



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-313435-22

Development	Permission to erect a 21m high telecommunications monopole carrying antennas and link dishes together with associated equipment and security fence.
Location	Cloonfad East, Cloonfad, Co. Roscommon.
Planning Authority	Roscommon County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	21378
Applicant(s)	Eircom Ltd. (t/a Eir)
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant	Eircom Ltd. (t/a Eir)
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	26 th October 2022

Inspector

Ian Campbell

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located in the townland of Cloonfad East, c. 250 metres west of the centre of Cloonfad, Co. Roscommon.
- 1.2. The appeal site has a stated area of 0.013 ha (130 sqm) and is located on the northern side of the R327. The appeal site accommodates a telecommunications compound. There is a 12 metre high telecommunication structure, consisting of a wooden pole, and an exchange cabinet located on the appeal site. The appeal site is set back from the R327 with a gravel area separating the appeal site and the R327. Leylandii trees form the boundaries of the appeal site.
- 1.3. Detached dwellings are located to the east and west of the appeal site. The lands to the south, on the opposite side of the R327, are under grass and appear to be in agricultural use. The lands to the north of the appeal site are also under grass and also appear to be in agricultural use. Riverbank housing estate is located c. 150 metres south-east of the appeal site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises;
 - The construction/erection of a 21 metre high telecommunication structure (monopole structure). A 1.5 metre high lightning finial is attached to the top of the monopole. The proposal also includes;
 - Antennas, link dishes, associated equipment;
 - Ground cabinets;
 - 2.4 metre high palisade fencing enclosing the telecommunication structure and cabinets.
- 2.2. The planning application is accompanied by a cover letter outlining the technical justification for the proposal, specifically that;
 - The proposed installation is required to address substandard coverage in Cloonfad.

- Vodafone currently transmit from the Cloonfad East site, however the low height, lack of fixing points and limited structural capacity of the current structure prevents any opportunity to co-locate onto this structure. The nature of the existing structure also limits Vodafone in upgrading its service provision beyond current levels (exemplified in ComRegs coverage maps where Vodafone's 4G coverage in the area is indicated as being 'fair').
- Eir does not transmit from its exchange at Cloonfad East and will only fulfil its licence requirements in Cloonfad by erecting a new telecommunication structure within its own compound. Eir requires a 21 metre high monopole at this location, providing the requisite height, and structural integrity to accommodate its equipment and to enable it to roll out its full range of technologies and to address coverage weakness in the area.
- Existing telecommunication installations in the wider area are not suitable and would not fulfil Eir's coverage objectives. Four other installations have been examined in the area but have been discounted on the basis of being too remote from Cloonfad, namely, Three Ireland's installations at Cloonfad West, located c. 2 km from Cloonfad; Ballykeaghra, located c. 4 km from Cloonfad and Carrowneden, located c. 5.75 km from Cloonfad, and Eir's installation at Moanvane, which is located c. 6 km from Cloonfad.
- The proposed structure will allow for site sharing with other providers. Imagine have also expressed interest in locating on the proposed telecommunications structure. Developing the existing compound at Cloonfad East will reduce the need for further telecommunication infrastructure and also allows for Eir to converge its over ground telecoms infrastructure with its underground infrastructure.
- The monopole design of the proposed structure complies with Section 4.3 of the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 1996, where monopole structures are preferred.
- The site was chosen as it achieves maximum coverage while minimising visual impact on the locality. The Eir compound is an established feature in the area. The monopole structure is a simple, clean design and is screened on all four sides by trees.

- The proposed development accords with Development Plan policy, and also with the NDP 2020 – 2040; National Broadband Plan 2012; Digital Agenda for Europe 2020, and the Border Midland and Western Regional Operational Programme 2014-2020.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Request for Further Information

Prior to the decision of the Planning Authority to REFUSE permission for the proposed development, the Planning Authority requested Further Information.

3.1.1. Further Information was requested on the 26th August 2021 as follows:

- Coverage maps illustrating the type of infrastructure, service provided and range of coverage available within the catchment of Cloonfad village and surrounding area, including details of the coverage provided by each service provider.
- Documentary evidence of engagement with other telecommunication providers in the area in relation to the possibility of co-location.
- Coverage maps showing the extent of the area that would be serviced by the proposal, compared to the extent of Eir coverage presently available.
- Confirmation of the planning status of the existing telecommunications equipment on the site.
- Photomontages to show the visual impact of the proposal.

