



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-311903-21

Development	Permission for a 2.5 headframe extension to 15 metre high telecommunications structure.
Location	ESB Telecoms' Compound, to the rear of 76 Main Street, Swords, Co Dublin
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	F21A/0444
Applicant(s)	ESB Telecoms.
Type of Application	Planning Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	ESB Telecoms.
Observer(s)	No Observers.
Date of Site Inspection	25 th May 2022.
Inspector	Elaine Sullivan

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	6
3.4. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	7
5.1. Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023.....	7
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	11
5.3. EIA Screening	11
6.0 The Appeal	11
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	11
6.2. Planning Authority Response	13
6.3. Observations	14
7.0 Assessment.....	14
8.0 Recommendation.....	18
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	18

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located on the southern end of Swords Main Street, at the corner of Well Road and Main Street. It has a stated area of 0.00131ha and comprises a single storey paint shop facing onto Main Street. Vehicular access is from Main Street and there is a surface car parking area along the northern section of the site. To the rear is a telecommunications compound with a mast and two ground mounted cabinets, enclosed by a 2.4m high palisade fence.
- 1.2. Along the southern and western boundaries, the site abuts the public footpath on Well Road. This boundary is formed by a stone wall with mature hedges and trees. There is a significant level difference between the site and Well Road with the levels decreasing as you travel north-west towards Church Road.
- 1.3. To the south of the site and facing onto Main Street is a two storey building. To the rear of this building and facing onto the site, and Well Road is a 3 storey, over basement apartment development called Cooldriona Court. There is a small green area adjoining this development with a holy well monument, (DU011-034013). The Ward River Valley Park is located further to the west of the subject site.
- 1.4. At the junction of Well Road and Church Road is the Old Schoolhouse protected structure, (RPS Ref. 359) and the stone road bridge over the Ward River, (RPS Ref. 908). Further west and approximately 200m from the subject site is St. Columba's Church, (RPS Ref. 360a). The church grounds also include a number of protected structures; the Round Tower, (RPS Ref. 360b), Medieval Tower, (RPS Ref. 360c), the Sextons House (RPS Ref. 361) and the Old Vicarage, (RPS Ref. 362), which is located on the opposite side of the road. The church complex is elevated and has clear views towards Main Street.
- 1.5. Directly adjoining the site to the north is a two-storey building comprising a food store called Umami with a large car parking area to the rear. Adjoining this site to the north is the Old Borough hotel, (RPS Ref. 357), which is set back from the public footpath with a surface car parking area to the front.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for a 2.5m headframe extension to the existing 15m high communications structure for the purpose of carrying antennae and communication dishes, along with ancillary lightening filial to a total height of 17.5m.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Planning permission was refused by the PA for the following three reasons:

1. Having regard to the height and siting of the proposed telecommunications infrastructure and its highly sensitive location within the Zone of Archaeological Potential for the historic town of Swords (RMP Ref. DU011-034) and within close proximity to the historic and protected sites of The Old Boro (RPS 357), The Old Schoolhouse Restaurant (RPS 359), The Old Vicarage (RPS 0362), St. Columba's Church (RPS 360a), Round Tower (RPS 0360b), Medieval Tower (RPS0360c) and Sexton's House (RPS 0361), it is considered that the proposed development would have a significant and adverse visual impact on the appearance and character of the area and would also detract from the settings of nearby protected structures, contrary to Objectives CH07, CH09 and CH14 of the Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. The Planning Authority is not satisfied based on the information submitted that the proposed development complies with Objectives IT07, DMS143 and DMS145 of the Fingal County Development Plan 2017-23 and Section 4.5 of the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures 1996 Guidelines in terms of the impracticality of co-location and sharing of facilities in the area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
3. The proposal would contravene Objective Swords 4 of the Fingal Development Plan, which requires development within the Town Centre to be

in compliance with The Swords Masterplan 2009, which sets out in detail views to be protected from unsuitable development with specific reference to views from St. Columbas eastward across the historic core of Swords.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the Planning Officer, (PO), dated the 12th October 2021 informed the decision of the PA and included the following:

