



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-313858-22

Development	Section 254 licence for a telecommunication structure
Location	Sidmonton Road, Bray, Co. Wicklow
Planning Authority	Wicklow County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	22319
Applicant(s)	On Tower Ireland Limited
Type of Application	Section 254 Licence
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Licence
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	On Tower Ireland Limited
Observer(s)	Michael and Margaret Murray
Date of Site Inspection	6 th March 2023
Inspector	Ian Boyle

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is on the northeastern corner of the intersection of where Sidmonton Road and Convent Avenue meet in Bray, Co. Wicklow. It is adjacent the Bray Garda Station and comprises a small section of pavement / public footpath. A tall stone wall lies between the site and the rear part of the garda station building. The footpath in this part is relatively wide and spacious.
- 1.2. There are tall lamp standards, overhead powerlines and road signage in both the immediate and wider surrounding vicinity. There is an existing telecommunications facility in the form of a tall lattice tower approximately 25m to the north of the site. The facility is on the property associated with Bray Garda Station and accommodates multiple antennae, dishes and various other forms of communications infrastructure.
- 1.3. Bray town centre is roughly 1km to the north. The character of the area is mainly residential.
- 1.4. The site is owned by Wicklow County Council.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The Applicant is seeking approval for a Section 254 Licence, comprising an 15m high freestanding telecommunications monopole together with internal cabling, dish (only to be included if no fibre broadband is available in the area), equipment cabinet and associated operating works.
- 2.2. The monopole would be approximately 0.5m at its widest point and cables are housed internally.
- 2.3. The ground level cabinet would be approximately 1.9m wide, 1.7m high and 0.8m deep.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. The Planning Authority refused the Section 254 licence for two reasons, which are summarised as follows: -

1. The proposed development is at a junction which has a poor pedestrian environment, is contrary to the development standards for mast and telecommunications structures under the Wicklow County Development Plan 2016-2022, would lead to a substantial and excessive section of footpath being used for private commercial gain, and a loss of amenity to the public, and would depreciate the pedestrian environment and negatively impact on pedestrian movement, which is not in line with the recommendations of DMURS (2019).
2. The proposed scale and design of the telecommunications structure and its associated equipment would be visually obtrusive and intrusive in views from both the immediate and from longer distance along Sidmonton Road and would seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

- A previous nearby application (PPR 09/630045) for a 'lattice-type' triangular antennae support structure was refused because it was considered visually obtrusive and intrusive, particularly along Sidmonton Road, and that it would seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity.
- The subject application differs from PPR 09/630045 as the ground level for the proposed development is substantially higher than the Garda Station pole location.
- The Applicant states they have a policy to co-locate but have not found a suitable existing site (they list 4 no. locations that they found to be unsuitable). The Garda Station has not been listed as one of the 4 no. locations which were listed or considered.

- There is no footpath running along the eastern side of this portion of Sidmonton Road meaning the subject site is substandard for pedestrians. The proposed development would further depreciate the pedestrian environment, impact negatively on pedestrian movement and is not in accordance with DMURS (2019) for this reason, which recommends 'clearing footpaths of unnecessary street furniture, e.g., rationalisation of signage poles etc'.
- The allocation of a section of public footpath to the Applicant to erect what is effectively a permanent structure on public land for the Applicant's own private commercial gain would be excessive and a loss of public amenity.
- The proposed development due to its scale and prominent location would have a significant negative impact on the visual amenities of the area. The issues raised in PPR 09/630045 are relevant to the subject proposal.
- Refusal is recommended.

4.0 Planning History

ABP Ref. PL39.234651 (Reg. Ref. 09630045): The Board refused retention permission for an existing antennae support structure and associated equipment cabinets to the rear of Bray Garda Station, Convent Avenue, Bray. The development comprised 1 no. lattice-type triangular antennae support structure 32m height above ground level.

The reason for refusal was due to the proximity of the site to existing residential property, the design and overbearing nature of the development proposed, particularly when viewed from along Sidmonton Road, such that it would be visually obtrusive and overbearing and that it would seriously injure the amenities of the area and of property in the vicinity.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures, 1996

- 5.1.1. 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.
- 5.1.2. Section 4.3 of the Guidelines refers to visual impact and states 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 locations 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. and should be a monopole (or poles) rather than a latticed tripod or square structure.
- 5.1.3. The Guidelines also state that visual impact is among the more important considerations that should be considered in arriving at a decision for a particular application. In most cases, the Applicant will only have limited flexibility as regards location, given the constraints arising from radio planning parameters, etc. Visual impact will, by definition, vary with the general context of the proposed development.
- 5.1.4. 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.