3.1.2. Further Information submitted on the 18th February 2022:

- Coverage maps submitted for Eir, Three and Vodafone indicating that no operator enjoys optimal coverage in the area.
- Eir proposes to build the installation for its own benefit and then to make it available to other operators, subject to reasonable commercial terms. The proposal does not depend on third party letters of support and it would be nonsensical to retain the existing underperforming timber structure while co-

locating at another site which would not meet Eir's coverage objectives. Eir has therefore not engaged with other providers seeking to co-locate.

- Eir's existing level of coverage in the area has been indicated. The coverage which will result on foot of the proposal has also been indicated.
- The existing structure was constructed on foot of Class 29 of the Local Government (Planning and Development) Regulations, 1994, and was exempt development.
- Photomontages submitted from 6 no. locations in the vicinity of the site.

The Planning Authority issued a Notification of Decision to REFUSE Permission on the 1st April 2022 for two reasons which can be summarised as follows;

1. The proposed replacement telecommunications structure, which is significantly increased in both height and overall scale, would be injurious to the visual amenities of the area and would detract from the amenity of Cloonfad.
2. The possibility of co-locating on existing telecommunications infrastructure has not been adequately demonstrated. The proposal does not accord with the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures - Guidelines for Planning Authorities (1996), in particular Section 4.3 (Visual Impact) and Section 4.5 (Sharing Facilities and Clustering), or Section 4.7 (Telecommunications) of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2014 - 2020.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The first report of the Planning Officer includes the following comments;

- The location of the site, between two dwellings, gives rise to concerns from a residential amenity perspective.

- The proposed development is of a much greater scale and height than the existing development and would alter the character of the immediate area and wider village setting of Cloonfad.
- A more robust exploration of alternatives should be carried out.

Further information recommended.

The second report of the Planning Officer includes the following comments;

- Insufficient information has been submitted regarding engagement with other telecommunications providers in relation to potential co-location on existing facilities. Despite reference to the applicant being willing to engage with other third party operators, no evidence has been provided to indicate that other providers intend to, or will be able to avail of co-location at the subject site.
- The photomontages fail to provide adequate detail from the west and also closer to the subject site.
- Notwithstanding existing buildings and vegetation, given the scale of the structure proposed, its visual impact would be significant, particularly when one is proximal to the site, on approach from the west.
- Information provided fails to provide adequate justification of the site specific need to substantially upscale the level of development at this location.

The report of the Planning Officer recommends a refusal of permission consistent with the Notification of Decision which issued.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None referenced in report of the Planning Officer however a report from the Environment Section is attached to the file and notes no objection subject to a condition in relation to construction waste.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Irish Aviation Authority (IAA) - stating no requirement for obstacle lighting on the structure.

3.4. Third Party Observations

The Planning Officer's report refers to 1 no. submission/observation having been received in relation to the both the initial planning application and also in respect of the further information submitted. The report of the Planning Officer provides a summary of the main issues raised in the third-party observation, which are as follows;

- Visual impact concerns.
- Contravention of Development Plan.
- Current application is similar to previously withdrawn application.
- Impact on residential amenity.
- Existing mast in place serving Three less than 1.5 km from site.
- Health impacts.

4.0 Planning History

Appeal Site

20/83 – Permission for 20 metre high telecommunications monopole carrying antennas and link dishes together with associated equipment and security fence.

Application deemed withdrawn.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Policy

5.1.1 National Planning Framework ‘Project Ireland 2040’:

National Policy Objective 24 - support and facilitate delivery of the National Broadband Plan.

5.1.2 Regional, Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Northern and Western Regional Assembly (RSES):

The weakness/absence of high-quality telecommunications infrastructure is identified as being an important issue for the region (see page 232 RSES).

5.1.3 National Broadband Plan 2020:

The National Broadband Plan (NBP) is the Government’s initiative to improve digital connectivity by delivering high speed broadband services to all premises in Ireland, through investment by commercial enterprises coupled with intervention by the State in those parts of the country where private companies have no plans to invest.