- The subject site is zoned 'MC' in the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023, the objective of which is to *'Protect, provide for and/or improve major town centre facilities'*.
- Telecommunications structures are 'permitted in principle' within the 'MC'
- The site also within the Zone of Archaeological Potential for Swords (RMP Ref. DU011-035) and within a Historic Characterisation Area.
- There are a number of protected structures within the vicinity of the site and there are a number of protected views from St. Columba's Church.
- The applicant has stated that the proposed development is required in order to provide an adequate service to customers. However, there are 4 no. base stations in proximity to the subject site with planning permission for another mobile phone antenna granted under ABP-307828-20, (PA Ref. F20A/0147), on a site approximately 400m to the north of the subject site.
- It is considered that adequate information has not been submitted as to why the applicant cannot share the existing facilities in proximity to the site.
- The prevailing character of development around the site is low-rise, with a significant level change between Main Street and Well Road.
- The existing mast is significantly higher than the surrounding buildings and is visually intrusive. Any extension to the mast would exacerbate the visual impact on the streetscape.
- The height, location and siting of the proposed equipment would significantly detract from the broader historic area, which is of national and local

importance, and would detract from the existing streetscape. It would also impact on views from St. Comumba's Church.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Water Services Planning Section – No objection.
- Transportation Planning Section – No objection.
- Conservation Officer – There are 8 protected structures in the vicinity of the subject site. The proposal does not physically impact on any of the designated sites. The additional structure to be placed on top of existing infrastructure does not dramatically alter the existing visual impact.
- Community Archaeologist / Heritage Officer – No objection. Although the development is situated in the historic town of Swords, the proposal will not impact on historical features of interest at the proposed location.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- No responses on file.

3.4. Third Party Observations

- No third-party observations were received by the PA within the statutory public consultation period.

4.0 Planning History

- No recent planning history for the subject site.

On the adjoining site to the north:

- **ABP-306585-20, (PA Ref. F19A/0527)** – Planning permission refused for a new stand-alone, four-storey hotel comprising 104 bedrooms with ancillary services and a two-level basement car park with 52 car parking spaces. The development was refused as it would contravene Objective MT41 of the Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023 and because it would negatively impact on the town centre streetscape and would have an overbearing impact on the Old Borough protected structure.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023

- 5.1.1. The proposed development is located within a site zoned MC – Major Town Centre, the objective of which is to *‘Protect, provide for and/or improve major town centre facilities’*. Telecommunications structures are listed as ‘Permitted in Principle’ under the MC zoning objective.
- 5.1.2. It is also located within the Zone of Archaeological Notification and is in close proximity to three Protected Structures; The Old Borough Schoolhouse, (RPS Ref. 357), The Old School House Restaurant, (RPS Ref. 359) and the Road Bridge on Church Road, (RPS Ref. 908).
- 5.1.3. St. Columba’s Church, (RPS Ref. 360) and ecclesiastical remains, graveyard and round tower and the Sexton’s House (RPS Ref. 361), are approximately 200m to the north-east of the site and sit on an elevated position. The area surrounding the church complex has protected views and there are four Recorded Monuments within this site.

Section 4.2 – Swords

Objective SWORDS 4 - Promote the development of lands within Swords town centre in accordance with the principles and guidance laid down in the Swords Master Plan (January 2009).

Objective SWORDS 17 - Protect and conserve the historic core of Swords including the Zone of Archaeological notification in the centre of the town and implement the Swords Castle Cultural Quarter Architectural Masterplan.

Objective SWORDS 21 - Preserve existing good quality views of the Castle, Church and Round Tower from within Swords; and where feasible to open up new views.

Section 7.4 – Information and Communications Technologies

Objective IT01 - Promote and facilitate the sustainable delivery of a high-quality ICT infrastructure network throughout the County taking account of the need to protect the countryside and the urban environment together with seeking to achieve balanced social and economic development.

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.

Chapter 10 – Cultural Heritage

Objective CH07 – Ensure that development within the vicinity of a Recorded Monument or Zone of Archaeological Notification does not seriously detract from the setting of the feature, and is sited and designed appropriately.

Objective CH09 - Recognise the importance of archaeology or historic landscapes and the connectivity between sites, where it exists, in order to safeguard them from developments that would unduly sever or disrupt the relationship and/or inter-visibility between sites

Objective CH14 - Identify Zones of Archaeological Notification that contain clusters of Recorded Monuments or have a significant history of the discovery of archaeological sites, features and objects in order to allow for their designation, protection of their setting and environs.

