



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-310673-21

Development	Construction of lattice tower telecommunications structure.
Location	Ballymurray Townland, Ballymurray, Co Roscommon
Planning Authority	Roscommon County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	20357
Applicant(s)	Signal Infrastructure Ltd
Type of Application	Planning Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant with Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Appeals
Appellant(s)	Larry & Ann Shine, Kevin & Áine Cook, Louis & Teresa Hannon, Gerry McDermott, Ian Monaghan & Áine Kelly, Joe & Zara Beirne, Seamus & Clare Corcoran Louis and Teresa Hannon
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	9 th September 2021
Inspector	Susan Clarke

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located on the eastern site of the N61 in a rural area approximately 5km southeast of Roscommon town and measures 0.0481ha. It is a relatively rural area with dispersed one-off housing in the townland of Ballymurray. The surrounding land is largely in agriculture and forestry use.
- 1.2. The site is located on agricultural land, to the rear of two single storey detached dwellings and a farmyard complex that face onto the N61. The site has a low-lying flat topography with a mature hedgerow along its northern boundary. It is proposed to access the site via an existing access point off the N61 that currently serves the farmyard complex.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development consists of the:
 - Construction of a 36m high lattice tower telecommunication structure with antenna and dishes enclosed within a 2.4m high palisade fence compound;
 - Associated ground equipment; and
 - Associated site works including a new access track.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

A Notification of Decision to Grant Permission was issued on 3rd June 2021, subject to 5 No. conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports (28th October 2020 and 27th May 2021)

The Planning Officer considered that the proposal would have a relatively low visual impact, but questioned the visual impact of the proposed fencing as no elevations for same were submitted with the planning application. In addition, the proposed access

track was considered acceptable. A Request for Further Information (RFI) was issued on 5th November 2020 in relation to seven matters including *inter alia*:

- Requirement to prepare a Road Safety Audit (RSA),
- Compliance with sightline requirements,
- Confirmation of construction and operational traffic movements,
- Preparation of elevations for the proposed palisade fence and plans for the proposed cabinet,
- Confirmation that sufficient legal interest exists to access the lands, and
- Identification of 'other mobile sites in the area' that were discounted as possible locations for the proposed development.

A response to the RFI was submitted to the Local Authority on 15th April 2021. The Response confirmed that the Applicant accepted the design recommendations of the RSA and that a letter of consent had been obtained from the relevant landowner to trim the vegetation in order to maintain appropriate sightlines at the entrance to the site. It was also advised that there would be 2-8 No. vehicular visits to the site per annum using a small van. Whilst the TII stated the application would be premature pending the determination of a national road improvement scheme for the N61, the NRDO stated the subject site was not considered to impact upon the future project. The Planning Officer considered that no further action was required in relation to this matter. The Applicant advised that there is a lease agreement with the landowner to provide access to the site. The design details for the palisade fence and cabinet were also considered acceptable to the Planning Officer. Furthermore, the Planning Officer accepted the Applicant's justification for discounting other sites in the area on technical grounds.

In conclusion, the Planning Officer considered that having regard to the proposed siting of the structure and associated infrastructure, the application was acceptable.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- **Road Design:** No comments found on file.
- **NRDO:** The application is not considered to impact on the route being developed for the Ballymurray to Knockcroghery road project.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- **Irish Aviation Authority** (2nd October 2020): No observations made on the application.
- **Transport Infrastructure Ireland** (25th September 2020 and 14th May 2021): Proposed development is at variance with national policy in relation to control of frontage development on national roads. Recommended that a road safety audit is carried out. The TII later stated that the site is in an area under consideration as a route for a national road improvement scheme.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.5. A number of observations from local residents were made to the Local Authority opposing the proposed development during both the initial five-week consultation period following the lodgement of the application and after the Local Authority requested that the Statutory Notices be readvertised on receipt of the RFI Response that was deemed significant. The key points from the Observations can be summarised as follows:

