



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-310744-21

Development	Removal of telecommunication pole and replace with 21m slimline monopole & associated infrastructure.
Location	Eir Exchange, R164 Road, Newtown Girley, Fordstown, Navan, Co Meath
Planning Authority	Meath County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2194
Applicant(s)	Eircom Limited.
Type of Application	Planning Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission.
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Ian Manning.
Observer(s)	No Observers.
Date of Site Inspection	1 st November 2021.
Inspector	Elaine Sullivan

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located in a rural area on the western side of the R164, Kells to Athboy regional road. It is approximately 1km to the south of the village of Fordstown and 5km to the north of Athboy. The site has a stated area of 42m² and is located within the curtilage of a detached residential dwelling with associated garage and outbuildings.
- 1.2. There is an existing Eircom exchange building and monopole of 10m in height in place on an open area to the south east of the site. The exchange building is c. 15m from the corner of the house. The monopole is located behind this building and is c. 25m away from the corner of the house. Timber fencing surrounds the site and is in poor repair in places. Access to the exchange and monopole is through a shared gateway from the main road and through a right of way to the side of the dwelling.
- 1.3. A thick boundary hedge separates the subject site from the neighbouring site to the south-east. There is a detached residential dwelling in place on this site and it is c. 11m from the exchange building and c. 15m from the existing pole.
- 1.4. Open fields surround the subject site to the north, east and south. The approach roads have hedgerows on both sides but the hedges on the R164 on the approach from the south are particularly low which gives a clear view of the existing monopole from the open field to the south east.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought to remove the existing 10m telecommunications pole and to replace it with a 21m monopole. Infrastructure currently in place on the 10m pole, (comprising 2 x 600mm Eir dishes), would be moved to the new pole. This pole would also carry 3 x 2.5m long antennae, 3 x Remote Radio Units, (RRU's) mounted behind the antennae and an additional 1 no. 600mm dishes, (to provide a total of 3 x 600mm dishes).
- 2.2. Ancillary ground-based equipment would also be installed and would include cabinets and structures with a footprint of 2.4m² and a height of 2.2m and 0.115m² and a height of 1.56m respectively.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Planning permission was granted by the PA subject to 13 no. planning conditions, which are standard in nature.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The decision of the PA was informed by two reports from the Planning Officer. The initial report, dated the 11th of March 202 requested additional information and includes the following:

- The Meath CDP supports the provision of Information and Communications Technology, (ICT), infrastructure and the proposed development is in accordance with this policy.
- It is the preferred approach that all new support structures meet the co-location or clustering policy of the guidelines.
- The existing mast on the site appears to be without the benefit of planning permission.
- The principle of the development is acceptable subject to normal siting and design criteria.
- The site is located within the South West Kells Lowlands landscape character area which has a low potential capacity to accommodate overhead cables, substations and masts because of the views. Protected View no. 52, at the Hill of Ward, Athboy is located c. 4km from the application site.
- Further information is requested with regard to the following:
 - Information which demonstrates that the proposal will not impact on the National Heritage Area Girley Bog, (Site code 001580).
 - Photomontages indicating how the proposal will be viewed from Protected View No. 52, Hill of Ward.

- Responses to third party submissions.

The report of the PO dated the 8th June 2021 assessed the responses to the AI request and concluded that the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area and would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment or ecology in the area.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Transportation Department – No objection subject to agreement of a construction traffic management plan.
- Fire Service Department – A Fire Safety Certificate is not required for the development.
- Environmental Health Officer – The applicant has advised that measurements will be taken regularly to ensure compliance with International Radiation Association Guidelines. The frequency of monitoring should be agreed with the planning authority prior to the commencement of works and all monitoring results should be submitted to the Local Authority.
- Broadband Officer – Mobile connectivity has been an issue in the area. The new site would provide improved 3G and 4G coverage for residents and tourists in the area. The site will have access to open Eir's fibre backhaul network which would increase the capacity to carry 4G traffic improving speeds for people using the service.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- No responses.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One third party submission was received by the PA. It was submitted by Ian Manning who is the owner of the house directly beside the exchange building. The issues raised include:

- Devaluation of their property.