Chapter 12 – Development Management Standards

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.

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.

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 measure.

5.1.4. **Swords Master Plan 2009**

This plan is integrated into the County Development Plan under Swords Objective 4.

The subject site is located within the Historic Town Core as identified in the Master Plan.

Section 3.4 – Urban Design Guidelines

- Protect strong views within Swords, particularly towards Swords Castle, St Columba's Church and St Colmcille's Church.
- Protect the view to the historic core of Swords at St Columba's Church and round tower from Main Street, Church Road and Well Road. Protect the view to the spire of St Columcille's Roman Catholic Church from Main Street and New Street

5.1.5. **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.

Only as a last resort should free-standing masts be located within or in the immediate surrounds of smaller towns or villages.

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

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.

5.1.6. **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'*.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.2.1. No designations apply to the appeal site.

5.3. EIA Screening

- 5.3.1. An Environmental Impact Assessment Screening report was not submitted with the application. The proposed development is not listed in either Part 1 or Part 2 of Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended), which sets out the types and thresholds of development that requires a mandatory EIA. The proposal has also been assessed against the criteria outlined in Schedule 7 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended). and the provisions of Article 109, (3) of the Regulations. do not apply to the site and it has and does not warrant an EIA based on the criteria listed.
- 5.3.2. Under the provisions of Article 109, (3) of the Regulations, it is noted that the site is not located within a European site, is not designated for the protection of the landscape or of natural or cultural heritage and the proposed development is not likely to have a significant effect on any European Site as discussed below.
- 5.3.3. The proposed development is minor in nature and scale and not require any significant ground works or construction. I have concluded that, by reason of the nature, scale and location of the subject site, the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment and that on preliminary examination an environmental impact assessment report for the proposed development was not necessary in this case. (See Preliminary Examination EIAR Screening Form).

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal include the following;

- The proposed development is for an extension to an existing telecoms structure which has been in place since 2004 and was erected under Class 31 (h) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended).
- The site is currently in use by 2 national mobile broadband providers, Three Ireland and Eir Mobile.
- The technical reason for the height extension is to allow for longer antennae types which can accommodate more recent technologies.
- The first reason for refusal relates to the height and siting of the proposal within a highly sensitive location and within a zone of archaeological potential. The applicant states that a refusal of permission would not result in the removal of the existing antenna.
- A 2.5m extension is modest in nature given the site's longstanding use as a telecoms compound and is acceptable in terms of visual impact on the surrounding area.
- In response to Refusal Reason 1 – impact on sensitive sites:
- With regard to the sensitive sites and protected structures, it is argued that the extension to the antenna is either not visible or would not be visibly prominent when viewed from the Old Borough, (RPS 357), the Old Schoolhouse Restaurant, (RPS 359), St. Columba's Church, (RPS 360a), and the Round Tower, (RPS 360b), the Medieval Tower, (RPS 360c), the Sexton's House, (RPS 361) and the Old Vicarage (RPS 0362).
- As a result, the proposed extension would not be contrary to Objective CH07 as it would not 'seriously detract from the setting of the feature'.
- As the site is located off Main Street, invoking Objective CHO9 as a reason for refusal seems unfounded as the existing site neither 'severs' or 'disrupts' any 'relationship or inter-visibility between sites'. The inclusion of Objective CH14 appears to be an error.
- In response to Refusal Reason 2 – which relates to Objectives IT 07, DMS 143 and DMS 145.

- Objective IT 07 requires 'best practice in siting and design' for telecommunications antennae. The applicant argues that the use of an existing site within a town centre, whereby an existing structure will be extended by 2.5m to provide additional service complies with this objective.
- Objective DMS 143 requires the co-location of antennae on existing support structures and the submission of documentary evidence if this is not feasible. As the proposed development is for a moderate extension to an existing structure, as opposed to a new structure, the applicant would strongly ask the Board to overlook this reason for refusal.
- Objective 145 sets out the information to be included in any application in respect of telecommunications antennae. The applicant submits that the requirements of DMS 145 were adequately addressed in the application and in Section 4 of the Planning Report submitted with the application.
- In response to Refusal Reason No. 3 – contrary to Swords Masterplan -
- The refusal reason states that the development would contravene Objective Swords 4 of the Development Plan which requires development to be in accordance with the Swords Masterplan 2009, which sets out the views to be protected from St. Columba's eastward towards the historic core of Swords. The applicant found no reference in the Masterplan regarding the protection of views from the protected structure towards Main Street. However, the protection of views towards the protected structures is referenced. The applicant states that it is clear from the photographs included in the appeal that any such impact would not be detrimental.
- It is of note that the report of the Fingal Council's Conservation Officer states that 'the proposal will not physically impact on any of the designated sites. As the mast is an existing tall structure, the visual impact already exists and the addition to the top of it does not dramatically alter this situation'.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- No response on file.