- Health concerns from emanating rays.
- Devaluation of property and land in the area.
- Proposal will be out of place in the locality and inappropriate in a rural setting.
- The proposed height will be an eyesore and unsightly.
- Planning application was not advertised in local newspapers.
- Danger to life during times of storms or hurricanes.
- Danger to grazing animals and wildlife.
- More suitable sites are available further away from residential properties.
- Visual Impact Assessment is unacceptable. The photographs are subjective and have been manipulated in terms of location.
- The mast will be visually intrusive and due to its size, it will not be possible to screen the structure to any appreciable degree.
- The proposal will result in a traffic hazard.
- Concerns raised in relation to the RSA.

- The development will cause additional traffic manoeuvres at a junction that has limited visibility and on a road that has high speeds.
- The site is located in the study area proposed for the Ballymurray/Knockcroghery by-pass.
- No information provided in relation to how much equipment will be on-site and how wide the tower will be.
- No need for the infrastructure as broadband will be provided within the next 12 months by landline.
- The proposal will damage the cultural heritage and high landscape value in the area.
- The proposal is inconsistent with the Development Plan's policies and objectives.
- The RSA fails to reference the number of road traffic accidents that have occurred on the N61. In addition, the RSA was undertaken in December 2020 during the global pandemic when movements were restricted.
- The required sightlines are not achieved.
- Serious concerns in relation to the recommendation for hedge cutting to be undertaken to improve poor visibility at the entrance to the site.
- Insufficient evidence submitted in relation to any right of way over the land or lease agreement.
- Concerns raised in relation to water run-off due to the foundations and roadway to be constructed.
- Concerns raised in relation to the reports outlining the technical justification for the location of the development.

4.0 **Planning History**

None.

5.0 Policy Context

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

- 5.1.1. These Guidelines set out the criteria for the assessment of telecommunications structures. Section 3.2 of the Guidelines sets out that an authority should indicate in their Development Plan 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.
- 5.1.2. The Guidelines state that only as a last resort should free-standing masts be located within or in the immediate surrounds of smaller towns or villages, within 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. In urban and suburban areas, the use of tall buildings or other existing structures is always preferable to the construction of an independent antennae support structure.
- 5.1.3. The visual impact is among the more important considerations to be considered 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.

5.2. Circular Letter PL07/12

The Circular Letter revises elements of the 1996 Guidelines under Section 2.2 to 2.7. It advises Planning Authorities to:

- cease attaching time limiting conditions to telecommunications masts, except in exceptional circumstances,
- avoid inclusion in development plans of minimum separation distances between masts and schools and houses,

- omit conditions on planning permission requiring security in the form of a bond/cash deposit,
- reiterates advise not to include monitoring arrangements on health and safety or to determine planning applications on health grounds.
- future development contribution schemes to include waivers for broadband infrastructure provision.

5.3. Local Policy - Roscommon County Development Plan 2014-2020

The operative development plan is the Roscommon County Development Plan 2014-2020. (The Roscommon County Development Plan 2021-2027 is currently being prepared.) The site is in open countryside without any specific zoning or other designation. Policies and objectives on Telecommunications are set out in Section 4.7 of the Development Plan. It states as follows; ‘The telecommunications policy for the County shall be based on the recommended Guidelines for Planning Authorities with regard to Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures (1996) and any revisions. Applicable policies in the Development Plan include *inter alia*:

Policy 4.64 Promote an integrated approach with service providers and with appropriate bodies in the creation of a modern telecommunications infrastructure within County Roscommon.

Policy 4.65 Work towards achieving the aims of the National Broadband Plan for Ireland- Delivering a Connected Society.

Policy 4.66 Have regard to recommendations made by the Landscape Character Assessment and seek to protect sensitive landscapes from the visual impact of large scale telecommunications projects.

