



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-317084-23

Development

Section 254 Licence for the provision of a smart streetpole and operator cabinet.

Location

Dangan, Kilmore, Carrick-on-Shannon, Co. Roscommon.

Planning Authority

Roscommon County Council.

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

LC/21/11.

Applicant(s)

Signal Infrastructure Limited.

Type of Application

Section 254 Licence.

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Licence.

Type of Appeal

Third Party.

Appellant(s)

Franziska Ludwig.

Observer(s)

None.

Date of Site Inspection

7 December 2023.

Inspector

Stephen Rhys Thomas.

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description.....	3
2.0 Proposed Development.....	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
3.1. Decision.....	3
3.2. Planning Authority Reports.....	3
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	4
3.4. Third Party Observations.....	4
4.0 Planning History	4
5.0 Policy Context	4
5.1. Development Plan	4
5.2. National Guidelines	5
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations.....	7
5.4. EIA Screening.....	7
6.0 The Appeal.....	8
6.1. Grounds of Appeal.....	8
6.2. Applicant Response.....	9
6.3. Planning Authority Response	10
6.4. Further Responses	10
7.0 Assessment.....	11
8.0 Recommendation	16
9.0 Reasons and Considerations	17
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The site is located at Dangan, west of the village of Kilmore and about 8 kilometres south of Carrick on Shannon, Co. Roscommon. The site is positioned alongside the public road, opposite a church and school. The public road at this location is characterised by a mature roadside bank and hedge on one side and the boundary walls of premises to the back of the public road. There are a limited amount of street lighting poles of moderate height, some telegraph poles and school warning signage. There are dashed yellow road markings at the margin of the road and the posted speed limit at this location is restricted to 50 kph. The 15 metre tall steel pole and ground mounted cabinet, the subject of this appeal are already in situ.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The applicant is applying for a licence to install and operate an infrastructure pole and associated operator cabinet. The development proposal is for the installation of a 15m freestanding galvanised pole with a diameter of 330mm, with internal cables, 2 GPS domes on brackets, 300mm diameter dish (if no fibre infrastructure in the area). A ground mounted cabinet with a footprint of 1.5 sqm, height 1.7 metres, length at base of 0.9 metres and width of 1.9 metres would be installed beside the pole and would be painted green. The proposed telecoms installation as described, is already in situ.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. The PA decided to grant permission for the licence without conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the Planning Officer dated the 15th June 2021 that informed the decision of the PA and includes the following:

- No objections from the Area Engineer.

- Lands are not located in a designated site.
- Site not liable to flooding.

No objections to the principle of development.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Area Engineer – no objections (by email report dated 14th June 2021)

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Site:

None.

4.2. Relevant sites in the area:

PA ref: 18/317 and ABP ref PL20.302557 – Permission for retention of an existing 15m telecommunications support structure which carries 3 No. aerials for the emergency service users (Garda, Ambulance and Fire Brigade) previously granted permission under Planning Ref. PD/08/179 together with telecommunications equipment and fencing at Eir Exchange, Kilmore, Co. Roscommon. Constructed.

ABP ref: ABP-309405-21 - Permission for the construction of a 30 metre lattice tower enclosed within a 2.4 metre high palisade fence compound.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.1.1. Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028

Chapter 3: People, Places and Housing

PPH 3.23 Promote the development of Smart Villages in order to develop and diversify the rural economy and build on local enterprise and infrastructure assets to drive innovations.

Chapter 7: Infrastructure, Transport and Communications

ITC 7.63 Promote and facilitate the sustainable development of a high-quality ICT network throughout the county, in accordance with the requirements of the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures – Guidelines for Planning Authorities, in order to achieve balanced social and economic development, whilst protecting the amenities of urban and rural areas.

ITC 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.

ITC 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.

Chapter 12 Development Management Standards

12.22 Telecommunications

The Council recognises the importance of telecommunication infrastructure as a means of removing the peripheral barrier that the county experiences.

It is also recognised that the location of telecommunication infrastructure is dictated by service provision and hence each application will be determined on its own merits.

5.2. National Guidelines

Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The development is considered under Section 254(1)(ee) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

DoHELG Circular Letter PL 11/2020. This circular provided clarification in relation to the planning exemptions applicable to telecommunications works undertaken by

statutory undertakers authorised to provide telecommunications services. 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.