5.1.4 Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 1996 (Department of the Environment and Local Government):

The Guidelines provide relevant technical information in relation to installations and offer guidance on planning issues so that environmental impact is minimised and a consistent approach is adopted by Planning Authorities. Visual impact is noted as among the most important considerations in assessing applications for telecommunications structures but the Guidelines also note that generally, applicants have limited locational flexibility, given the constraints arising from radio planning parameters. The Guidelines place an emphasis on the principle of co-location.

Section 4.3 ‘Visual Impact’, provides that, *‘only as a last resort should free-standing masts be located within or in the immediate surrounds of smaller towns or villages. If*

such location should become necessary, sites already developed for utilities should be considered and masts and antennae should be designed and adapted for the specific location. The support structure should be kept to the minimum height consistent with effective operation'. Section 4.3 also states, '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'.

Section 4.3 also notes that some masts will remain quite noticeable in spite of the best precautions and that the following considerations may need to be taken into account, specifically, whether a mast terminates a view; whether views of the mast are intermittent and incidental, and the presence of intermediate objects in the wider panorama (buildings, trees etc).

5.1.5 Circular Letter PL 03/2018

Circular Letter PL 03/2018, dated 3rd July 2018 provides a revision to Chapter 2 of the Development Contribution, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2013, and specifically states that the waiver provided in the Development Contribution, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2013 should apply not only to the provision of broadband services but also to mobile services.

5.2 Development Plan

5.2.1. The proposed development was considered by the Planning Authority under the Roscommon County Development Plan 2014-2020 however the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 came into effect on the 19th April 2022 and is now the relevant development plan.

5.2.2. The appeal site is not subject to a specific land use zoning in the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028. The appeal site is located within the plan boundary of Cloonfad.

5.2.3. The provisions of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 - 2028 relevant to this assessment are as follows:

- Section 12.22 - Recognises that the location of telecommunication infrastructure is dictated by service provision. Planning applications are required to be accompanied by, a reasoned justification for the development at a particular location; a justification for sites which have been discounted; proposals to mitigate visual impact; and where possible the location of the structure in a manner so as to benefit from the screening afforded by existing tree belts, topography or buildings.
- Policy ICT 7.65 – Encourage co-location of antennae on existing telecommunications structures. The shared use of existing structures will be required where the numbers of masts located in any single area is considered to have an excessive concentration.
- Policy ICT 7.66 - Ensure that telecommunications structures are located to minimise and/or mitigate any adverse impacts on communities, public rights of way and the built or natural environment.
- Policy NH 10.25 – Minimise visual impacts on areas categorised within the County Roscommon Landscape Character Assessment including “moderate value”, “high value”, “very high value” and with special emphasis on areas classified as “exceptional value” and where deemed necessary, require the use of Visual Impact Assessment where proposed development may have significant effect on such designated areas.

5.2.4. The appeal site is located within the ‘Cloonfad Bog and Upland Landscape Character Area’ (see Landscape Character Assessment document which accompanies Development Plan) for the purpose of landscape type, and is described as having a ‘moderate value’. The appeal site is not subject to any protected views.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code – 000297) – c. 70 metres south-west.

5.4. EIA Screening

The proposed development does not fall within a class of development set out in Part 1 or Part 2 of Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, (as amended), and therefore is not subject to EIA requirements.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

This is a first-party appeal against the decision to refuse permission. The grounds for appeal can be summarised under the following headings;

Need/Justification:

- The proposed development should be granted under Section 37 (2) b (iii) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended.
- The existing wooden pole is inadequate to facilitate the technology required to provide Eir's coverage needs. Vodafone will be relocating to the new structure, and the wooden pole will be removed. This was not explained during the initial planning application.
- A Vodafone Radio Engineering Report accompanies the appeal submission and notes that;
 - the existing site at Cloonfad is not capable of providing the level of coverage needed, the wooden structure is limited to 2G and 3G services and the site cannot provide 4G and 5G services without upgrade.
 - the proposal will provide 4G and 5G services to a level of 'good' and 'very good' within the village of Cloonfad, enhancing services to the N83, R327 and surrounding roads in addition to significantly improving mobile broadband services.

Alternative Sites/Co-Location:

- With the exception of the appeal site which has been in existence since 1995, there are no existing or alternative suitable infrastructure in Cloonfad.