Policy 4.67 Ensure that telecommunications infrastructure is adequately screened, integrated and/or landscaped, so as to minimize adverse visual impacts on the environment.

Policy 4.68 Encourage the location of telecommunications based services at appropriate locations within the county subject to technical requirements and to environmental considerations.

The site is located in LCA Area 32: 'Roscommon Town and Hinterland' in the Development Plan's Landscape Character Assessment. The area is described as being of a 'High Landscape Value' which is a reflection of the high quality of cultural heritage features to be found in the town environs."

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

There are no designated sites of relevance to the appeal site.

6.0 The Appeal

Two Third Party Appeals were made by:

- 1) Larry & Ann Shine, Kevin & Áine Cook, Louis & Teresa Hannon, Gerry McDermott, Ian Monaghan & Áine Kelly, Joe & Zara Beirne, Seamus & Clare Corcoran of Ballymurray, Co. Roscommon; and
- 2) Louis and Teresa Hannon of Ballymurray, Roscommon, Co. Roscommon.

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The Local Authority failed to ensure that the development complied with Section 3.2 of the 1996 Telecommunication Guidelines with respect to (1) siting and design, (2) visual amenity and access roads, and (3) possible sharing of installations.
- The Local Authority failed to ensure that the development complied with Policy 4.66 of the Development Plan to protect sensitive landscapes from the visual impact of a large-scale telecommunication project and Policy 4.67 to ensure the proposal is appropriately screened.
- The visual impact assessment submitted by the applicant is deficient. The Local Authority failed to mitigate the defects within the Landscape Character Assessment.

- The development would constitute a visually strident feature that would be seriously injurious to the visual amenities of this greenfield site and the surrounding local amenities.
- The proposal would set an undesirable precedent for future development.
- The development would reduce the character value of the area significantly.
- There is a proliferation of masts in the area (the proposal will result in six masts within a 6km radius).
- No justification is given for the height or need for the proposed mast. It is proposed to be located within a blackspot with no line of sight to Roscommon or Knockcroghery and as such is poor planning.
- The installation would endanger public safety due to traffic hazard or obstruction of road users or otherwise on a roadway which is extremely dangerous and contrary to national policy.
- The risks and issues outlined in the Road Safety Matters report have not been addressed.
- No satisfactory evidence that the minimum sight distances for a national secondary road can be achieved in both directions of the site.
- Undertakings to better maintain boundaries are redundant as these are not in the ownership of the parties committing to the undertaking.
- The proposal will serve as a distraction for motorists.
- There is no local residential need for broadband or telephone coverage, although it is accepted that mobile phone coverage may be enhanced.
- The application is not consistent with various sections of the Development Plan.
- Concerns that the antennae and dishes that will be attached to the proposed structure will cause electromagnetic radiation, the effects of which are potentially negative to the health of those in close proximity.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

None.

6.3. Observations

None.

6.4. First Party Response to Third-Party Appeals

A First Party Response to the two Third-Party Appeals was submitted by 4Site on behalf of the Applicant. The key points in the Response can be summarised as follows:

- It is acknowledged that the subject site is located within an area of high landscape value, however it is submitted with regard to the visual impact assessment that the proposed development will not impact upon any views or scenic routes identified in the Landscape Character Assessment.
- The structure is designed to a minimal height to meet the coverage objectives for the area and ensure signal propagation over the surrounding area.
- The development has been assessed under current policy and guidance pertaining to telecommunications development. The site was chosen to address a particular coverage blackspot and to improve broadband coverage.
- The visual impact on the surrounding landscape and the residential amenities in the area is considered acceptable as demonstrated in the photomontages.
- There are no opportunities for co-location on existing sites in the surrounding area, coverage objectives dictate the location of a structure. Following a review of potential sites, it was determined that the installation of the proposed development at the subject site was the best possible solution in which to provide a satisfactory level of service.
- The operators have committed to a Site Sharing Code of Practice Agreement which promotes site sharing of existing infrastructure where available.
- The applicant has accepted the design recommendations outlined in the RSA subject to agreement with Roscommon County Council's road department.

