



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

### ABP-311318-21

---

<b>Development</b>	Extension to telecommunications structure for the purposes of carrying additional antennae.
<b>Location</b>	ESB Telecoms' Compound, within the ESB Castleknock 38kV Substation, Carpenterstown Road, Castleknock, Dublin 15
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Fingal County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	FW21A/0110
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	ESB Telecoms Ltd
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Refuse
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	ESB Telecoms Ltd
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	5 September 2021
<b>Inspector</b>	Una Crosse

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site, with a stated area of 0.184 hectares, comprises the northwestern part of the overall ESB Networks compound which accommodates the existing ESB Castleknock 38kV substation and is located adjoining the Carpenterstown Road in Castleknock (Dublin 15). In addition to the telecommunications structure, subject of this appeal, the site also accommodates an electricity pylon which supports the electricity cables which terminate at the ESB substation which is located to the immediate south of the subject site. The site is bounded by dense vegetation and accessed from an entrance gate onto the Carpenterstown Road from where a ROW exists to the subject site through the compound.
- 1.2. The site is adjoined to the south by a residential development known as Mulberry Court (1-13) with Mulberry Crescent to the west of same and south west of the subject site. To the north and west of the site, there is a large detached dwelling and out buildings on a large site which is known as Ros na Ri. East of the site is the Carpenterstown Road with the M50, underbridge and embankment for same to the south/southeast of the site.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal provides for the increase in height by 5m of the existing 14.5m high telecommunications structure to provide an overall structure height of 19.5 metres.
- 2.2. It should be noted that the public notices refers to an extension to the existing 14.5 metre high telecommunications structure with an overall proposed height of main structure of 19.5m. The documentation submitted to the Planning Authority and the Planners report from the Planning Authority also references the existing 14.5m structure. However, the drawings received reference an existing 12m tower with a proposed 7.5m high extension. The existing contiguous drawings indicate a height of 12m to the height of the pylon/tower with the overall height with the equipment 14.5m. The proposed contiguous drawing indicate that the pylon height remains at 12m but the equipment level extends by 2.5m to 7.5m with an overall height increase of 5m.

2.3. The additional height is proposed for the purposes of carrying additional antennae, communication dishes and all ancillary equipment.

2.4. It is proposed that the structure is shared with multiple operators.

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

#### **3.1. Decision**

3.1.1. The Planning Authority decided to refuse permission on 11 August 2021 for the following reason:

*“The proposed development by reason of its height, design and location on land which is subject to the ‘RS – Residential’ zoning in the Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023 and adjacent to existing residential development, would seriously injure the amenities and depreciate the value of existing property in the area. The proposed development would be contrary to Objectives IT07, IT08 and DMS144 of the Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023 and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area”.*

#### **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

##### **3.2.1. Planning Reports**

The Planner’s Report includes a site location and description, outline of proposal, planning history, national and local planning policy and observations/submissions.

The Planning Appraisal is summarised as follows:

- Noted that no pre-planning consultation undertaken.
- Noted that current structure is the host for the equipment of three mobile phone service providers and considered to be consistent with regard to shared in Objective DMS143;
- Note the positive contribution made by proposed structure to mobile phone reception in the area (Fig. 1 & 2 Appendix 2);

- Proposal impacts unduly in a negative manner on visual amenities of the area and consequently the amenities of property in this established residential area resulting from
  - Combined elevation of 19.5m in height;
  - Highly mechanical, rectilinear and metal structure and
  - Location c.45m west of Carpenterstown Road and c.25m north of the Mulberry residential development;
- Impact is demonstrated by details presented within the drawings and photo locations.
- No realistic pathway to any European Sites with no likelihood of significant effects.
- Not a class of development for purposes of EIA.
- Concludes that taking into account the planning history, technical requirements for the infrastructure, visual impact proposed development is not considered acceptable on the residentially zoned site and would not accord with objectives IT07, IT08 and DMS144 of the Development Plan.

### 3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

None on file.

### 3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

None on file.