- Negative impact on quality of life.
- Visual intrusion of the mast.
- Impact on landscape.
- Potential for damage to property during construction.
- Structural security of the proposed development on the property.

A second observation was submitted following the applicant's response to the request for further information. Concerns were raised regarding:

- Damage to property
- Movements on site & disruption during construction
- Impact of the proposal on property prices.

4.0 Planning History

- No planning history was found for the subject site on the National Planning Application Database, (www.myplan.ie).

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The site is located within the administrative boundary of Meath County Council. The operative Development Plan for the area is the Meath County Development Plan, (CDP), 2021-2027, which came into effect on the 3rd November 2021.
- 5.1.2. The application was assessed by Meath County Council in accordance with the policies and objectives of the Meath County Development Plan 2013-2019, which was the operative Development Plan at the time.
- 5.1.3. On review of the contents of both plans I note that there are no material changes between the 2013 County Development Plan and the 2021 County Development Plan as they relate to the appeal site and the current proposal. In this regard I consider the proposal in accordance with the guidance and provisions of the

operative Development Plan, namely the 2021 – 2027 Meath County Development Plan.

- 5.1.4. The following sections of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027 are relevant to the proposed development;

Zoning – The subject site has a ‘RA’ zoning, the objective of which is *‘To protect and promote in a balanced way, the development of agriculture, forestry and rural-related enterprise, community facilities, biodiversity, the rural landscape, and the built and cultural heritage’*.

Under the RA zoning a ‘Utility Structure’ is listed as a ‘Permitted Use’, and a ‘Telecommunications Structure’ is listed as ‘Open for Consideration’.

- 5.1.5. **Protected Views** – There is a protected view, (View ID. 52), from the Hill of Ward, which is approximately 4.5km to the south of the subject site. The protected view is described as, *‘Panoramic views in all directions to very distant horizons. Very open landscape in foreground and middle distance across a working landscape with relatively little settlement visible except for town of Athboy to west’*.

- 5.1.6. **Landscape Character Assessment** – The subject site is located within the South West Kells Lowlands landscape character area, (Map 01 – Landscape Character Types). It is defined as ‘Moderate Value’ and ‘Moderate Sensitivity’ in the Landscape Character Assessment, (LCA). This landscape is noted as having a *‘Low potential capacity to accommodate overhead cables, substations and communications masts because views within this LCA and from the adjacent LCA 19, are often extensive and such development is likely to be prominent’*.

- 5.1.7. **Natural Heritage** – Girley Bog, National Heritage Area, (Site Code 001580), is located c. 2km to the north west of the subject site. The Girley, (Drewstown), Bog SAC (Site Code 002203), directly adjoins this site and is approximately 2.5km away.

- 5.1.8. **Section 6.16.4 – Telecommunications Antennae**

It shall be the preferred approach that all new support structures fully meet the co-location or clustering policy of the current guidelines or any such guidelines that replace these, and that shared use of existing structures will be insisted upon where the numbers of masts located in any single area are considered to be excessive.

INF POL 54 - To facilitate the delivery of a high capacity Information and Communications Technology (ICT) infrastructure and broadband network and digital broadcasting throughout the County.

INF POL 56 - To promote orderly development of telecommunications infrastructure throughout the County in accordance with the requirements of the “Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures – Guidelines for Planning Authorities” July 1996, except where they conflict with Circular Letter PL 07/12 which shall take precedence, and any subsequent revisions or expanded guidelines in this area.

INF POL 59 - 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.

5.1.9. **Section 11.8.5 – Telecommunications and Broadband**

DM OBJ 83 - To encourage the location of telecommunications structures at appropriate location within the County, subject to environmental considerations.