National Broadband Plan, DCENR, 2012. Sets out a strategy to deliver high speed broadband across the State.

Circular Letter PL07/12 – The circular updates the guidance document and specifically refers to temporary permissions, removal of separation distances from houses and schools, bonds and contributions, planning considerations related to location and design and health and safety matters, and the establishment of a register / database.

Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, DoE, 1996. Provide guidance on, amongst other things, siting of masts. This includes, in city suburbs, to co-locate telecommunications where possible and to locate new telecommunication masts in industrial or in industrially zoned land or commercial or retail areas. The guidance states that only as a last resort, if these alternatives are not available, should free-standing masts be located in a residential area or beside schools. Further, 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, with the support structure be kept to the minimum height consistent with effective operation.

Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets – section 2.4.5 Street Furniture.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.3.1. The site is not situated within any European Sites. There are no designated European Sites in close proximity to the site.

5.4. EIA Screening

- 5.4.1. The proposed development is not listed in either Part 1 or Part 2 of Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended), which sets out the types and thresholds of development that requires a mandatory EIA. The proposal has also been assessed against the criteria outlined in Schedule 7 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended), and the provisions of Article 109, (3) of the Regulations.
- 5.4.2. Under the provisions of Article 109, (3) of the Regulations, it is noted that the site is not located within a European site, is not designated for the protection of the landscape or of natural or cultural heritage and the proposed development is not likely to have a significant effect on any European Site.
- 5.4.3. The proposed development is minor in nature and scale and will not require any significant ground works or construction methods. I have concluded that, by reason of the nature, scale and location of the subject site, the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment and that after a pre-screening exercise an environmental impact assessment report for the proposed

development was not necessary in this case. (See Pre-Screening Form, Appendix 1).

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A Third Party Appeal has been submitted by Peter Thomson (Planning Solutions) on behalf of Franziska Ludwig, the grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The written consent of the land owner upon which the infrastructure is proposed has not been sought. The landowner of Folio RN20523 has not provided any consent for development to take place.
- No conditions were attached to the licence permission, the licence is therefore unenforceable.
- The planning assessment had regard to the 2014 development plan and the telecoms guidelines 1996. The protection of visual amenities forms part of the current plan and should have been considered. Co-location should be considered and only as a last resort should a new free standing mast be proposed. The location of the pole was considered too close to the school at first, it is closer in its current location. Such a location close to the school and other facilities is at variance with ministerial guidelines and would materially contravene the development plan. This is not an application made under section 34 of the Act and so therefore the Board cannot consider granting permission for development that is contrary to the plan. Policy ITC 7.63 seeks to protect communities, rights of way and built/natural environment. Other locations were not considered, permission should be refused.
- The applicant has incorrectly stated that there are no protected structures in the vicinity. There is a ringfort, castle site and church (RPS 0100186) all within close proximity to the site and the proposed pole will negatively impact these heritage items.
- (314689) The licence is invalid as no EIA screening took place. Screening for EIA is required for development in proximity to protected structures and

recorded monuments. The proposed development comprises a sub threshold urban development (10(b)(iv), Part 2 of Schedule 5), the Board cannot screen out and cannot grant permission.

- Screening for AA was not carried out by the planning authority, and the Board cannot do so either. There is no legal basis with which to carry out screening in any case, when assessing a section 254 licence application.
- The applicant has not demonstrated health and safety aspects of the development in accordance with ICNRP compliance. Impact to human health and wellbeing will result. The pole is located too close to a school and community centre and the health impacts have not been assessed.

6.2. Applicant Response

The First Party have submitted a response prepared by David Mulcahy on behalf of Signal Infrastructure Limited. It is summarised as follows:

- There is no requirement for public notice or public consultation under a section 254 licence application.
- The infrastructure is erected on land owned by Roscommon County Council, the roadside and a letter of consent was sought and received, appendix A refers. Legislation requires that works should occur on, under, over and along public roads and this is the case in this instance, reference is made to ABP-311679-21.
- The attachment of conditions to the granting of a licence is at the discretion of the planning authority and not a requirement of the 2000 Act, section 254(4) refers.
- Both the 2014 and 2022 County Development Plans are supportive of telecoms infrastructure and the development the subject of the licence is in compliance with the policies and objectives out in the plan and as guided by national policy. The pole covers a black spot in coverage, the closest mast is almost 5 km distant, co-location was not possible in this case. Images are supplied that show the pole does not have an adverse visual impact on the area in general and community facilities in particular.