- A letter of consent to undertake associated works, including cutting back and maintenance of vegetation within the site provider's ownership to facilitate sight lines was provided as part of the RFI response.
- Overall the additional traffic and turning movements on the road is unlikely to cause a substantial effect on the safety of the road subject to the appropriate design considerations entering and accessing the site as detailed in the RSA submitted with the RFI Response.
- A temporary traffic management plan will be put in place during the construction phase which will be over a period of 2-4 weeks.
- Analysis undertaken by Vilicom has demonstrated that the infrastructure is needed in the area. Five potential sites in the wider area were examined before selecting the subject site.
- It is highly unlikely given the costs, risks and delays involved in building an installation that there would be a saturation of large antenna support structures in Ballymurray, rather the network operators will utilise existing support structures, where suitable and available, as well as smaller scale planning exempt installations.
- The proposed solution will allow operators to bring a significant improvement in voice and broadband services to the area, particularly a stretch of the N61 between Roscommon and a stretch of the train line between Roscommon town and Athlone, L20002, the L1806 and all surrounding regional roads, businesses and housing.
- The proposal is designed to comply with the limits set by the Guidelines of ICNIRP.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the planning application, the two Third-Party Appeals, inspection of the site, and having regard to relevant local/regional/policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues on this appeal are as follows:

1. Justification for the Development,
2. Visual Impact,
3. Road Safety,

4. Health Impacts, and
5. Appropriate Assessment.

Each of these issues is addressed in turn below.

7.2. Justification for the Development

- 7.2.1. The Appellants contend that there is no requirement or local need for the subject development notwithstanding that mobile phone coverage may be enhanced. On the contrary, the Applicant advises that there is a coverage blackspot in the area and the wider area in general has deficient broadband telecommunications services. It is argued that the proposed development will allow operators to bring a significant improvement in voice and broadband services to the area, particularly a stretch of the N61 and a stretch of the train line between Roscommon town and Athlone, L20002, the L1806 and all surrounding regional roads, businesses and housing. Furthermore, it is stated that the proposed structure will allow multiple network operators to deploy 2G voice, 3G and high speed 4G broadband services. In addition to general coverage enhancement in these areas, customers will also benefit from more choice of network operators for high-speed broadband and mobile data services leading to greater competition between the network operators and better options for the people of the area. Whilst I do not dismiss the Appellants' local knowledge of the area, it would appear from the evidence submitted with the application, in particular the two reports prepared by Vilicom (dated 27th August 2020 and 12th April 2021), that there is a justification for the development in the immediate area. As such having regard to the Telecommunication Guidelines and Development Plan policy, I would consider that the proposed development should be generally considered acceptable in principle subject to normal planning consideration.
- 7.2.2. The Appellants contend that there is a proliferation of telecommunication structures in the area. Furthermore, it is queried whether any of the installations in the area are suitable for co-location, redevelopment or if a better location is available in the area. As outlined above, in order to avoid an unnecessary proliferation of masts, the Telecommunications Guidelines encourage the co-location of antennae on existing support structures and state that applicants will have to satisfy the authority that they have made a reasonable effort to share. Vilicom on behalf of the Applicant advises

that there are no opportunities for co-location on existing sites and that five sites in the area were examined as possible locations for the proposed structure but were all ruled out on technical grounds. Furthermore, it is noted that the proposed structure will support multiple operators. The First Party Response states that there are substantial costs associated with delivering sites not only as a result of the design, planning, legal and build costs but also in the operations and maintenance of sites that are typically leased from private landowners. It is suggested that due to the costs, risks and delays involved in building an installation that there is unlikely to be a saturation of large antenna support structures in the area. It is highlighted that operators have committed to a Site Sharing Code of Practice Agreement which promotes site sharing or existing infrastructure, where available.