DM OBJ 84 - To require the co-location of antennae on existing support structures and where this is not feasible require documentary evidence as to the non-availability of this option in proposals for new structures.

DM OBJ 85 - To avoid the location of structures in sensitive landscapes, in nature conservation areas, in highly sensitive landscapes and where views are to be preserved.

5.2. **National Guidelines**

5.2.1. **National Planning Framework – Project Ireland 2040**

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.’

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

The guidelines aim to provide a modern mobile telephone system as part of national development infrastructure, whilst minimising environmental impact. Amongst other things, the Guidelines advocate sharing of installations to reduce visual impact on the landscape.

4.3 – Visual Impact - The guidelines note that visual impact is one of the more important considerations which have to be taken into account and also that some masts will remain quite noticeable in spite of the best precautions.

4.5 – Sharing Facilities and Clustering – Applicants will be encouraged to share facilities and to allow clustering of services and will have to satisfy the Planning Authority that they have made a reasonable effort to share.

5.2.3. **DoECLG Circular Letter PL07/12**

This Circular was issued to Planning Authorities in 2012 and updated some of the sections of the above Guidelines including ceasing the practice of limiting the life of the permission by attaching a planning condition.

It also reiterates the advice in the 1996 Guidelines that planning authorities should not determine planning applications on health grounds and states that, *‘Planning authorities should be primarily concerned with the appropriate location and design of telecommunications structures and do not have competence for health and safety matters in respect of telecommunications infrastructure. These are regulated by other codes and such matters should not be additionally regulated by the planning process’*.

5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

No designations apply to the subject site.

5.4. EIA Screening

5.5. The proposed development does not fall within a class of development set out in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations. Having regard to the limited nature and scale of the proposed development and 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

The grounds of appeal include the following:

- The mast will visually dominate the adjoining residential property, which is occupied and has windows facing onto the mast.
- Access to the site is via a right of way over the appellants lands. There is no entitlement for Eir or agents of Eir to obstruct property or land adjoining this right of way and consent will not be given.
- The construction methods could result in damage to property.
- The proposal would tower over the existing dwelling and would have an overbearing impact.
- The development would result in a devaluation of the residential property.
- The construction management plan is flawed and contradictory.
- The site is unsuitable.
- The application was lodged during Covid restrictions which impacted public consultation.

6.2. Applicant Response

A response was received from the applicant on the 27th July 2021 and includes the following:

- The Land Registry Folio No. 18561 submitted by the appellant clearly shows the Eircom (successor in title to the Minister for Posts and Telegraphs) right of way to through the neighbouring property from the R164 to the exchange building. This right of way is legally watertight and will enable the proposed development to be built.
- Recent works were undertaken at the exchange which were not authorised by Eir and involved the construction of a separate pedestrian access to the exchange from the R164. Eir is sympathetic to the neighbouring landowner and would be willing to enter into discussions to explore the possibility of having a completely separate vehicular access point from the exchange to the public road. However, the right of way would have to be maintained as all fibre ducting and cabling is underneath the existing vehicular access.
- The proposed development would be sited as far away as possible from the neighbouring dwelling. There is a garage in place between the house and the monopole which would screen the majority of the proposal.
- There is considerable vegetation to the south of the proposal and between the neighbouring dwelling on the adjoining site and along the R164, which would help to shield the pole from view.
- Regarding the devaluation of property, the Board have previously adjudicated on such matters and have found that in the absence of evidence or actual examples it should not be used as a reason for refusal.
- With regard to the Construction Management Plan, the applicant commits to engaging with the appellant regarding the construction process, including access arrangements and timing and duration. The applicant is open to considering an alternative vehicular point possibly to the east of the Eir exchange.
- A health and safety assessment will be carried out prior to construction.

- It is the intention of Eir to upgrade and repair the boundary to the Eir exchange site as part of the development works.
- Existing utilities and electricity cables will be protected.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

A response was received from the PA on the 30th July 2021.

