment project

7.2. The principle of the development

- 7.2.1. The proposed development is clearly supported by national, regional and local planning policies which seek to improve telecommunications infrastructure in rural areas in the interests of improved connectivity and economic development.
- 7.2.2. The application includes a Technical Justification report prepared by Vilicom, which outlines that the development will accommodate multiple mobile phone and broadband operators and will improve voice and data services to areas that currently have poor to non-existent coverage. The coverage area includes large sections of the Dublin-Sligo rail line and the Shannon waterway. It is stated that the proposed 30m height is necessary to ensure adequate coverage.
- 7.2.3. The report outlines that the nearest other site is a single operator tower at a distance of c. 4.2km, which I note to be consistent with the available mapping of masts as per the ComReg website. It is stated that this mast is unable to provide coverage for the target areas as it is too far away and does not have an adequate line of sight, as is the case with all other facilities in the area. Service coverage predictions are included which outline that the proposed development will greatly improve service to the target areas.
- 7.2.4. I note that the Telecommunications Guidelines encourage the co-location of antennae on existing support structures and masts. They acknowledge that sites will be chosen in the interests of good quality coverage taking into account topography, population, and other criteria, and accept that in some instances may not be technically possible to share facilities.
- 7.2.5. Having regard to the above, I consider that the proposed development would be consistent with national, regional and local planning policy to support telecommunications infrastructure in this rural area. I have considered the applicant's justification for the proposed development and I am satisfied that reasonable attempts have been made to share or co-locate the proposed development with other structures. In the absence of a suitable site for sharing and the particular

coverage deficiencies that exist at this location, I would have no objection to the principle of the proposed development.

7.3. Visual Amenity

- 7.3.1. The site is located within a drumlin / lakeland landscape adjoining the River Shannon. The Roscommon CDP classifies the landscape on the southern side of the Shannon as being of 'Very High Value'. Given the significant height of the proposed structure and its proximity to the Leitrim county boundary, I also note that the Leitrim CDP similarly classifies the landscape on the northern side of the river as 'High Visual Amenity'. Furthermore, I acknowledge that both CDP's identify the River Shannon corridor as an important natural resource in terms of tourism and recreation and outline that new development proposals should not detract from the value of the landscape.
- 7.3.2. The Telecommunications Guidelines acknowledge that the location, siting and design of infrastructure will be largely influenced by radio and engineering parameters. In acknowledging that some masts will remain quite noticeable despite best precautions, the guidelines advise taking into account the extent to which the mast would terminate a view; whether views are limited to intermittent or incidental impacts; and local factors including vegetation, topography and other objects in the wider panorama.
- 7.3.3. The application includes a visual impact assessment which considers the impact of the development from 12 viewpoints within a 1.1km zone of influence. While I consider that quality of the photomontage images is limited, I note that the assessment concludes that impact significance will not be more than moderate.
- 7.3.4. Having inspected the site and the surrounding area, I note that there are no major road routes in close proximity to the site. Furthermore, the undulating topography of this drumlin landscape helps to ensure that the site is not overly exposed when viewed from the surrounding network of local roads.
- 7.3.5. To the north of the site, the rail line and the River Shannon are of course important routes for differing reasons of transportation and tourism/recreation respectively. The height of the proposed structure means that it will be unavoidably visible from these routes, albeit for intermittent sections. However, I consider that the visual impact

must also be considered in the context of the existing landscape to the south, which is already somewhat dominated by the presence of the 220kv power lines and their supporting structures. I would also consider that the rail line itself impacts on the character and quality of this rural landscape by reason of visual and noise disturbance, albeit that those impacts are limited to brief but intense instances of passing trains.

- 7.3.6. Having regard to the above, I consider that, while the proposed structure would certainly be visible and would have negative impacts on the landscape, these impacts will be limited in terms of sensitivity and significance, particularly having regard to the baseline condition of the surrounding area and the existing presence of strategic infrastructure. Accordingly, I do not consider that the proposed development would seriously detract from the character or amenities of the area.

7.4. Impact on the N4 road realignment project

- 7.4.1. Reflecting the Planning Authority's reason for refusal, I consider that this is the determining issue for consideration in this appeal. Effectively, it is an issue which requires a balanced consideration of the apparently conflicting needs of transport and telecommunications infrastructure. In section 4 of this report I have outlined similar cases whereby the Board's decisions have, understandably, varied depending on the circumstances of the case. Together with the policy context outlined in section 5 of this report, I consider that these cases have highlighted the importance of establishing the status and progression of the project, particularly in terms of the project appraisal, route selection, incorporation into statutory plans, and timeframe for delivery.
- 7.4.2. With regard to Development Plan policy, I have outlined how the Roscommon CDP acknowledges that the N4 Carrick-on-Shannon to Dromod project may not be completed in the plan period and that the scheme is not included in the list of planned national road projects (Table 4.1) to be facilitated in accordance with Objective 4.22. Therefore, while objective Policy 4.14 aims to reserve road corridors where they appear in the Plan, there is no evidence of the existence in the CDP of a defined corridor for the scheme in question.

