



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-312095-21

Development	Telecommunications street works solution
Location	Tymon North, Dublin 24
Planning Authority	South Dublin County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	S25419/08
Applicant(s)	Cignal Infrastructure Ltd.
Type of Application	Section 254 Licence
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Audrey Clarke
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	1 st March 2022
Inspector	Ian Boyle

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is on the southern edge of an existing open space area at the junction between Tymon North Park and St. Aongus' Road in Tallaght, Dublin 24.
- 1.2. The space is relatively expansive, grassed, and surrounded on each side by residential housing.
- 1.3. A public footpath runs along the southern side of the park and appeal site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The Applicant is seeking approval for a Section 254 Licence, comprising an 15m high telecommunications monopole together with antenna, internal cabling, dish, and ancillary cabinet and operating works.
- 2.2. The monopole would be 0.4m at its widest point, which is at the top, where the antenna is housed. The purpose of the proposed infrastructure is to provide improved, high quality network coverage for the surrounding area.
- 2.3. The Planning Authority requested further information on 6th February 2020, including in relation to the potential feasibility of the proposed development sharing with existing facilities, consideration of the cumulative impact of street clutter in the area (including potential removal of a nearby lighting pole and use of a shared pole), interaction with local services, clarification of drawing details, and provision of a tree survey and report.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. The Applicant submitted further information on 30th April 2020.
- 3.1.2. The Planning Authority granted the Section 254 Licence subject to 19 no. conditions in September 2020, which are generally standard in nature. Notable conditions include:
 - Condition No. 3 specifies that the duration of the licence is for three years only.

- Condition No. 4 states that the Planning Authority reserves the right to withdraw the licence in accordance with section 254(4) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended.
- Condition No. 5 requires that in the event of obsolescence, or withdrawal or expiry of the license without renewal, the telecommunications streetpole, antenna, and associated operator cabinet shall be removed from the site

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The Applicant has provided a map of existing telecommunications structures and related commentary indicating that most alternative sites are incapable of serving the 'coverage blackspot'. While some sites would have been potentially suitable the landowner in each case was not interested.
- They also provided a list of 33 sites within the 2km radius of the site and reasons for not selecting any of these alternatives. Any site further than 900m from the site is considered as being too far away to provide the required quality of coverage for the target area.
- In the case of the proposed site, the landowner is South Dublin County Council (SDCC).
- The Planning Department strongly supports the co-location of such structures with other services, such as lighting columns, as part of an overall strategy to reduce unnecessary street furniture.
- The Environmental Services Department has no objection to the development. However, it is noted that the proposed development could potentially affect gas, electricity and communications services in this area. The Applicant will need consent from the relevant bodies in this regard.
- In conclusion, having regard to the information submitted to the Planning Authority, and the provisions of the South Dublin County Development Plan 2016 - 2022, it was considered that the proposed development would not

seriously injure the amenities of the area and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.3. Other Technical Reports

- Environmental Services (Verbal Response): Requested further information initially to confirm that the installation would be of sufficient distance from services. No objection subject to receipt of further information from the Applicant.
- Roads (Verbal Response): Requested further information as several utilities appear to be located within the verge. The Applicant should provide a drawing showing the location of, and potential impact on, these utilities.
- Broadband Officer (Verbal Response): No objection.
- Public Realm: No report received.
- Asset Management (Verbal Response): No objection.

4.0 Policy Context

4.1. Planning Authorities on Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures issued (1996)

- 4.1.1. The *'Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures'* (1996) set out government policy for the assessment of proposed new telecommunications structures ('the 1996 Guidelines'). The Guidelines state that the rapid expansion of mobile telephone services in Ireland has required the construction of base station towers in urban and rural areas across the country. This are an essential feature of all modern telecommunications networks. In many suburban situations, because of the low rise nature of buildings and structures, a supporting mast or tower is needed.
- 4.1.2. Section 4.3 of the Guidelines refers to visual impact and states that only as a last resort, and if the alternatives are either unavailable or unsuitable, should free-standing masts be located in a residential area. 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 proposed structure 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.