- The appeal has been examined by the PA and the PA are satisfied that all matters outlined in the submission were considered in the course of its assessment of the application as detailed in the report of the PO.

6.4. Observations

- No third party observations were received.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. The main issues that arise for assessment in relation to the appeal can be addressed under the following headings:

- Principle of Development
- Justification for the development
- Visual Impact
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Appropriate Assessment

7.2. Principle of Development

7.2.1. The subject site is zoned 'RA', Rural Area. The objective of this zoning is, '*To protect and promote in a balanced way, the development of agriculture, forestry and rural-related enterprise, community facilities, biodiversity, the rural landscape, and the built and cultural heritage*'. Under the RA zoning a 'Utility Structure' is listed as a

‘Permitted Use’, and a ‘Telecommunications Structure’ is listed as ‘Open for Consideration’.

- 7.2.2. I am satisfied that the proposed development can be considered within the existing zoning objective and subject to the provisions of the Meath County Development Plan and national guidance.
- 7.2.3. The grounds of appeal raised concerns regarding the impact of the Covid 19 restrictions on public participation for the proposed development. At the time, emergency legislation was enacted under Section 251A of the Planning and Development Act, (as amended), to address the restrictions and the public consultation period was extended accordingly. I note that the Planning Authority deemed the application to be acceptable under the requirements of Article 22 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, (as amended), and I am satisfied that third party rights were not prejudiced during the process.
- 7.2.4. A query was raised in the grounds of appeal regarding the right-of-way access to the site across the appellant’s land. The applicant has responded to this issue and has stated that Land Registry Folio No. 18561 submitted by the appellant clearly shows the Eircom, (successor in title to the Minister for Posts and Telegraphs), right of way to through the neighbouring property from the R164 to the exchange building. This right of way originally enabled the construction of the telephone exchange and allows for subsequent maintenance purposes. It is considered to be legally watertight and will enable the proposed development to be built.
- 7.2.5. In terms of the legal interest, I am satisfied that the applicants have provided sufficient evidence of their legal interest for the purposes of the planning application and decision. Any further consents that may have to be obtained are essentially a subsequent matter and are outside the scope of the planning appeal. In any case this is a matter to be resolved between the parties, having regard to the provisions of S. 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended). Furthermore, under Chapter 5.13 of the ‘Development Management – Guidelines for Planning Authorities’, (DoECLG 2007), it states, inter alia, the following: *‘The planning system is not designed as a mechanism for resolving disputes about title to land or premises or rights over land; these are ultimately matters for resolution in the Courts...’*

7.3. The potential for damage to private property was also included in the grounds of appeal. Should it arise, this is a civil matter to be resolved between the parties, having regard to the provisions of s.34(13) of the 2000 Planning and Development Act.

7.4. **Justification for the development**

7.4.1. The applicant has stated that the proposed development is required in order to improve the existing wireless broadband services in the area and to provide new 3G (data) and 4G (high speed data) services and to improve overall network coverage. The height of the of the structure has been driven by the requirement to achieve the desired level of coverage to the wider area. It has been kept to the absolute minimum available to the operator that will allow for these criteria to be met and to achieve a 'line of sight' above the surrounding built form and vegetation.

Furthermore, the subject site provides the optimum location for this equipment whilst minimising the number of masts in the immediate area from two, to a single structure which would support two separate operators.

7.4.2. I have reviewed the ComReg coverage maps for the subject site and the surrounding area. The maps show that the subject site has 4G coverage that is defined as '*Fair*' but the area around Fordstown and to the north-east of the site has '*Fringe*' coverage for 4G services from all providers. A '*Fringe*' service is defined by ComReg as a service where '*Disconnections are likely to occur*' and a '*Fair*' service may have marginal data with drop-outs at weaker signal levels. 3G services were mixed with some providers having better services than others. However, there were also distinct gaps in the overall coverage in the area.