5.1.5. The Guidelines state that some masts will remain quite noticeable despite best precautions. For example, there will be local factors which have to 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.

5.2. **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 permissions requiring security (i.e. bond/cash deposits).
- 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.

5.3. **Circular Letter PL11/2020**

5.3.1. 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.

Section 254(5) of the Act outlines the criteria to which the Planning Authority shall have regard in assessing such proposals:

- a) the proper planning and sustainable development of the area,
- b) any relevant provisions of the development plan, or a local area plan,
- c) the number and location of existing appliances, apparatuses or structures on, under, over or along the public road, and
- d) the convenience and safety of road users including pedestrians.

5.4. Other National Legislation

- *Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets, 2019 ('DMURS')*

5.5. Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2018-2024

Zoning

- 5.5.1. The site is zoned 'Existing Residential' under the Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2018-2024 ('LAP'). The LAP states that the objective of this zoning is 'to protect, provide and improve residential amenities of existing residential areas'.
- 5.5.2. The zoning seeks to provide for house improvements, alterations and extensions and appropriate infill residential development in accordance with principles of good design and protection of existing residential amenity. In existing residential areas, the areas of open space permitted, designated or dedicated solely to the use of the residents will normally be zoned 'RE' as they form an intrinsic part of the overall

residential development; however new housing or other non-community related uses will not normally be permitted.

5.6. Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028

The following objectives from the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028 ('Development Plan') are considered relevant:

Chapter 16 'Energy & Information Infrastructure'

'The widespread availability of a high quality telecommunications network throughout County Wicklow will be critical to the development of a knowledge based economy. It will contribute to sustained macro-economic growth and competitiveness, by ensuring that the County is best placed to avail of the emerging opportunities provided by the information and knowledge society and supporting new and innovative forms of distance working including working from home and the development of co-working hubs.'

Telecommunications Antennae & Support Structures Guidelines (1996)

'These guidelines were published in 1996 to support Government policy on the roll out of a high quality telecommunications service. The overarching aim of these guidelines (and subsequent Circular PL 07/2012) is to ensure a consistent approach by Planning Authorities in the preparation of development plans and in determining applications for planning permission.'

Communication Objectives

CPO 16.35: *To facilitate and support the roll out of the National Broadband Plan and the development/expansion of communication, information and broadcasting networks, including mobile phone networks, broadband and other digital services, subject to environmental and visual amenity constraints.*

CPO 16.37: *The development of new masts and antennae shall be in accordance with the development standards set out in Appendix 1 of this plan.*

Appendix 1 'Development and Design Standards'

Section 2 Infrastructure & Services (sub-section 2.4 'telecommunications') is relevant to the development proposed, particularly the section dealing with 'Location in Settlements'. In this regard, it is stated that:

'The applicant shall be required to follow a 'sequential' approach to site location i.e. in accordance with the order of priority set out to follow, the applicant must show that the preferred locations have been examined in the first instance and rejected for specified reasons (commercial competition in this instance will not be acceptable as a reason) and only then, can locations further down in the hierarchy be considered:

- 1. Clustering with existing support structures;*
- 2. In industrial estates or on industrial zoned lands;*
- 3. Rooftop locations in commercial / retail zones;*
- 4. In parks / open space areas ('disguised' masts may be requested in such areas).*

New support structures shall not be permitted within or in the immediate surrounds of a residential area or beside schools. Impacts on protected structures, Architectural Conservation Areas, National Monuments or other building / sites of heritage value shall be considered.

5.7. Natural Heritage Designations

No natural heritage designations apply to the subject site.

The closest European Site is the Bray Head SAC (Site Code: 000714) and the Bray Head pNHA (Site Code: 000714), which are roughly 750m to the southeast.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- The appeal site is not characterised as being within a poor pedestrian environment. There is a wide public footpath in this location and there would be no material impact on pedestrian movement for this reason.