4.1.3. The Guidelines also state that visual impact is among the more important considerations which should be considered in arriving at a decision for a particular application. In most cases, the Applicant will only have limited flexibility as regards selecting a location given the constraints arising from radio planning parameters, etc. Visual impact will, by definition, vary with the general context of the proposed development.

4.1.4. The Guidelines state that the approach will vary depending on whether a proposed development is in:

- a rural/agricultural area;
- an upland/hilly, mountainous area;
- a smaller settlement/village;
- an industrial area/industrially zoned land; or
- a suburban area of a larger town or city.

4.1.5. The Guidelines state that some masts will remain quite noticeable despite best precautions. For example, local factors must be taken into account in determining the extent to which an object is noticeable or intrusive. This may include intermediate objects (buildings or trees), topography, the scale of the object in the wider landscape, the multiplicity of other objects in the wider panorama, the position of the object with respect to the skyline, weather, lighting conditions, etc. Softening of the visual impact can be achieved through a judicious choice of colour scheme and through the planting of shrubs, trees etc. as a screen or backdrop.

4.2. **Circular Letter PL07/12**

Circular Letter PL07/12 revised elements of the 1996 Guidelines under Section 2.2 to 2.7. It advises Planning Authorities to:

- Cease attaching time limiting conditions or issuing temporary durations to telecommunications masts, except in exceptional circumstances.

- Avoid including minimum separation distances between masts or schools and houses in Development Plans.
- Omit conditions on planning permissions requiring security in the form of a bond/cash deposit.
- Not include monitoring arrangements on health and safety or to determine planning applications on health grounds.
- Include waivers on future development contribution schemes for the provision of broadband infrastructure.

4.3. **Circular Letter PL11/2020**

- 4.3.1. Circular Letter PL11/2020 'Telecommunications Services – Planning Exemptions and Section 254 Licences' was issued in December 2020.

It advises Planning Authorities that:

- Section 254 of the Act outlines the provisions in relation to the licensing of appliances and cables etc on public roads. Where development of a type specified in section 254(1) of the Act is proposed to be carried out on a public road, approval for the works is required from a Planning Authority by means of the obtaining of a section 254 licence.
- A Section 254 Licence is required for overground electronic communications infrastructure, and its associated works, and that such works are exempt from planning permission.
- The exemptions for telecommunications infrastructure along public roads do not apply:
 - (a) where the proposed development is in sensitive areas where there is a requirement for Appropriate Assessment.
 - (b) where the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard or obstruction of road users.

4.4. Other National and Regional Policy

- *Project Ireland 2040 – The National Planning Framework (NPF), 2018*
- *The East and Midlands Regional Spatial Economic Strategy (RSES), 2019*

4.5. South Dublin County Development Plan 2016-2022

Zoning

The site is zoned 'OS – Open Space', which seeks 'to preserve and provide for open space and recreational amenities'.

Section 7.4.0 'Information and Communications Technology'

Policy IE4 Information and Communications Technology (ICT)

It is the policy of the Council to promote and facilitate the sustainable development of a high quality ICT network throughout the County in order to achieve balanced social and economic development, whilst protecting the amenities of urban and rural areas.

IE4 Objective 1

To promote and facilitate the provision of appropriate telecommunications infrastructure, including broadband connectivity and other innovative and advancing technologies within the County.

IE4 Objective 3

To permit telecommunications antennae and support infrastructure throughout the County, subject to high quality design, the protection of sensitive landscapes and visual amenity.

IE4 Objective 4

To discourage a proliferation of telecommunication masts in the County and promote and facilitate the sharing of facilities.

Section 11.6.2

In the consideration of proposals for telecommunications antennae and support structures, applicants will be required to demonstrate:

- *Compliance with the Planning Guidelines for Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures (1996) and Circular Letter PL 07/12 issued by the DECLG (as may be amended), and to other publications and material as may be relevant in the circumstances,*
- *On a map, the location of all existing telecommunications structures within a 2km radius of the proposed site, stating reasons why (if not proposed) it is not feasible to share existing facilities having regard to the Code of Practice on Sharing of Radio Sites issued by the Commission for Communications Regulation (2003),*
- *Degree to which the proposal will impact on the amenities of occupiers of nearby properties, or the amenities of the area (e.g. visual impacts of masts and associated equipment cabinets, security fencing treatment etc) and the potential for mitigating visual impacts including low and mid-level landscape screening, tree-type masts being provided where appropriate, colouring or painting of masts and antennae, and considered access arrangements, and*
- *The significance of the proposed development as part of the telecommunications network.*

4.6. Natural Heritage Designations

There are no designated European sites within the vicinity of the site.