- The structure will facilitate co-location with other providers. Vodafone and Imagine wish to locate on the structure.
- The appeal site is a site of last resort. The proposal will avoid the requirement for other telecommunication structures within the village.

Design/Impact of Proposal:

- The compound is well screened by trees which are to be retained. The upper part of all masts must be able to propagate a signal and are therefore visible. The structure is monopole in nature and is of a height which enables more than one operator.
- The photomontages submitted demonstrate that the proposal will not result in the negative visual impact which the Planning Authority anticipate. The locations of the photomontages have been taken from within the greatest zone of visual impact.
- Views of the proposal will be intermittent and the proposal does not directly visually impact the adjoining houses.
- The residential properties adjoining the appeal site face the road and will not be looking directly at the proposal. The main zone of influence will be for pedestrians and motorists. Views of the proposal will be intermittent, with trees and manmade objects screening views of the proposal.
- Houses have been constructed on either side of the compound, these properties benefit most from the trees which surround the compound. A condition could be attached to any grant of permission requiring these trees to be retained.
- The appeal site does not conflict with any designations, specifically SPA's, SAC's, Special Amenity Areas, NHA's, or archaeology or listed buildings.

Compliance with Applicable Policy:

- The proposed development does not contravene the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 1996. The Guidelines were written over 25 years ago and new technology requires sites to be developed within towns and village, which was not envisaged when

the Guidelines were written. Visual impact will vary depending on the context of the site. Within a small village there is limited flexibility to secure the necessary coverage. The appeal site is an ideal location with established utilities for Eir and other operators.

- The Guidelines note that some masts will remain quite noticeable in spite of the best precautions and consideration needs to be given to whether the site is along a major road or tourist route, whether a site terminates a view or appears intermittently visible. The Planning Authority have not had regard to the forgoing.
- A free standing mast is required at the edge of the village to provide coverage to the village. Although the site is near residences, every effort has been made to comply with the Guidelines. The site is already developed for utilities and the proposed structure is of monopole design. The assertion of the Planning Authority that the proposal is not compliant with the Guidelines is considered to be incorrect.
- Government policy is supportive of telecommunications infrastructure.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

None received.

6.3. Observations

None received.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. I consider the main issues in the assessment of this appeal are as follows:

- Extent of Proposal.
- Technical Justification/Appropriateness of Location.
- Impact on Visual Amenity.
- Impact on Residential Amenity.
- Other Issues.

- Appropriate Assessment.

7.2. Extent of Proposal

- 7.2.1. The drawings submitted with the planning application indicated the proposed monopole structure located alongside the existing wooden pole. The first party has however clarified in the appeal submission that Vodafone will be relocating to the new structure, and that the wooden pole will be removed. The drawings depicting the proposal submitted to the Board with the appeal reflect this and indicate a single telecommunication structure on the site.

7.3. Technical Justification/Appropriateness of Location

- 7.3.1. The first party states that the proposed development is required at this location in order to address specific service/coverage deficiencies in Cloonfad. I have verified the existing level of mobile coverage for this area using ComReg's coverage maps and note that Cloonfad is identified as having 'good coverage' for Eir's 4G services. ComRegs maps indicate no 5G coverage in the central part of the village or to the north of the village, and 'fair' 5G coverage on the approaches to Cloonfad. According to ComReg's website, in areas with fair coverage, 'fast and reliable data speeds may be attained, but marginal data with drop-outs is possible at weaker signal levels'. The first party notes that ComReg mapping typically indicates the strength of coverage outdoors. The first party have submitted mapping which indicates the improvements to 3G coverage for Eir in the wider area with the proposed new telecommunication structure. In this scenario I note that 3G coverage is significantly expanded, in particular to the north of Cloonfad, and also indoor coverage to areas where there is currently none.
- 7.3.2. In relation to using the existing telecommunication structure on the appeal site, from which Vodafone currently transmit, the first party notes that it is not feasible to co-locate onto this structure due to its low height, lack of fixing points and limited structural capacity. Additionally, the first party notes that the nature of the existing structure also limits Vodafone in upgrading its service provision beyond current levels and that it is proposed to remove this structure from the site, with Vodafone lo-locating onto the proposed monopole.