### 3.4. **Third Party Observations**

- 3.4.1. The third-party submission received by the PA from a property owned in Mulberry Drive outline concerns in relation to the potential level and range of radiation which has not been adequately considered and not addressed in the Health and Safety element of the documents. No effort made to recognise persons suffering from electro-hypersensitivity and consult with near neighbours to the site to grant them adequate protections and/or an opportunities to be aware of potential consequences.

Reference is made to the EU Parliamentary Resolution (2008/2211(INI))(2009) Point 2B for further details.

## 4.0 **Planning History**

- 4.1. No recent planning history. Documentation submitted by applicant states that the existing telecommunications structure was constructed under Class 31 of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended.

## 5.0 **Policy Context**

### 5.1. **National Guidelines**

#### 5.1.1. **Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures - Guidelines for Planning Authorities (1996)**

These set out current national planning policy in relation to telecommunications structures and address issues relating to, inter alia, site selection; minimising adverse impact; sharing and clustering of facilities; and development control. The Guidelines are generally supportive of the development and maintenance of a high-quality telecommunications service. At 4.3 it is stated that “the visual impact is among the more important considerations which have to be taken into account in arriving at a decision on a particular application. In most cases the applicant will only have limited flexibility as regards location, given the constraints arising from radio planning parameters. Only as a last resort and if the alternatives are either unavailable or unsuitable should free-standing masts be located in a residential area or beside schools. If such a location should become necessary sites already developed for utilities should be considered and masts and antennae should be designed and adapted for the specific location. The support structures should be kept to the minimum height consistent with effective operation and should be monopole (or poles) rather than a latticed tripod or square structure.

#### 5.1.2. **Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures and DoECLG Circular Letter PL07/12**

The 2012 Circular letter set out to revise sections 2.2. to 2.7 of the 1996 Guidelines. The 1996 Guidelines advised that planning authorities should indicate in their development plans any locations where, for various reasons, telecommunications installations would not be favoured or where special conditions would apply and suggested that such locations might include lands whose high amenity value is already recognised in a development plan, protected structures, or sites beside schools. While the policies above are reasonable, there has, however, been a growing trend for the insertion of development plan policies and objectives specifying minimum distances between telecommunications structures from houses and schools, e.g. up to 1km. Such distance requirements, without allowing for flexibility on a case-by-case basis, can make the identification of a site for new infrastructure very difficult. Planning authorities should therefore not include such separation distances as they can inadvertently have a major impact on the roll out of a viable and effective telecommunications network.

Section 2.6 of the Circular letter refers to Health and Safety Aspects and reiterates the advice of the 1996 Guidelines that planning authorities should not include monitoring arrangements as part of planning permission conditions nor determine planning applications on health grounds. 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.

## **5.2. Development Plan**

### **5.2.1. Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023**

#### **Zoning**

The site is zoned RS in the County Development Plan, the objective of which is to 'provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity'. The vision for this zoning is stated as to: "*ensure that any new development in existing areas would have a minimal impact on and enhance existing residential amenity*".

Telecommunications structures are not included in the uses which are permitted in principle and not permitted. In this regard, the Plan states that: *“uses which are neither ‘Permitted in Principle’ nor ‘Not Permitted’ will be assessed in terms of their contribution towards the achievement of the Zoning Objective and Vision and their compliance and consistency with the policies and objectives of the Development Plan”*.

### **Telecommunications Structures**

Section 7.4 of the Plan addresses Information and Communication Technologies with specific references to Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures which notes that *“the Council recognises the essential need for high quality communications and information technology networks in assuring the competitiveness of the County’s economy and its role in supporting regional and national development”*. It further states: *“The advantages of a high quality ICT infrastructure must however be balanced against the need to safeguard the rural and urban environment. Visual impact must therefore be kept to a minimum with detailed consideration given to the siting and external appearance of the apparatus and to the scope for utilizing landscaping measures effectively. The Council will consider proposals for such infrastructure in the light of the recommendations of the guidelines issued”*.

### **Objectives**

Objective IT05

*“Provide the necessary 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 PL07/12 which shall take precedence, and any subsequent revisions or additional guidelines in this area”*.