5.0 The Appeal

5.1. Grounds of Appeal

A Third Party Appeal was received from a resident in the area on 1st December 2021. The main grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The subject site is an inappropriate location. It is situated in front of the Appellant's house and beside an area of public open space provided for houses in the vicinity. The excessive height and width of the development is apparent when compared to the existing lamp standard.

- The Applicant has not adequately considered alternative sites for the proposed development and has not provided a rationale for the location of the proposal, which is in the middle of a residential area. The other locations reviewed by the Applicant were listed as commercial premises, which, it is stated, were not interested in the proposal. It is not stated if they were offered appropriate rent or compensation, however.
- Greenhills Business Park, zoned for employment, would be a far more suitable location for the development and should be re-examined by the Applicant with new offers made to relevant landowners. There is also a retail centre to the east that would be more appropriate.
- The proposal is not in accordance with IE7, Objective 4, which seeks to 'ensure that future developments are designed and constructed to minimise noise disturbance and take into account the multi functional uses of streets including movement and recreation as detailed in the Urban Design Manual (2009) and the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2013)'.
- The development would interrupt views along the streetscape and adjoining public open space.
- The Comreg map submitted by the Applicant shows locations of nearby existing facilities that are operated by the Applicant's competitors. If one of these were chosen instead, it would avoid the need for locating the proposal at the subject site.
- A standalone monopole has been proposed in this location as this is the Applicant's preference, rather than it being the only option available.
- The proposed development is not in accordance with Section 11.6.2 of the Development Plan as the Applicant has not demonstrated appropriate planning reasons as to why it is not feasible to share existing facilities, has failed to consider the impact on the amenity of nearby residential properties, and has not included appropriate mitigation measures to reduce visual impact.
- The Applicant has not submitted a Visual Impact Statement. It is noted that the Planner's Report states that 'given the potential for significant visual impact, the

proposal may warrant a planning application...'. This shows the potential planning impacts of the development proposed.

- The cabinet is now installed and the monopole has not. The cabinet is larger than was represented in a visualisation image submitted as part of the original application, is poorly finished, and attracts anti-social behaviour. The proposed development, therefore, contravenes IE4, Objective 3 of the Development Plan.
- The proposal would reduce the attractiveness and value of property in the area.
- The cumulative impact on visual amenity should be taken into account and it is evident that the development does not sit well within the suburban streetscape. The chosen materials for the cabinet are particularly poor and it should be finished in green, at least.
- The Planning Authority granted a temporary 3-year licence for the proposed development. However, this is not an appropriate way in which to address legitimate planning impacts.

5.2. Applicant Response

The Applicant submitted an appeal response on 7th January 2022. The main issues can be summarised as follows:

- The Appellant lives at No. 1 Tymon North Park, Tallaght, Dublin 24, which is orientated towards the northeast. The proposed monopole would be visible from this location. However, it is necessary in this location to address an existing mobile and wireless broadband 'blackspot' that effects this area. It will replace an existing installation at Greenhills Industrial Park, which is being impeded by tall buildings in its vicinity.
- The alternatives considered by the Applicant looked at various different options, but none were successful mainly due to physical distance and as owners did not want to facilitate the development.
- It is accepted that although the monopole would be visible from the Appellant's property it would not materially interrupt views of the public open space, nor impact the streetscape. The proposed development is approximately 23.5m

from the Appellant's property, thus, it would not be overbearing. The monopole would be contemporary in design and have a slimline appearance.