- 7.3.3. In terms of the consideration of alternative sites where the first party could co-locate, details of four other installations have been examined in the area but have been discounted on the basis of being too remote from Cloonfad (namely a Three Ireland installation at Cloonfad West located c. 2 km from Cloonfad; Eir's installation at Moanvane c. 6 km from Cloonfad; Three Ireland's installation at Ballykeaghra, c. 4 km from Cloonfad; and Three Ireland's installation at Carrownedden, located c. 5.75 km from Cloonfad). The first party contends that existing telecommunication installations in the wider area are not suitable and would not fulfil Eir's coverage objectives, and that with the exception of the appeal site, there are no existing or alternative suitable infrastructure in Cloonfad on which to co-locate. Having regard to the forgoing, I consider that the applicant has evaluated alternative sites for the purpose of co-locating the structure, that the basis for discounting these sites is reasonable and that the justification for the proposed structure is acceptable.
- 7.3.4. Regarding the appropriateness of the appeal site for the proposed development, the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 1996 provide that *'only as a last resort should free-standing masts be located within or in the immediate surrounds of smaller towns or villages, and if such location should become necessary, sites already developed for utilities should be considered....masts and antennae should be designed and adapted for the specific location'*, and.... *'the support structure should be kept to the minimum height consistent with effective operation'*. Regarding the appropriateness of the appeal site for the proposed development, the site is an existing telecommunication compound and as such I consider that the site has the capacity to absorb the proposal. Furthermore, I note that the design of the support structure is a monopole structure, as recommended by the Guidelines for sensitive locations. I note that the height of the proposed structure allows for other providers to co-locate onto the structure. Should the Board be minded to grant permission for the proposed development I recommend that a planning condition is attached requiring the applicant to facilitate other operators to co-locate onto the structure. On this basis I consider the appeal site to be appropriate for the proposed development of a telecommunication structure.
- 7.3.5. Based on the information submitted, I consider that there is a technical justification for the proposal at this location. I am also satisfied that the appeal site is appropriate for

such a development and that the proposed development accords with the provisions of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028, and the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures Guidelines for Planning Authorities in relation to the location of installations.

7.4. Impact on Visual Amenity

- 7.4.1. The appeal site is located within the ‘Cloonfad Bog and Upland Landscape Character Area’ for the purpose of landscape type. This landscape character area is described as having a ‘moderate value’. I note that the appeal site is not identified as being affected by any designated or protected views and as such I consider the landscape sensitivity to be low to such development.
- 7.4.2. I note that the appeal site is located at the edge of a village where telecommunications and other utility structures are common. The appeal site accommodates an existing telecommunications compound and a wooden telecommunications pole of c. 12 metres in height. As such, telecommunications infrastructure at this location is a feature of the village’s landscape.
- 7.4.3. The proposal comprises a monopole structure with a height of 21 metres. Existing trees which form the perimeter boundary of the compound provide a degree of screening. I note that the upper section of the structure will not be screened, however I acknowledge that in order for the structure to propagate a signal, screening the upper part of the structure would not be technically feasible. The first party has stated that it is amenable to permitting other operators to co-locate on the structure and in this regard I consider that the proposed height would facilitate this, thereby avoiding the need for other telecommunication structures in the area in the future.
- 7.4.4. The applicant has submitted photomontages of the proposed development. I consider these photomontages to be representative and accurate. I note that the proposal will be intermittently visible in the surrounding landscape from a number of locations, however the proposed structure does not terminate any view, is located at the edge of the village, is distinct from the centre and as such I do not consider that the proposed structure would dominate or be intrusive within the landscape at this location. Additionally, noting the established use of the compound and the existing

telecommunication structure on the appeal site, I do not consider that the proposed structure would represent a discordant feature at this location. Having regard to the developed nature of the landscape in the vicinity of the appeal site, the presence of natural screening around the site, and to the design of the proposed structure, comprising a monopole, I am of the view that the proposal would not be incongruous within the immediate landscape and I consider that the overall visual impact of the proposal would be satisfactory in the context of the visual amenities of the area.