Objective IT06

*“Promote and encourage service providers to engage in pre-planning discussions with the Planning Authority prior to the submission of planning applications”*.

Objective IT07

*“Require best practice in siting and design in relation to the erection of communication antennae”.*

Objective IT08

*“Secure a high quality of design of masts, towers and antennae and other such infrastructure in the interests of visual amenity and the protection of sensitive landscapes, subject to radio and engineering parameters”.*

### **Development Management Standards**

Objective DMS143

*“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”.*

Objective DMS144

*“Encourage the location of telecommunications based services at appropriate locations within the County, subject to environmental considerations and avoid the location of structures in fragile landscapes, in nature conservation areas, in highly sensitive landscapes and where views are to be preserved”.*

Objective DMS145

*“Require the following information with respect to telecommunications structures at application stage:*

- Demonstrate compliance with Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures – Guidelines for Planning Authorities issued by the Department of the Environment in July 1996 and / or to any subsequent amendments, Code of Practice on Sharing of Radio Sites issued by the Commission for Communications Regulation and to such other publications and material as maybe relevant in the circumstances.*
- Demonstrate the significance of the proposed development as part of a national telecommunications network.*
- Indicate on a map the location of all existing telecommunications structures (whether operated by the applicant or a competing company) within a 1km radius of the proposed site.*



- *Where sharing is not proposed, submit documentary evidence clearly stating the reasons why it is not feasible to share existing facilities bearing in mind the Code of Practice on Sharing of Radio Sites issued by the Commission for Communications Regulation”.*
- Demonstrate to what degree there is an impact on public safety, landscape, vistas and ecology.
- Identify any mitigation measures.

### Trees

There is a specific objective on the lands to the north of the site to protect trees and hedgerows.

## **5.3. Natural Heritage Designations**

There are no designated sites within close proximity of the sites.

## **5.4. EIA Screening**

- 5.4.1. The proposed development is not a project/class of development which falls within either Part 1 or Part 2 of Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended.

## **6.0 The Appeal**

### **6.1. Grounds of Appeal**

The grounds of appeal are summarised as follows:

- Issues previously raised in planning supporting statement taken as read and will solely address reason for refusal.
- Issues only expanded upon to show how proposal accords with the Development Plan and proper planning and sustainable development.
- To provide full justification for proposal attention will be drawn to information submitted from two of the three mobile/broadband providers operating from the structure with third operator indicating support but did not provide written support.

- In terms of compliance with zoning, site is an existing and established telecommunications site, located within the outer compound of an existing substation, which is a utility installation and which is a permitted use in RS zoned lands with the extent to which the proposal contributes to the zoning objective and vision critical.
- Existing pylon structure already exists and is located within an existing utility site.
- Extension in overall height of 5m is modest addition which is necessary to facilitate the continued provision of services in to the area with permission for the proposal allowing the provision of significantly enhanced coverage of voice and data services without being unduly visually intrusive and causing undue harm to residential amenity.
- DMS144 seeks to encourage location of telecommunications structures at appropriate locations subject to environmental considerations avoiding fragile landscape, nature conservation areas and highly sensitive landscapes where views are preserved with proposal taking environmental considerations into account, location is not a designated fragile landscape, nor a nature conservation area, or a highly sensitive landscape where views are preserved.
- Utility is well screened from the street and the visual impact is modest not unduly impacting either the visual or residential amenities of the area.
- Importance of structure to delivery of mobile and broadband telephony services to the local area cannot be over emphasised with analysis of ComReg site viewed highlighting that immediate locality is poorly covered with main driver for proposal to improve services to large area of residential and commercial properties within the area, the M50 motorway and the local transport infrastructure.
- By not deploying a suitable site, a coverage deficit for all users will remain in the area leading to poor voice and data services.
- Site effectiveness at current height compromised by growth of trees within close proximity with proposal providing sufficient overlap of coverage footprint to adequately serve the area and counteract reduced cell shrinkage effect which occurs at peak times.