- There is no public footpath further north along Sidmonton Road. However, this is not relevant to the application being assessed.
- The refusal reason does not specify which Development Plan standards have not been complied with by the proposal.
- The Applicant is happy to accept a condition requiring the structure to be in situ for a temporary period only.
- The purpose of the application is not for 'private commercial gain', but to address an identified blackspot to improve telecommunications in this area.
- The site comprises an area of wide footpath and is not an amenity in the normal understanding of the term.
- The submitted CGI images and Visual Impact Assessment indicate that the proposed monopole and its associated equipment would not have a material visual impact on Sidmonton Road.
- Similar proposals for 15m high streetpole solutions have been permitted by the Board.
- The proposed streetpole may have an initial visual impact but this will quickly fade and become another element of street furniture.
- None of the nearby residential buildings face towards the subject site.
- The Applicant does not require written consent from the Local Authority for the proposed licence.
- It is understood that the nearby lattice telecommunications structure does not have permission, as noted in the Planner's Report. The Applicant reviewed this option as part of the alternatives considered for the area. However, the tower does not allow for telecoms and therefore is not an option.

6.2. Observations

A single observation from residents in the area has been received by the Board. The main issues raised are as follows:

- The decision by Wicklow County Council to refuse the proposed licence should be upheld by the Board.
- In 2009/2010, retention permission for a similar type telecoms support structure was refused permission.
- The application does not include any contiguous elevations showing the relationship of the proposed mast with the surrounding buildings. The photomontages provided do not give an accurate representation of the mast within the surrounding area.
- Views from the observers' property, as well as from along Sidmonton Road on the approach to Convent Avenue, towards Bray Head are currently unobstructed. The view is not a designated protected view. However, it is an important view nonetheless as demonstrated in the enclosed drawings.
- Consent to make the licence application should have been obtained from the Local Authority and adjacent Garda Station. The proposed monopole could pose a security risk or provide easy access into the Garda Station.
- The proposed mast would be very visually prominent and not akin to other types of street furniture.
- Other locations should have been considered instead.
- Bray is not a 'rural town' as referred to in the application.
- The presence of a nearby Protected Structure should have been considered as part of the proposal.

7.0 **Assessment**

The main planning considerations relevant to this appeal are:

- Pedestrian Environment and Public Realm
- Visual Impact
- Other
- Appropriate Assessment

7.1. Pedestrian Environment and Public Realm

- 7.1.1. The Planning Authority's first reason for refusal is due to the prominent location and setting of the appeal site, which is at a junction where it is stated there is already a poor-quality pedestrian environment. It is also stated that that the proposal would lead to a substantial section of footpath being used for private commercial gain and a depreciation in the pedestrian environment and related forms of movement, which is not in accordance with the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2019) ('DMURS').
- 7.1.2. I note that Section 2.1.2 of DMURS under the sub-section 'Comfort' addresses the pedestrian environment. It states that pedestrians are sometimes marginalised along street edges so that greater space can be provided within the street reserve to facilitate vehicle movement or because footpaths become cluttered with poles and guardrails thus constraining pedestrian movement and creating visual clutter.
- 7.1.3. The proposed development comprises a small section of public footpath on the northeastern corner of the intersection of where Sidmonton Road and Convent Avenue meet. Bray Garda Station is to the northeast and there is a tall stone wall between it and the appeal site. The area affected comprises a relatively deep section of footpath. There are no other street fixtures in the immediate vicinity of the site which might otherwise contribute to cluttering the space and, therefore, pose a difficulty to pedestrians or to other vulnerable users.
- 7.1.4. The Proposed Site Layout Plan submitted with the application shows that the extent of the proposed works would encompass a relatively small footprint (3.8m x 1.6m). The monopole and associated ground-level cabinet would be set tight against the stone wall and setback a minimum of 2.2m from the street edge at its nearest point. The dimensions of the monopole and cabinet are such, in my opinion, that they would not encroach excessively onto the public footpath. Adequate clearance would still be available between it and the edge of path to comfortably accommodate passers-by.
- 7.1.5. I note that the cabinet doors would open and swing over the path by a small distance, but that this would still leave sufficient clear space. I envisage that any required servicing or maintenance would be infrequent and likely happen only a few times each year.