- Two previous proposals are comparable to the subject proposal and were permitted by the Board under Refs. LC93.309598 and PL.61.306440. The Applicant cites the Inspector's Report for the latter Decision, where it was stated that 'the structure itself is nondescript in character and design and is not dissimilar in scale or design of a lamp standard or traffic light pole. I would consider that the structure is of a design and scale that would not be out of character or be a visually obtrusive or an incongruous element in a suburban area such as this'.
- In dealing with various local authorities, and An Bord Pleanála, there are no known instances where overbearing was referenced as a reason for refusal for similar proposals.
- The in-situ cabinet complies with the approved dimensions.
- There is a notable absence of street furniture in the area. Therefore, it cannot be objectively said that there is a high level of existing visual clutter.
- Subject to approval from the Board, the Applicant would be willing to accept a condition requiring a lamp standard to be placed on the proposed streetpole and for the adjacent streetpole to be removed. This would reduce the number of poles in the area.
- In relation to the grey colour of the cabinet, this is a requirement under condition.

5.3. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority submitted a response to the third party appeal on 3rd February 2022. It stated that:

- The Planning Authority has no issue with the condition requiring the cabinet to be grey being omitted from the licence.
- The Applicant has offered to affix a lampstand at the top of the telecommunications structure and to remove a nearby lighting column, so as to reduce the potential for street clutter in the area. If the Applicant is happy to

combine the services on one structure, the Board should specify by condition that this can only occur subject to the agreement of SDCC.

5.4. **Further Responses**

The Appellant made a further observation to the Board on 3rd February 2022, which addressed the first party response.

The observation raises similar points as those referenced in the Appellant's original appeal received on 1st December 2021.

6.0 **Assessment**

The main planning considerations relevant to this appeal case are:

- Residential Amenity
- Site Selection (Alternatives Considered)
- Appropriate Assessment

6.1. **Residential Amenity**

- 6.1.1. The Appellant's main concern is the potential for visual and residential amenity impacts arising due to the proposed development and that it would add to the extent of visual clutter that is already in the area. It is also submitted that the Applicant has not adequately considered alternative locations for the proposed development.
- 6.1.2. IE4 Objective 1 seeks to promote and facilitate the provision of appropriate telecommunications infrastructure, including broadband connectivity and other innovative and advancing technologies within the County. IE4 Objective 3 states that it is policy to permit telecommunications antennae and support infrastructure throughout the County, subject to high quality design, the protection of sensitive landscapes and visual amenity.
- 6.1.3. It is acknowledged that the proposed monopole and ancillary telecommunications equipment may cause some potential impact on the local environment due to its height and potential for visual intrusion on the surrounding area, which is mainly a residential area. I acknowledge that sites such as this, which are close to existing

houses and with a residential area, are noted as being particularly sensitive from both a visual and residential amenity perspective. This is referenced in Section 4.3 in the 1996 Guidelines.

- 6.1.4. The drawings and visualisation image (Drwg. No. DN4811-104) submitted with the original application provides sufficient context for the assessment of the proposal. Having physically visited the site and completed a visual inspection up close and from the surrounding vicinity, I consider the visualisation to be generally an accurate depiction of how the proposed development would appear as if it were built. Whilst that the existing equipment cabinet has been finished in a grey colour, rather than green, as shown in the image, I note that this was a condition applied by the Planning Authority.
- 6.1.5. I acknowledge the proposed structure would be more visible than some of the existing structures in the area, including trees and lamp standards. The green area to the north is very open and would allow for long unimpeded views from this perspective, particularly of the monopole. However, I consider that the development would not be so visually impactful that it would seriously injure the visual and residential amenity of the receiving environment.
- 6.1.6. There are no adjacent houses facing directly onto the appeal site, which is situated just north of the junction between Tymon North Park and St. Aongus' Road. However, I note that some of the houses to the southwest, including the Appellant's, face in the general direction of the site and that the proposed development would be visible from these properties. The proposed telecoms equipment would take up a relatively small footprint, however, and I note that the 1996 Guidelines state that some masts will remain quite noticeable, despite best precautions. I further note that there are large evergreen bushes in the front gardens of some of these properties, which would assist in reducing any visual impact arising.
- 6.1.7. There are also some tall, mature trees situated along the northern periphery of the public open space which would assist in impeding views of the proposed development from locations further north. There are no sensitive environmental, conservation or scenic view objectives or designations that apply to the site.
- 6.1.8. The proposed monopole also adopts a slim contemporary appearance and, in my opinion, the Applicant has sought to minimise its potential for visual impact by

selecting a monopole of low to medium height. The 1996 Guidelines state that the height of these structures, when the requirements of the backbone network are taken into account, can range from 12m to 60m though most typically they will be between 20m and 40m. The proposed monopole is 15m. I note also that the adjacent lighting column to the east is approximately 9m high and that there is an option to remove this and place the lighting fixture on the new monopole instead.