7.4.3. It is evident that the existing service 4G service within the surrounding area could be improved and that the village of Fordstown and the surrounding area would benefit from the improved service. Having reviewed the current ComReg maps, the information in the application and the report of the Broadband Officer for the PA, I am satisfied that the proposed infrastructure would provide improved capacity and service to the subject site, the village of Fordstown and the surrounding area, which would be in accordance with national and local objectives to improve the overall ICT infrastructure. Furthermore, the replacement of the existing pole could allow for co-

location of services and would decrease the need for additional infrastructure, which would be in accordance with national guidance contained in the Telecommunications Guidelines.

7.5. Visual Impact

- 7.5.1. Having visited the site and reviewed the photomontages submitted, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not result in any significant negative visual impact on the surrounding landscape when viewed from the wider area. The most significant impact would be from the residential properties on either side of the subject site and in particular from the house within the wider landholding adjoining the site.
- 7.5.2. Two Photomontage Reports were submitted with the application, the second of which was submitted in response to a request for further information. The reports include photomontages of the proposed development from points in close proximity to the site and from further afield, including from the Protected View at the Hill of Ward.
- 7.5.3. I note the low-lying, open character of the surrounding landscape and I am satisfied that the proposed monopole would not result in a significant negative impact when viewed from the wider area. The pole would be slender in nature and coloured in a galvanised (CL 3093W) finish, which will assimilate with the typical sky colour in Ireland. It would also be positioned in close proximity to the roadside boundaries along the R164 which include telegraph and electricity poles. Therefore, it would not be out of character when viewed from the surrounding area.
- 7.5.4. The proposal would have the greatest visual impact when viewed from close proximity. On the approach from the north, views of the structure would be intermittent from the R164 as the roadside boundary comprises thick hedgerows and trees. However, the views of the site on the approach from the south are much more open. On the occasion of the site visit, the hedgerows along the R164 to the south of the site has been trimmed. This allowed for open views across the fields towards the site. Whilst there would be clear views from the public road to the south of the site, I am satisfied that they would not be visually obtrusive. There are a number of

infrastructure poles in place along the road and as such the monopole would not be out of place. The proposed colour would also blend into the wider skyline.

- 7.5.5. There would be a significant visual impact when viewed from the space adjoining the house within the wider site. The proposed monopole would be c. 21m from the corner of the house and by virtue of its scale would be visually prominent when viewed from the attendant spaces to the east and south. The house does not directly face onto the subject site and there is a double garage positioned directly to the side of the house which would restrict the views from the house. However, the grounds of appeal include photographs taken from inside the house which show that the existing pole can be seen from the house.
- 7.5.6. Whilst the proposed monopole would be considerably taller than the existing pole, the impacts currently experienced by the residents would not be of a significantly different nature. The existing infrastructure is old and unsightly and the boundary treatment is flimsy and in poor repair. Having visited the site it is my view that the impact on the existing residential amenity would be markedly reduced by appropriate landscaping and screening. If planting was provided along the site boundary the visual impact of the proposal would be lessened when viewed from the house and from the attendant spaces. Should the Board be minded to grant permission for the development, I recommend that a condition requiring appropriate landscaping be provided around the site boundary in order to provide adequate screening.
- 7.5.7. The proposed development would not have such a significant visual impact from the adjoining house to the south-east. Existing hedgerows and trees along the site boundary would provide some screening from the house. The house also backs onto the site with the front of the house orientated to the south. As such it would not directly overlook the proposed development.
- 7.5.8. Although there is no recent planning history for the site, the existing exchange building and associated infrastructure has been in place for some time and the proposed development represents the use of an existing utilities site which would negate the requirement for additional poles in the area and is in accordance with national and local guidance.