7.1.6. In summary, I conclude that the appeal site and footpath upon which it is situated is not so narrow or sub-standard such that the proposed development would impede pedestrian movement or that there would be insufficient room for people to pass. I also do not consider that the pedestrian environment, in this relatively spacious corner setting, would become excessively cluttered on foot of the proposal or that vulnerable users would be unnecessarily hindered or impeded as a result.

7.2. Visual Impact

7.2.1. The Planning Authority's second reason for refusal is that the proposed development due to its scale and design would be visually obtrusive and intrusive in views from both the immediate, and from longer distances along Sidmonton Road, and that it would therefore seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity.

7.2.2. Chapter 16 of the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028 ('the Development Plan') is in relation to 'Energy & Information Infrastructure'. It states *inter alia* that the widespread availability of a high quality telecommunications network throughout County Wicklow are critical to the development of a knowledge based economy. Objective CPO 16.35 seeks to facilitate and support the roll out of the National Broadband Plan and the development/expansion of communication, information and broadcasting networks, including mobile phone networks, broadband and other digital services, subject to environmental and visual amenity constraints. Objective 16.37 states that the development of new masts and antennae must be in accordance with the development standards set out in Appendix 1 of the Plan.

7.2.3. Appendix 1 states that a proposal for a new telecommunications installation is subject to a sequential approach as regards site location and selection. It requires that the Applicant must show that the locations preferred by the Development Plan have been adequately examined and rejected for specified reasons and that locations further down in the hierarchy can only then be considered. The hierarchy (or order of preference) is as follows:

1. *Clustering with existing support structures;*
2. *In industrial estates or on industrial zoned lands;*
3. *Rooftop locations in commercial / retail zones;*

4. *In parks / open space areas ('disguised' masts may be requested in such areas).*

Appendix 1 also states that new support structures will not be permitted within or in the immediate surrounds of a residential area or beside schools.

- 7.2.4. The Applicant has examined several alternative locations and sites from which to locate the proposed development. However, these were ultimately discounted due to being either unavailable or unsuitable and outside the required search ring of 300m in diameter to address the coverage blackspot in this area.
- 7.2.5. I further note that the existing nearby lattice telecommunications structure within the confines of the Garda Station does not appear to have permission, as noted in the Council Planner's Report, which would mean it is not a viable option from which to co-locate. Therefore, having reviewed the information contained within the application, appeal submission, and given the deficit in network coverage for the area, I am satisfied that alternative sites had been duly considered and that the proposal is justified in this location as a 'last resort' option as per the Guidelines.
- 7.2.6. I accept that the proposed telecommunications facility may have some potential visual impact on its receiving environment by virtue of its height and positioning on a prominent corner location, where Sidmonton Road and Convent Avenue converge. Sites such as this, located close to existing residential housing, are acknowledged as being particularly sensitive from a visual and residential amenity perspective. This is referenced in Section 4.3 of the 'Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures, 1996' ('the 1996 Guidelines'). The Guidelines do not prohibit telecommunications facilities in such areas however, and state that if alternative options have been exhausted residential areas can then be considered.
- 7.2.7. I also considered Planning Circular PL07/12 in this regard, which specifically recommends that Development Plans avoid including any policies that have minimum separation distances between telecommunication installations, schools, and residential dwellings. The Circular states that the 1996 Guidelines encouraged Planning Authorities to indicate in their Development Plans any locations where, for various reasons, telecommunications installations would not be favoured or where special conditions might apply. However, as the Circular notes, while such policies

are reasonable, there has been a growing trend for the insertion of Development Plan policies and objectives specifying minimum distances between telecommunications structures from houses and schools. Such distance requirements, without allowing for flexibility on a case-by-case basis, can make the identification of a site for new infrastructure very difficult. The Circular states that planning authorities should therefore not include such separation distances as they can inadvertently have a major impact on the roll out of a viable and effective telecommunications network.