- 6.1.9. From inspecting the drawings submitted as part of the original application, it would appear the monopole structure would be coated in a grey muted paint, which is typical of telecommunications infrastructure seeking to assimilate with the typical sky colour in Ireland. The existing, permitted cabinet is also grey. I consider the use of grey in both instances to be acceptable.
- 6.1.10. Planning Circular PL07/12 recommends that Development Plans should avoid including any policies that have minimum separation distances between telecommunication installations, and schools / residential areas. There are no schools in the vicinity of the site, and whilst the site is situated amongst an existing housing estate, I note that such locations can be permitted as a last resort where the Applicant has presented a viable case demonstrating that alternative sites are either unavailable or unsuitable. In this regard, I note that the Applicant provided an assessment with a detailed rationale for selecting the subject site over 33 no. others. The assessment outlined a series of reasons for not selecting any of these alternatives. (See Section 6.2 below for further details).
- 6.1.11. It is further noted that a fundamental concern submitted by the Appellant is that there would be an increase in visual clutter in the area arising due to the addition of the proposed development within the streetscape. The proposal would serve to negatively impact the visual and residential amenity of the area and, therefore, would not be in accordance with IE4 Objective 4 of the Development Plan.
- 6.1.12. In this regard, I note the Applicant's response in that they would be willing to accept a condition requiring a lamp standard be fitted on the proposed monopole, so that the adjacent streetpole could be removed. This would reduce the number of poles in the area and should go some way to addressing the Appellant's concerns regarding visual clutter. I recommend that a condition to this effect be included if the Board decide to grant the proposed licence.

6.1.13. In summary, I do not consider that the proposed development would present as overly dominant, or be an overbearing feature, in this setting and that the Applicant has employed appropriate mitigation measures to reduce any such impact from arising. Therefore, I consider the proposal to be acceptable from a visual impact and residential amenity perspective and that it is in accordance with the provisions of the County Development Plan, including Policy IE4 (Objectives 1, 3, and 4) and Section 11.6.2.

6.2. Site Selection (Alternatives Considered)

The Development Plan seeks to promote and facilitate the provision of appropriate telecommunications infrastructure, including broadband connectivity and other innovative and advancing technologies within the County (IE4 Objective 1). The Plan also discourages a proliferation of telecommunication masts in the County and promotes and facilitates the sharing of facilities (IE4 Objective 4).

6.2.1. The Applicant states that Eir are upgrading their network in Dublin to provide customers with better quality mobile and wireless broadband services. I have viewed the ComReg Outdoor Coverage Map for 3G and 4G coverage for the site and its surrounding vicinity. Eir's 3G coverage for the area varies between 'very good' and 'good', which means that there is a mix of strong signal with maximum and good data speeds. The quality of network coverage is weak a short distance east of the site, however, where there are some sporadic spots of 'fair' coverage. This means that fast and reliable data speeds may be attainable, but that marginal data with drop-outs with a weaker signal is also possible.

6.2.2. The 4G Outdoor Coverage Map shows that 'very good' network signals are available in the area, but that there is a larger prevalence of the weaker 'good' and 'fair' coverage values. The Eir network in the general area is least effective towards the east and southeast of the appeal site and it is evident that there are blackspots in this part of Tallaght.

6.2.3. The Telecommunication Guidelines and Planning Circular PL07/12 encourages co-locating antennae on existing support structures and requires documentary evidence of the non-availability of this option for proposals for new structures. It also states that the shared use of existing structures will be required where there is an

excessive concentration of masts located in a single area. Telecommunication facilities are encouraged to primarily locate within existing industrial estates, or industrially zoned land, in the vicinity of larger suburban areas or towns, insofar as this is possible.