- Justification for increase in height also applies to other operators on the site who outline improvement in coverage at greater height, with trees impeding coverage at the existing height (Appendix outlining coverage).
- ESB Telecoms separate to ESB Networks who own the site but independent access to the mast by other users provided in compliance with Objective IT07 of the Plan.
- Height chosen to allow customers – mobile/broadband – offer reasonable coverage to customers in vicinity into the future keeping height to minimum required for continued co-location.
- Point to point visibility between neighbouring structures a pre-requisite with growth of nearby trees, while providing excellent screening, impact negatively on the sites effectiveness at delivering services with proposal allowing up to date services be delivered allowing operators upgrade and add equipment to cater for increased strain remote working has placed on the network.
- Alternative sites considered but none found given nature of development in area with site an already established utility site forming part of local electricity grid. Existing mast structures in the area discounted as would not provide necessary coverage. Lack of suitable sites verified by operators (Appendix 1).
- Within site itself, alternatives considered such as a new monopole to replace the pylon which would have little difference in visual impact but would be significantly more expensive and less sustainable and temporary loss of service.
- Three monopole structures considered but restricted nature of site and operational changes required to overall site.
- While visible from adjoining properties, proposal modest in height and will not impact unduly visual amenities of area or amenities of residents nearby, will not impact on protected trees, with plans and photomontages demonstrating same.
- Supporting statement submitted with application outlines that the main views from the adjoining residential property to the north and east of the site, Ros na Ri will be southwards past the structure rather than in direct line of sight with trees within the curtilage of the property lessening views within the residential site.

- Views from the Carpenterstown Road largely screened and from the wider area, the extension will only be seen from a distance within the trees.
- Upper part of structure currently visible from entrance to the adjoining Mulberry housing development with the extension visible but seen against the existing trees and with the houses having an east west orientation the development will not be visible from within the houses. To the east along the Carpenterstown Road views will be limited and seen within the context of the substation site. The house further east has no windows facing the site.
- Proposal satisfies requirements of IT07 and IT08 and the site is not situated within a sensitive landscape and no evidence to suggest property values would depreciate.
- Objection received by PA on health grounds appropriately addressed by Planner and health grounds did not form part of reason for refusal.
- Technical justification report prepared by Three Ireland attached as Appendix 1.
- Technical justification report prepared by Eir attached as Appendix 2 which notes that the additional height proposed on the tower is to facilitate Eir having their own independent antenna system as they have a legal obligation to decouple from H3G Irl and without the additional height there would not be sufficient room for Eir with no alternative sites.

## 6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

No further comments.

## 6.3. **Observations**

None on file.

## 7.0 Assessment

### 7.1. Introduction

Having inspected the site and considered the contents of the first-party appeal in detail, the main planning issues in the assessment of the proposed development are as follows:

- Procedural Matter
- Principle of Proposal & Compliance with Development Plan Policies and Objectives
- Impact on Amenities
- Health Impacts
- Identification of Alternative Sites
- Appropriate Assessment

### 7.2. Procedural Matter

7.2.1. As I outlined in Section 2 of this report, I have noted that the public notices refer to an extension to the existing 14.5 metre high telecommunications structure with an overall proposed height of main structure of 19.5m. The documentation submitted to the Planning Authority and the Planners report from the Planning Authority also reference the existing 14.5m structure. However, the urban place map received references an existing 12m tower with a proposed 7.5m high extension as do the four elevation drawings.

7.2.2. The existing contiguous drawings indicate a height of 12m to the height of the pylon/tower with the overall height with the equipment being 14.5m. The proposed contiguous drawing indicate that the pylon height remains at 12m but the equipment level extends by 2.5m to 7.5m with an overall height increase of this element of the structure of 5m.

7.2.3. While confusion has been caused between the drawings themselves and the drawings and public notices, I note that both the drawings and the public notices refer to an overall height of 19.5 metres and in this regard the public have been informed as to the proposed overall height of the structure and in that regard I would

recommend to the Board that the proposal can be considered from a procedural perspective.

### 7.3. Principle of Proposal and Compliance with Development Plan Policies and Objectives

7.3.1. The site is zoned RS in the County Development Plan, the objective of which is to *'provide for residential development and protect and improve residential amenity'*.