- 7.2.8. The Applicant has submitted a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) to aid the visual assessment of the development proposal. The assessment comprises 6 no. viewpoints from various locations ranging from nearby and further afield. This includes 3 no. viewpoints along Sidmonton Road and 3 no. viewpoints from Convent Avenue. Having physically visited the site and completed a visual inspection up close and from the surrounding vicinity I consider the photomontages to be an accurate depiction of how the proposed development would appear as if it were built.
- 7.2.9. I accept the proposed monopole would be more visually apparent than some of the existing structures in the area, including overhead powerlines, lamp standards and road signage. However, I consider that it would not be so visually apparent or such a significant intervention in the streetscape that it would seriously injure the visual and residential amenity of its receiving environment. This is further evidenced from viewing the schematic elevation in Drawing No. SR_3254-104 and various viewpoints provided as part of the VIA. I further note that no designated protected views or prospects apply to the appeal site or its surrounding area as per Map No. H2 of the Bray Municipal District LAP 2018-2024.
- 7.2.10. The full extent of the proposed development, including both the mast and cabinet, would be mainly only visible for closeup views (Nos. 1, 2 and 3), which would not be unexpected, and I note that the 1996 Guidelines state that some masts will remain 'quite noticeable despite best precautions'. The proposed monopole adopts a slender appearance and, in my view, the Applicant has sought to minimise its potential for visual impact by selecting a monopole of low to medium height.
- 7.2.11. The proposed monopole is 15m tall. 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 therefore on the lower-end in terms of height, which I consider an appropriate mitigating factor in this circumstance.

7.2.12. The surrounding area includes several mature and established trees. These are mainly to the north and east, around such areas as Sidmonton Park and within the area between Bray Garda Station and the grounds of a nearby nursing home. During my physical inspection of the site, which was during the early Spring months, many of these trees had shed their leaves. However, they still provide a good level of screening of the proposed monopole, particularly from longer distance views from the north in the direction of Bray Head. Many of the trees are large and have significant crowns, so that even when not in full leaf they can still significantly mitigate the potential for visual impact caused by the proposed development. During the summer months the vegetative screening provided by these trees would be denser and thicker meaning views of the monopole would be further reduced.

7.2.13. I have considered the previous retention application refused in 2010 for an existing antennae support structure near the appeal site. It comprised a lattice-type triangular telecoms tower situated roughly 20m north of the appeal site on the eastern side of Sidmonton Road. The structure was 32m in height and, therefore, more than double the height of the current proposal at 15m. The tower was designed to accommodate a considerable amount of antennae and dishes and various other items of telecoms infrastructure. Therefore, the tower would have had a far more imposing, domineering and overbearing presence on the street than the current proposal.

7.2.14. In my opinion, the proposed development adopts a much more modern and contemporary appearance. Its design is sleek and slender by comparison. This is in accordance with the 1996 Guidelines, which state the height of such infrastructure should be kept to a minimum and take the form of a monopole rather than a latticed or square tower structure. The monopole would also be coated in a grey muted paint typical of a telecoms facility seeking to assimilate with the typical sky colour in Ireland, which is another positive design aspect in my view.

7.2.15. In summary, I do not consider that the proposed telecoms infrastructure 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. I conclude that the proposal is acceptable from a visual impact perspective and that it would not be overly visually obtrusive or obtrusive.

7.3. Other

Plans and Particulars

- 7.3.1. In relation to the provision of contiguous elevations, I note that Article 23 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 deals with the requirements to provide particulars with an application. Article 23 (1) (d) of the Regulations requires that drawings of elevations of any proposed structure shall show the main features of any buildings which would be contiguous to the proposed structure if it were erected, whether on the application site or in the vicinity. I highlight for the Board's attention that such a drawing was not provided with the application. The Planning Authority accepted the licence application as valid.

7.4. Appropriate Assessment

Given the nature and scale of the development proposed, which is for a telecommunications monopole and ancillary works, and 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.

8.0 Recommendation

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

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures Guidelines for Planning Authorities issued by the Department of Housing, Planning and Local Government in 1996 (as updated by Circular Letters PL 07/12 and

PL11/2020, respectively), the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022-2028, the Bray Municipal District Local Area Plan 2018-2024, and the height, scale and location of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area, including that of the pedestrian environment, or result in a significant negative visual impact on the surrounding vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application 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>a) This licence shall apply for a period of five years from the date of this Order. The telecommunications structure and related ancillary structures shall then be removed unless, prior to the end of the period, continuance shall have been granted for their retention for a further period.</p> <p>b) The site shall be reinstated on removal of the telecommunications structure and ancillary structures. Details relating to the removal and reinstatement shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority at least one month before the date of expiry of this licence.</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>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>
4.	<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>

Ian Boyle
 Planning Inspector

16th March 2023