- 6.2.4. I note that Hibernian Industrial Estate is to the west and there are other commercial areas situated nearby, which could have been suitable to accommodate the proposed development. The Applicant has addressed this as part of further information, however. A total of 33 no. alternative sites within 2km were identified as part of their research and it was demonstrated that whilst such locations were duly considered, none were suitable for various reasons, including that they were too far removed from the search area to offer a viable solution and for lack of landowner interest.
- 6.2.5. It was further submitted that there is a general absence of existing tall buildings in the area and that alternative existing Comreg sites were further than 900m from the site and, therefore, too far away to provide adequate coverage for the target area. Therefore, it was not possible for the Applicant to co-locate on an existing telecommunications structure whilst also providing the required network upgrade in coverage provision.
- 6.2.6. Having reviewed the information contained within the application, appeal submission, and the existing coverage information that is available on the ComReg website, I am satisfied that alternative sites had been duly considered by the Applicant, that the proposal is justified, and that it would help to improve the existing 3G and 4G service coverage for the region.
- 6.2.7. I consider that the Applicant has provided adequate technical justification showing that there are service deficiencies in the area, which would be resolved by the proposed development. The proposal is consistent with IE4 Objective 4 and Section 11.6.2 of the Development Plan, and the 1996 Guidelines, which require co-location of antennae on existing support structures, but that where this is not feasible to submit evidence of the non-availability of this option.

6.3. Other Issues

Equipment Cabinet

- 6.3.1. The Appellant states that the existing in-situ equipment cabinet is larger than that proposed and that the visualisation image submitted as part of the original application misrepresented its actual size. Conversely, the Applicant contends that the cabinet complies with its permitted dimensions.
- 6.3.2. I have based my assessment on the information that is recorded on file and consider that the proposed cabinet would be appropriate from both a visual and residential amenity perspective.
- 6.3.3. Whilst there may, or may not, be technical discrepancies I would note that enforcement matters are a function reserved for the relevant Local Authority and the Board have no role in resolving such disputes.

6.4. Appropriate Assessment

Given the nature and scale of the development proposed, which is for a telecommunications support structure, equipment cabinet, and ancillary works, and the separation distance from the nearest Natura 2000 site, it is considered that the proposal would not be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans and projects on a European site and there is no requirement for a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment.

7.0 Recommendation

I recommend that a licence be granted subject to conditions, for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

8.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the section 254 of the Planning & Development Act, 2000 (as amended), the South Dublin County Development Plan 2016-2022, and the 'Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures Guidelines for Planning Authorities (1996) (as updated by Circular Letters PL 07/12 and

PL11/2020, respectively); it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not be visually intrusive or seriously injurious to the visual or residential amenity of the area, or of properties in the vicinity, and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

9.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted on the 30th April 2020 except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The license shall be valid for three years from the date of this order. The telecommunications structure and related ancillary structures including any access arrangements shall then be removed and the site lands shall be reinstated on removal of the telecommunications structure and ancillary structures unless, prior to the end of the period, planning permission shall have been granted for their retention for a further period.</p> <p>Reason: To enable the impact of the development to be re-assessed, having regard to changes in technology and design during the specified period.</p>
3.	<p>Provision shall be made for a lamp standard to be accommodated on the proposed monopole structure, and the existing adjacent lamp standard which is located to the east of the proposed development shall be removed, to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority. Details of this shall be</p>

	<p>submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area.</p>
4.	<p>Details of the proposed colour scheme for the telecommunications structure, ancillary structures and fencing shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area.</p>
5.	<p>A low intensity fixed red obstacle light shall be fitted as close to the top of the mast as practicable and shall be visible from all angles in azimuth. Details of this light, its location and period of operation shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public safety.</p>
6.	<p>Landscaping of the site shall be carried out in accordance with a landscaping scheme which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with planning authority prior to the commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area.</p>
7.	<p>No advertisement or advertisement structure shall be erected or displayed on the proposed structure or within the curtilage of the site without a prior grant of planning permission.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area</p>

Ian Boyle

Planning Inspector

9th March 2022