The vision for this zoning is stated as to: *"ensure that any new development in existing areas would have a minimal impact on and enhance existing residential amenity"*.

7.3.2. I note that Telecommunications structures are not included in the uses which are permitted in principle and not permitted. In this regard, the Plan states that: *"uses which are neither 'Permitted in Principle' nor 'Not Permitted' will be assessed in terms of their contribution towards the achievement of the Zoning Objective and Vision and their compliance and consistency with the policies and objectives of the Development Plan"*. However, as pointed out by the appellant, the structure is located within a larger ESB substation compound which includes another pylon for the purposes of carrying overhead powerlines to and from the site. As pointed out, the Plan includes utilities as permitted in principle within this zoning objective and as part of the overall compound I consider that it could be reasonably argued that the proposal would be acceptable in principle. Furthermore, this is not a new structure. It is an extension to an existing structure located within this utility which provides the necessary supporting utilities for the wider residential area. A residential area is dependent on such infrastructure and in respect of the principle of whether it is appropriate at this location, I consider that in principle the proposal is acceptable.

7.3.3. The reason for refusal references a number of specific objectives in the Development Plan by way of supporting the PA's conclusion that the proposal would injure the amenities of the area and depreciate the value of existing property in the area. I will address each in turn.

7.3.4. Firstly, Objective IT07 is included which states that the Council will *"require best practice in siting and design in relation to the erection of communication antennae"*. As noted above, this is not a new structure, it is an extension of an existing structure

which is located within a larger utility compound therefore it is arguably located in the most suitable site for such infrastructure and the design is based on the existing pylons located on the site both the subject telecommunications structure and the other electrical pylon. I do not consider that the proposal would contravene this objective and suggest to the Board that it is not reasonable to be included in any reason for refusal.

- 7.3.5. Secondly, Objective IT08 seeks to “*secure a high quality of design of masts, towers and antennae and other such infrastructure in the interests of visual amenity and the protection of sensitive landscapes, subject to radio and engineering parameters*”. Critical to this objective is the last element – subject to radio and engineering parameters. The nature of telecommunication structures is that they need to transmit and in order to do so have to be of a sufficient height. The appellant has outlined the issues arising with the surrounding trees and growth of same. Additionally, Eir have outlined the need for increased room on the mast to support their independent antennae. This is an urban landscape where telecommunication infrastructure is critical to facilitate modern day living. This is even more pronounced with increased remote working. Additionally, this is not a new mast, as I have outlined elsewhere. It is an extension to an existing structure and in this regard, the design has been established by the existing structure. I would also note that this is not a sensitive landscape and therefore I consider that the proposal would not contravene this objective and suggest to the Board that it is not reasonable to be included in any reason for refusal.
- 7.3.6. The final objective included within the reason for refusal is Objective DMS144 which seeks to “*encourage the location of telecommunications based services at appropriate locations within the County, subject to environmental considerations and avoid the location of structures in fragile landscapes, in nature conservation areas, in highly sensitive landscapes and where views are to be preserved*”. The subject site is not located within a fragile landscape, in a nature conservation area, nor is it in a highly sensitive landscape and neither are there views which are to be preserved. The structure subject of this extension is located within an existing ESB compound and therefore I consider is located in an appropriate location for the purposes of telecommunications. I consider that the proposal would not contravene this objective

and suggest to the Board that it is not reasonable to be included in any reason for refusal.