7.5. Impact on Residential Amenity

- 7.5.1. Circular PL07/12 recommended that development plans should avoid the inclusion of minimum separation distances between telecommunications structures and residences. I note the separation distances between the proposed structure and the dwelling to the west at c. 11 metres, and to the dwelling to the east at c. 20 metres. I also note that the proposed structure is not positioned forward of the front wall of either of the adjoining dwellings. I consider the separation distances between the proposed structure and the closest neighbouring dwellings to be adequate to ensure that there would be no significant overbearing or visual intrusion arising from the proposed development. In addition, I note that the perimeter boundary of the appeal site comprises mature *Leylandii* trees, c. 8 metres in height which will provide a good degree of screening for the proposal. I note that the two adjoining dwellings are orientated towards the road and do not directly face the proposed structure. Having regard to the forgoing, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not result in significant negative impacts on the amenity of residential property adjoining the appeal site or in the vicinity of the appeal site.

7.6. Other Issues

- 7.6.1. The applicant states that the appeal is made with reference to the provisions of S.37 2 (b) (iii) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, however, I note that the Notification of Decision to Refuse Permission does not make reference to material contravention of the County Development Plan and as such the provisions of s.37(2)(b) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, are therefore not applicable in this case.

- 7.6.2. The issue of the health impacts of the proposed development was raised in observations to the Planning Authority. In respect of issues concerning health and telecommunications structures, Circular Letter: PL 07/12 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'. Accordingly, I consider that this issue is outside the scope of this appeal.
- 7.6.3. Regarding development contributions, the adopted Roscommon County Council Development Contribution Scheme 2014, as amended 24th February 2020, provides a 100% waiver for mobile and broadband telecommunications infrastructure, in accordance with Circular Letter 03/2018 and as such the proposed development does not attract a development contribution.

7.7. Appropriate Assessment

- 7.7.1. The appeal site is located c. 70 metres from Lough Corrib SAC. Having regard to the separation distance between the appeal site and Lough Corrib SAC and to the lack of a hydrological pathway between the appeal site and Lough Corrib SAC, I do not consider there to be any potential for polluted run-off from the construction phase of the proposed development to reach Lough Corrib SAC and impact water sensitive habitats, or qualifying interests associated with Lough Corrib SAC. Given the nature of the proposal, I do not consider there to be any potential for operational impacts from the proposal on Lough Corrib SAC. Having regard to the nature and limited scale of the proposed development, the lack of a hydrological or other pathway between the site and European sites, it is considered that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise and that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect either individually or in combination with other plans or projects on any European site.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. Having regard to the above it is recommended that permission is granted based on the following reasons and considerations and subject to the attached conditions.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to:

- (a) The DOEHLG Section 28 Statutory Guidelines; Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures: Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 1996, as updated by circular letter PL 07/12 in 2012,
- (b) The Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028,
- (c) The moderate landscape sensitivity of the area,
- (d) The distance between the proposed telecommunications structure and sensitive receptors, including residential development,
- (e) The nature and scale of the proposed telecommunication structure,
- (f) The demonstrated need for the telecommunications infrastructure at this location,
- (g) Circular Letter PL 03/2018,

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 amenities of the area or the residential amenities of properties in the vicinity, would not be prejudicial to public health, would not have a significant impact on ecology or on European sites in the vicinity, and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1.	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.
----	---

	Reason: In the interest of clarity.
2.	<p>The developer shall provide and make available at reasonable terms, the proposed support structure for the provision of mobile telecommunications antenna of third-party licenced telecommunications operators.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of avoidance of multiplicity of telecommunications structures in the area, in the interest of visual amenity and proper planning and sustainable development.</p>
3.	<p>Within six months of the cessation of the use of the telecommunications structure, all structures shall be removed from the site, and the site shall be reinstated at the operator's expense in accordance with a scheme to be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority as soon as practicable.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of protecting the landscape.</p>
4.	<p>The trees which form the boundary of the compound shall be retained. Any trees which die, or which become diseased, shall be replaced with trees of the similar height.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of protecting the landscape.</p>
5.	<p>The wooden pole shall be removed from the site within 6 months of the new monopole becoming operational.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of avoidance of multiplicity of telecommunications structures in the area, in the interest of visual amenity and proper planning and sustainable development.</p>
6.	<p>Details of the proposed colour scheme for the telecommunications structure and ancillary structures 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>
7.	<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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public safety.</p>

8.	<p>No advertisement or advertisement structure shall be erected or displayed on the proposed structure or its appendages or within the curtilage of the site.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area.</p>
9.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>

Ian Campbell
Planning Inspector

8th December 2022