- 7.2.3. In conclusion, I consider that sufficient technical evidence has been presented to justify the need for the development, and the need for the proposed location. As such, I would not recommend refusal on the grounds of there being an insufficient justification for the proposed structure or its location.

7.3. Visual Impact

- 7.3.1. The Appellants argue that the visual impact, design and siting of the proposed structure is contrary to the Telecommunication Guidelines and Development Plan policy (Policies 4.66 and 4.67). Furthermore it is stated that the visual impact assessment submitted by the Applicant is deficient and the Local Authority failed to mitigate the defects within the Landscape Character Assessment during its assessment of the application. As stated in Section 5.3 above, the site is located in LCA Area 32: 'Roscommon Town and Hinterland' in the Development Plan's Landscape Character Assessment. The area is described as being of a 'High Landscape Value' which is a reflection of the "high quality of cultural heritage features to be found in the town environs."
- 7.3.2. The planning application included a Visual Impact Assessment which consisted of 12 No. views of the site from the surrounding area with the proposed structure superimposed on the images. The analysis concluded that there would be a 'negative' impact for six of the 12 No. viewpoints and of these six, four would be considered to be of 'moderate' significance, one 'slight/moderate' significance and one 'slight'

significance. The balance of the impacts are considered 'neutral'. It is stated that whilst the proposed development will be exposed from views close to the structure, foliage and trees and the topography of the area will restrict wider and more distant public views. Having inspected the site and environs (including from Moate Park and Athlone Laboratories Ltd) and having regard to the topography and road alignment, I consider the Visual Impact Assessment conclusions to be reasonable.

7.3.3. By its nature, the mast will be a prominent feature in the locality when viewed from the N61 road and immediate area as illustrated in the photomontages. Its siting to the rear of dwellings and a farmyard complex and their associated hedgerows will provide some screening for the lower section of the structure. I acknowledge the Observers' queries to the Local Authority as to why the structure could not be positioned further into the landholding at a greater distance from the nearby dwellings (notwithstanding that a longer access track would be required). I note that the structure is approximately 105m from the nearest dwellings. No explanation is provided by the Applicant in this regard. However, whilst relocating the structure further into the landholding would increase the separation distance, the upper sections would still be visible. Having regard to the lightweight design of the structure, I do not consider it to have an adversely overbearing impact on these dwellings. The mature hedgerows to the rear of the closest dwellings will screen the lower sections of the structure. In my opinion there is little scope to screen the upper section of such a structure in a relatively open landscape from the nearby dwellings located along the N61. The structure will be visible to road users on N61. However these views will be transient and short lived.

7.3.4. In conclusion, while I accept that the mast will be visible in near distance views, in the context of its strategic role in the provision of infrastructure and the local and national policies that support such development, it is not an unreasonable intrusion on the local landscape. I note that the proposed structure will not impact upon any views or scenic routes identified in the Development Plan. Notwithstanding my concerns over the specific siting of the structure to dwellings and within the overall landholding, I do not consider that the impact is such to justify a refusal, having regard to the criteria set out in the guidelines and circulars and the Development Plan.

7.4. Road Safety

The Appellants argue that the installation would endanger public safety due to traffic hazard or obstruction of road users or otherwise on a roadway, which is extremely dangerous and contrary to national policy. Furthermore, it is argued that the risks and issues outlined in the Road Safety Matters report have not been addressed and no satisfactory evidence that the minimum sight distances for a national secondary road can be achieved in both directions of the site.