#### **7.4. Impact on Amenities**

- 7.4.1. While I have addressed the objectives which seek to protect the amenities of the area within which such development is proposed, the reason for refusal states that the proposal would seriously injure the amenities and depreciate the value of existing property in the area. I will, therefore, address visual amenities and residential amenities in turn.
- 7.4.2. The visual impact of the proposed extension to the structure on the immediate residential community is in my opinion the most pressing consideration in respect of this application. As outlined above, the subject site is not located within a fragile landscape, in a nature conservation area, nor is it in a highly sensitive landscape and neither are there views which are to be preserved and as concluded above, objective DMS144 does not apply. It is most pertinently the visual impact of the proposal from the adjoining properties that requires consideration. As outlined by the applicant, the properties within the Mulberry residential development to the south of the site which adjoin the site boundary have an east west orientation and therefore there are no views from inside the houses. Views of the structure will be available when looking north, but I would note that the existing structure can be seen in glimpses but is well screened by trees within the wider area. Yes the structure will be visible but the impact is not considered to be adverse. Similarly, the property to the east on the other side of the Carpenterstown Road has a north south orientation with no direct views east towards the site. The most proximate property is the large detached property known as Ros na Ri which is located to the northwest of the site. Views from the rear windows of the property are south but are not in line with the site and while there may be views they are not considered to create an adverse impact. I would note that the structure is currently visible from the front entrance of Ros na Ri and the higher structure will be more visible. The house is not protected and while the extended structure will be more visible than it already is, this is an urban area where such structures would be an expected part of the urban environment.



7.4.3. While I have addressed visual amenities above, the potential for injure to the residential amenities of the area and the potential to depreciate the value of existing property in the area must also be considered. As I outlined above, the extended structure will be more visible within the area and from the curtilage of a number of adjoining properties. However, this is an important electrical and telecommunications site within the area and a residential area cannot function without such supporting infrastructure. In this regard, the site is well established and the increase in the height of the telecommunications structure can be appropriately absorbed in the context that it is located on an existing structure within an existing compound. I do not therefore consider that the proposal would detrimentally impact the residential amenities of properties or depreciate property values given the existing long standing use of the site.

## 7.5. Health Impacts

- 7.5.1. The submission received by the Planning Authority from a property owner in Mulberry Drive to the south of the site, outline their concerns in relation to the potential level and range of radiation which has not been adequately considered and not addressed in the Health and Safety element of the documents. They state that no effort has been made to recognise persons suffering from electro-hypersensitivity and consult with near neighbours to the site to grant them adequate protections and/or an opportunities to be aware of potential consequences.
- 7.5.2. I would refer the Board to Section 2.6 of the Circular letter PL07/12 which refers to Health and Safety Aspects and reiterates the advice of the 1996 Guidelines that planning authorities should not include monitoring arrangements as part of planning permission conditions nor determine planning applications on health grounds. It 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. I consider that this concludes matters in this regard.

## **7.6. Identification of Alternative Sites**

- 7.6.1. The appellant outlines the process by which alternative locations and designs for the infrastructure required were undertaken. This is an established site within an existing compound which provides necessary utilities for the wider residential area. I consider that the matter has been satisfactorily addressed.

## **7.7. Appropriate Assessment**

- 7.7.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, which is a vertical mast, outside of and not connected to any Natura 2000 sites, I do not consider that any Appropriate Assessment issues arise and 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.

## **8.0 Recommendation**

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

## **9.0 Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to:

- a) the National Planning Framework Project Ireland 2040,
- b) the national strategy regarding the improvement of mobile communications services,
- c) the guidelines relating to telecommunications antennas and support structures which were issued by the Department of the Environment and Local Government to planning authorities in July, 1996, as updated by Circular Letter PL07/12 issued by the Minister for the Environment, Community and Local Government on the 19th day of October, 2012 under Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended,
- d) the policy of the planning authority as set out in the Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023, to support the provision of telecommunications and broadband infrastructure,

- e) the established use of the site,
- f) the potential for sharing of the structure and site with other operators,
- g) the general topography of the site and orientation of residential properties within the vicinity of the site to the proposed development,

it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenities of the area, would not be prejudicial to public health and 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, 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><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of clarity</p>
2	<p>Prior to commencement of development, details of the proposed colour scheme for the additional installations shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interests of visual amenity and orderly development</p>
3	<p>Any additional panels or structures, proposed to be attached to the mast exceeding 1.3 metres in any dimension, shall be the subject of a separate planning application.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> To regulate and control the layout of the development in the interest of orderly development</p>
4	<p>No advertising signage shall be erected on the mast, or ancillary equipment.</p>

	<b>Reason:</b> In the interest of visual amenity.
--	---

---

Una Crosse  
Senior Planning Inspector

8 November 2021