6.3. Observations

- No observations received.

7.0 Assessment

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

- Principle of Development
- Visual Impact
- Impact on Architectural Heritage
- Appropriate Assessment

7.1. Principle of Development

- 7.1.1. The proposed development is consistent with the 'MC' zoning objective for the site, under which telecommunications structures are a permitted in principle land-use.

7.2. Justification for Development

- 7.2.1. The proposal is justified on the basis that the restricted height of the existing structure leads to radio signal interference, which impacts on service. Additional height is required to allow a 0.5m separation distance between providers in order to provide the latest technological services to customers in the area. In the report of the Planning Officer, it was noted that there are currently four base stations located in proximity to the subject site: three on the Pavilions Shopping Centre, and one on the roof of a three-storey building to the north of the site. Planning permission for additional mobile phone antennae was also permitted under ABP-307828-20, (PA Ref. F20A/0147), for a site on the corner of Church Road and Bridge Street. These locations range in distance from 150 - 340m from the subject site. Based on the existing and permitted infrastructure, the PA considered that the requirement for the additional infrastructure was not justified. The grounds of appeal state that the

development is required to provide effective service as new technologies arise on a site that already has telecommunications infrastructure on it.

- 7.2.2. The Comreg, Outdoor Coverage Map, shows a 'Very Good' coverage for 4G in the immediate proximity of the site for all providers. Some deficiencies in the service can be seen on the areas surrounding the centre of Swords. However, the service is still categorised as 'Good'. The existing telecommunications infrastructure has been in place since 2004 and as such is an established use. I accept that upgrades and additional services may be required to accommodate technological advances. However, given the location of the structure just off the main street of Swords, the most important considerations regarding the proposal would be the the visual impact of the development and its impact on the character and setting of the protected structures and architectural heritage of the area. These issues are assessed in detail in the sections below.

7.3. Visual Impact

- 7.3.1. A photomontage from six viewpoints in proximity to the site was submitted with the application. Having visited the site and the surrounding area, the existing structure is most visible from areas in close proximity to the site to the south and east. There are clear uninterrupted views from the shopping centre across from the site and on the opposite side of Main Street where the existing structure is prominent within the streetscape. When approaching from the south, the existing structure is not clearly visible until the views are unrestricted by buildings at the junction of Main Street and Well Road. When viewed from the eastern side of Main Street the structure can be seen above some buildings in the streetscape. The top of the structure is visible above the Umami food store when viewed from the northern section of the Malahide Road / Main Street junction. As you travel further northward along Main Street the structure is not visible. The additional height proposed would increase the visibility and prominence of the structure when viewed from the south and east of the site. Views from the north of main street would mainly be clocked by trees and buildings.
- 7.3.2. When viewed from directly opposite the site on Well Road, the structure is not immediately visible. When looking eastwards towards the site from the public footpath on Well Road, the existing structure is shielded from view by the change in

level and the large trees in place along the site boundary. As you travel further west towards Church Road the top of the structure can be seen clearly in the skyline and above the existing buildings on Main Street when viewed from the Church Road - Brackenstown Road junction. The existing structure can also be seen from some areas around St. Columba's Church.

7.3.3. The additional height and antennae would render the structure more pronounced within the streetscape of Main Street and would also make the structure more visible from the wider area and from the higher levels on Church Road and St. Columba's Church. Whilst, I acknowledge that the existing structure will remain in place regardless of whether the additional height is permitted or not, the additional height would result in an overly obtrusive feature in the existing streetscape that would be seriously injurious to the character of the Main Street when viewed from the east and south.