7.6. Impact of Residential Amenity

- 7.6.1. Apart from the visual impact, the structure also has the potential to have an overbearing impact on the adjacent house by virtue of its physical presence and scale. Whilst the monopole would be significantly taller than the single storey house, it would be slender in nature. It would also be set back from the house by c. 21m and would be located behind the existing exchange building.
- 7.6.2. I am satisfied that the proposed structure would not result in an overbearing impact on the adjoining house by virtue of its slender design and the separation distance from the house. As noted above, appropriate boundary screening to the site would help to mitigate against the potential impacts caused by the physical presence of the monopole structure.
- 7.6.3. I note the concerns raised in the grounds of appeal in respect to the devaluation of neighbouring property. However, having regard to the assessment and conclusion set out above, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area to such an extent that would adversely affect the value of property in the vicinity.

7.7. Appropriate Assessment

- 7.7.1. A Stage 1 Screening report does not accompany the application. However, an Ecological Impact Assessment was prepared by Moore Group Environmental Services in response to a request for further information by the PA. The assessment was prepared with specific focus on the impact of the proposal on the Girley Bog, National Heritage Area, (Site Code 001580).
- 7.7.2. In accordance with obligations under the Habitats Directives and implementing legislation, to take into consideration the possible effects a project may have, either on its own or in combination with other plans and projects, on a Natura 2000 site; there is a requirement on the Board, as the competent authority in this case, to consider the possible nature conservation implications of the proposed development on the Natura 2000 network, before making a decision, by carrying out appropriate assessment. The first stage of assessment is screening.

- 7.7.3. The proposed development is for the replacement of a 10m high monopole with a 21m monopole to carry telecommunications infrastructure transferred from the original structure along with additional infrastructure. The development site is within an established utility compound and does not require any ground works, new access roads or water connections.
- 7.7.4. The project is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of a European Site and therefore it needs to be determined if the development is likely to have significant effects on a European site(s). The proposed development is examined in relation to any possible interaction with European sites designated Special Conservation Areas (SAC) and Special Protection Areas (SPA) to assess whether it may give rise to significant effects on any European Site in view of the conservation objectives of those sites.
- 7.7.5. The closest European site is the Girley (Drewstown) Bog SAC, (Site Code 002203), which is approximately 2.5km to the north west of the subject site. This site also forms part of the Girley Bog, National Heritage Area, (Site Code 001580). The River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC, (Site Code 002299), is also located approximately 2.5km to the south-west of the subject site.
- 7.7.6. There is no direct or in-direct hydrological connection between the appeal site and the Girley (Drewstown) Bog SAC or the River Boyne and River Blackwater SAC.
- 7.7.7. Having reviewed the documents and submissions and having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development and the location of the site in a developed utility compound with no direct or indirect connection via a pathway to a European site, I am satisfied that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise, and it is not considered that the development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that planning permission be granted for the proposed development.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development for the replacement of an existing 10m telecommunications support structure with an a 21m monopole carrying telecommunications equipment with ancillary ground-mounted infrastructure, the proposed development would be in accordance with the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures – Guidelines for Planning Authorities 1996 and with the policies and objectives of the Meath County Development Plan 2021-2027, and the RA zoning for the site, and would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenities of the area or the amenities of property in the vicinity of the site. The proposed development would, therefore, 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 on the 20th of January 2021, and through further information on the 26th of April 2021 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>Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</p>

3.	<p>The site shall be landscaped in accordance with a comprehensive scheme of landscaping, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. All landscaping shall be carried out no later than the first planting season following commencement of development on site.</p> <p>All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
4.	<p>Details of the material finish and colour of the telecommunications support structure and associated equipment shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
5.	<p>The applicant shall provide and make available at reasonable terms, the proposed communications structure for the provision of mobile telecommunications antenna of third party licensed mobile telecommunications operators.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and the proper planning and development of the area.</p>
6.	<p>The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of public safety and residential amenity.</p>

.Elaine Sullivan
Planning Inspector

24th November 2021