At the request of the TII an RSA was undertaken on the existing access off the N61 to the site. The Applicant accepted the design recommendations from the RSA subject to agreement with the Local Authority's Roads Department. I note that the Roads' Department does not appear to have provided any commentary in respect of the application. I consider the recommendations to be relatively minor in nature. In addition, a sightline assessment was prepared. In short, the assessment concluded that there are no required amendments to the boundaries to achieve the required sightlines, aside from removal of vegetation along the N61 and a short section of damaged boundary wall to be removed. The Applicant has advised that a traffic management system will be put in place during the construction phase which will be over a period of 2-4 weeks. Furthermore, it is anticipated that the site will be visited 2-8 times per annum by one vehicle. I do not consider this to constitute a significant intensification of the existing entrance. Having regard to the foregoing and inspecting the site and access point, I do not consider that the proposal would represent a significant traffic hazard and as such I would not recommend refusal on the grounds of road safety.

Separately, in respect to the matter of the development being premature pending the completion of a route being identified to develop a new route between Ballymurray to Knockcroghery. In this regard, I accept the NRDO's commentary that the subject site will not impact the development of the project. As such, I would not recommend refusal on the grounds of the development being premature pending the finalisation of the new route.

7.5. Health Impacts

The Commission for Communications Regulations (ComReg) is the statutory body responsible for the regulation of radiation emissions. Compliance with emission limits in respect of regulation is regulated nationally by ComReg and so health issues are not a matter for An Bord Pleanála in determining and deliberating on the application proposed. Regular measurements of emission levels are required to comply with International Radiation Protection Association and Guidelines. While I acknowledge the concerns expressed by the local residents, this is a matter for ComReg. I would also note that Circular PL07/12 states that Planning Authorities should primarily be concerned with the appropriate location and design of telecommunication structures and do not have competence for health and safety matters in respect of telecommunications infrastructure, either with respect to human or animal health.

7.6. Appropriate Assessment

- 7.6.1. The appeal site is 983m as-the-crow-flies from Lough Ree SAC (site code 000440) and 3.3km as-the-crow-flies from Lough Ree SPA (site code 004064).
- 7.6.2. The site is relatively flat. A stream runs parallel to the proposed access track and is approximately 100m from the proposed structure. This stream is a tributary of the Hind River, which ultimately meanders through the SAC approx. 4.3km downstream.
- 7.6.3. Having regard to:
- the minor nature and scale of the proposed development (i.e. a telecommunications mast),
 - small site size (0.0481ha),
 - the nature of the receiving environment,
 - no emissions or pollutants,
 - no negative changes to surface water quality,
 - short-term construction period,
 - no loss, fragmentation disruption or disturbance to the European sites or their annexed species either directly or indirectly, and
 - the separation distance between the site and the subject SAC and SPA sites,

I do not consider that the proposal would be likely to significantly impact the qualifying interests of the European sites during either the construction or operational phases of development. I do not consider 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. As such, I consider that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1.1. I recommend that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions outlined below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 9.1.1. Having regard to the following:

- 1) The Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures – Guidelines for Planning Authorities, issued by the Department of Environment and Local Government in 1996,
- 2) The Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures and Department and Environment, Community and Local Government Circular Letter PL07/12,
- 3) The objectives of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2014-2020 and in particular policies 4.65 to 4.68,
- 4) The nature and scale and location of the proposed telecommunication lattice tower mast,

it is considered that the proposed development, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, would achieve the objectives set out in National Policy and the Roscommon County Development Plan 2014-2020. It is considered that the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenities of the area, would not result in a traffic hazard, and would otherwise 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 15th April 2021 to the Planning Authority, 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 antennae 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.</p> <p>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.</p>
3.	<p>The proposed mast and all associated antennas, equipment and fencing shall be demolished and removed from site when it is no longer required. The site shall be reinstated to its predevelopment condition at the expense of the developer.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of orderly development.</p>
4.	<p>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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area.</p>
5.	<p>Prior to construction, a traffic management plan including details of road signage warning the public of the site entrance during construction stage,</p>

	shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Reason: In the interest of traffic safety.
6.	Surface water drainage arrangements for the proposed development shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority. Reason: In the interest of public health.

Susan Clarke

Planning Inspector

16th September 2021