7.3.4. **Impact on Architectural Heritage**

7.3.5. There are three protected structures in close proximity to the subject site: the Old Borough Hotel to the north of the site and facing onto Main Street, the Old Schoolhouse restaurant to the north-west of the site on Church Road and the stone Road Bridge on Church Street spanning the Ward River. I have visited the site and reviewed the photomontage submitted with the application and I am satisfied that the proposed development would not result in a negative impact on the character and setting of the protected structures by virtue of the separation distances between the sites and the restricted visibility of the proposed development from the protected structures. The proposed development would be c. 40m to the south of the Old Borough hotel with a commercial building and parking area in between. The Old Schoolhouse would be c. 75m to the north-west of the site, and whilst the mast would be visible behind the building, the existing planting and topography would soften the visual impact. However, as noted above, I consider that the proposal will have a significant visual impact on the wider area.

7.3.6. A further four protected structures are located c. 200m to the north-west of the site and within the complex of St. Columba's Church. The Old Vicarage is another protected structure located on the eastern side of Church Road and across from the

entrance to St. Columba's Church. I am satisfied that the proposal would not impact on this structure by virtue of the separation distances between both sites, the topography and the existing pattern of development.

- 7.3.7. In the FCDP, there is an objective to protect views around St. Columba's Church. The development plan does not state in which direction the views are protected but extracts from Section 3.4 of the Swords Masterplan 2009, which is referenced in the PA's reasons for refusal state that, the urban design guidelines should, *'Protect strong views within Swords, particularly towards Swords Castle, St Columba's Church and St Colmcille's Church'*, and *'Protect the view to the historic core of Swords at St Columba's Church and round tower from Main Street, Church Road and Well Road'*. It is also noted that *'Views of Swords Castle, St Columba's and St Colmcille's Church are especially important in Swords, projecting the town's positive image'*.
- 7.3.8. Having visited the site and the surrounding area, I am satisfied that any views towards St. Columba's Church from Main Street, Well Road and Church Road would not be impacted from the proposed development by virtue of the topography of the site and the existing planting and development. The existing telecommunications structure is hidden from view by boundary planting when looking towards St. Columba's Church from Well Road and Church Road and St. Columba's Church is not clearly visible from Main Street in the immediate vicinity of the subject site.
- 7.3.9. I would consider that the views towards St. Columba's Church would be more sensitive and worthy of protecting rather than views towards the commercial main street of Swords where modern commercial buildings dominate the streetscape when viewed from the higher levels of Church Road / St. Columba's Church.
- 7.3.10. When viewed from the Church grounds, the immediate foreground of the vista comprises historic stone walls with mature trees and the protected structures of the Old Schoolhouse and the Old Vicarage. Beyond this, the wider vista is framed by the commercial main street which is dominated by modern apartment developments and commercial buildings. The existing telecommunications structure is visible from the church grounds when looking towards the south-east. However, it is not visually prominent within the overall vista as it blends in with the grey apartment block above the shopping centre on Main Street. The additional height proposed would project

above the background buildings and would be a prominent feature in the skyline when viewed from the church. Views 2 and 3 in the Photomontage demonstrate how the existing skyline will be impacted by the proposed development when viewed from Church Road and St. Columba's Church.

- 7.3.11. I am satisfied that the proposed development will not impact on the objective to preserve views around St. Columba's Church and that the proposed development would not have a negative impact on the character and setting of the protected structures in the vicinity of the subject site. However, the proposed development would have a negative visual impact on the existing streetscape along Main Street and would dominate the corner of Well Road and Main Street, which is characterised by low rise development.
- 7.3.12. The subject site is located within a Zone of Archaeological Notification. Given the nature of the proposed development, I am satisfied that it would not result in any impact on the archaeological heritage of the surrounding area.

7.4. Appropriate Assessment

- 7.4.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, which is outside of any Natura 2000 site, 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 planning permission for the proposed development be refused.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the visually prominent location of the site within the streetscape of Swords Main Street, and to the nature and scale of the proposed development for a 2.5m extension to an existing 15m telecommunications structure, it is considered that the proposed development would result in a significant and negative visual impact on the immediate

streetscape and on the wider area to the north and west. It would therefore be contrary to the provisions of the Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023, and in particular with Objectives IT07 and IT08. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Elaine Sullivan
Planning Inspector

25th July 2022