- 7.4.3. Again, I am conscious of the implications of the proximity of the site to the Leitrim county boundary, particularly given that the entire section of the N4 road between Carrick-on-Shannon and Dromod is within County Leitrim. The Leitrim CDP is more definitive on the project, outlining the aim to complete this project within the lifetime of the Plan and including policies to ensure that proposed developments do not prejudice the implementation of schemes and to preserve corridors free from development. The Plan includes a map (map 4.4) of the preferred route for the scheme, which does not affect the appeal site. The route runs to the north of the existing N4 and, apart from a section to the west of Carrick-on-Shannon, appears to be entirely within County Leitrim.
- 7.4.4. Having regard to the above, I do not consider that there is currently a protected route corridor for the N4 project contained within either CDP that would affect the appeal site. Furthermore, while the National Development Plan outlines that the scheme be subject to further appraisal, there is no commitment that it will be prioritised to proceed to construction.
- 7.4.5. It would appear that any previous progress on the scheme has effectively been abandoned and that the planning process has recommenced in entirety. According to the project website (www.carrickdromod.ie), the first public consultation phase on 'Constraints' took place in October 2020 and the project is now at 'option selection' stage. According to the National Roads Design Office report on file, options have not been developed at this time and it is anticipated that a preferred route will be established in Q3 of 2021.
- 7.4.6. I note that the TII Major Roads Projects Active List report of March 2021 confirms that the scheme is at 'Early Planning' (options selection) stage. Preliminary Business Case Approval has not yet been attained and a construction timeframe can clearly not yet be confirmed. The report refers to the TII Project Management Guidelines on project appraisal phases, which set out an indicate timeframe of 2-3 years for 'Early Planning' and another 2-5 years for Statutory Processes and Enabling and Procurement. Only after these phases are satisfactorily completed and approved can a project proceed to 'Construction and Implementation'.
- 7.4.7. In conclusion, I note that the project is at an early stage and I do not consider that any firm commitments exist to indicate that the project is likely to be delivered in the

short-term. In the absence of the existence of any relevant route option for the scheme in the Development Plan or otherwise, I note that the Planning Authority's decision has been based simply on the location of the site within the constraints study area. In this regard, I consider it important to distinguish between a route corridor and an initial study area. The former has a realistic prospect of being developed and warrants protection, most suitably through its incorporation into a Development Plan or Local Area Plan as recommended in section 2.9 of the Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines. However, I do not consider it reasonable to deem all development within a study area to be premature and I consider that important upgrades to telecommunications infrastructure should be facilitated where possible.

- 7.4.8. The appellant has indicated an acceptance towards a temporary 5-year permission and contends that this would eliminate any potential conflict with the future delivery of a route in this area. I note that Circular PL 07/12 indicates that temporary permissions should only be used in exceptional circumstances where particular site / environmental conditions apply. However, I consider that the intention of this particular guidance is to remove onerous obligations requiring the developer to reapply in light of changes in technology. In circumstances where the developer has indicated an acceptance towards a temporary permission, and where permission might otherwise be refused, I consider that the imposition of a temporary permission is warranted and appropriate in this case.
- 7.4.9. Having regard to the lack of certainty regarding route selection options for the N4 scheme and the likely timeframe for its progression, I consider that a 5-year permission will facilitate the immediate and much-needed upgrade of telecommunications infrastructure in the area, while also appropriately allowing for the reassessment of the proposed development in the event that the site is affected by a preferred route corridor.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment

Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, the nature of the receiving environment and the proximity to the nearest European site, 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.

9.0 Recommendation

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

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2014-2020, the 'Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures Guidelines for Planning Authorities' issued by the Department of the Environment and Local Government in 1996 and the associated Circular Letter PL 07/12, the Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities issued by the Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government in 2012, the existing pattern of development in the area and the nature and scale of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity, would not compromise the route selection process for the N4 Carrick-on-Shannon to Dromod road project, and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, 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.
 - (a) This grant of permission shall be for a period of five years from the date of this Order. The telecommunications support structure and related ancillary structures (including the access road) shall then be removed unless, prior to the end of the period, planning permission for retention for a further period has been obtained.
 - (b) 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 at least one month before the date of expiry of this permission. Reinstatement shall be deemed to include the grubbing out of the access road created in association with the development permitted herein.

Reason: To enable the impact of the development to be re-assessed having regard to the route selection process for the N4 Carrick-on-Shannon to Dromod National Road project.

3. 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 interest of the visual amenities of the area.

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

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

5. Drainage arrangements, including the disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

6. Details of the proposed colour scheme for the telecommunications structure and ancillary structures 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.

Stephen Ward
Senior Planning Inspector

22nd April 2021