- The 1996 guidelines have been misinterpreted by the appellant, in fact monopoles are preferred to free standing masts, if they must be placed close to schools. The guidelines are outdated with regard to pole design, and the current mast does not affect the area.
- Images presented show that the pole does not have any impact upon protected structures in the area.
- EIA screening not necessary, AA screening not relevant.
- Health issues are not relevant, Comreg is the competent authority to consider health implications.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

None.

6.4. Further Responses

6.4.1. The appellant has submitted a response to the applicants submission and can be summarised as follows:

- Ownership of the site is disputed, roadside verge and land under the road is in the ownership of the appellant.
- Conditions should be attached in the event of a grant of permission for a licence, section 254(4) is referenced.
- No assessment of the application was made by the planning authority and the act of granting a licence does not infer that policies and objectives of the development plan have been complied with.
- In terms of co-location and benefit to the community, the proposal contravenes the development plan.
- The pole does impact upon the built heritage.
- EIA screening and AA screening did not take place and should have in accordance with the Act.
- Mast and health issues have been completely dismissed by the applicant.

- 6.4.2. A letter of support for the appeal against the granting of a section 254 licence from the principal of Dangan National School is attached. A print out from an online petition against the development is also attached.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Introduction

- 7.1.1. According to the application documentation, the proposed street pole with 2 GPS domes on brackets would have a height of 15m and a diameter of 330mm. The pole would be galvanised, all cables run internally. There would also be a ground mounted cabinet with a footprint of 1.5 sqm, height 1.7 metres, length at base of 0.9 metres and width of 1.9 metres and this would be installed beside the pole and painted green. The entire development is already in situ.
- 7.1.2. The proposed development is brought forward under section 254(1) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended). In their consideration of the development, under section 254(5) of the Act, the Board is required to have regard to:
- 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.
- 7.1.3. Having regard to these requirements, local and national planning policy, the application details, all other documentation on file and my inspection of the site, I consider that the main issues for this appeal relate to:
- Planning and Development Plan
 - Co-location
 - Road Safety
 - Other Matters

7.2. Planning and Development Plan

- 7.2.1. Introduction - Section 254(5)(a) of the 2000 Act the Board is required to have regard to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area of which visual amenity is part. In addition, the Board are required to have regard any relevant provisions of the development plan, or a local area plan, section 254(5)(a) refers. I have combined both these topics within this section of my report.
- 7.2.2. The Roscommon County Development Plan (RCDP) sets out the overall strategy and vision for the proper planning and sustainable development of the county over the 6 year plan period and has been prepared in accordance with Part II, Chapter I of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended). Appendix 1 of the Written Statement contains a Statement prepared in accordance with Section 28 (1A) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) demonstrating how the Planning Authority in preparing the Development Plan has implemented the policies and objectives set out in Ministerial Guidelines issued under Section 28 of the Act. With reference to the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (1996), Chapter 7 (Infrastructure, Transport and Communications) identifies the importance and role of telecommunications in ensuring the county is adequately connected. Policy objectives set out in Section 7.12 reflect the content of the Guidelines, and I am satisfied that the development plan includes all relevant guidance on the matter of telecommunications.
- 7.2.3. Visual Amenity - The appellant has raised concerns about the impact the pole will have on the visual amenities of the village, particularly with respect to the nearby church. The applicant disagrees and has prepared a photographic analysis of the pole structure and its impact on the visual amenities of the area, appendix B of the response to the grounds of appeal refers. The applicant concludes that the proposed pole will not adversely impact upon the amenities of the village.
- 7.2.4. At present, the pole is already in situ, together with its equipment cabinet and so it is simple to determine if the development impacts the visual amenities of the area. The receiving environment is typical of a small village in rural Roscommon. There is a national school and community centre across the road from the appeal site and St. Brigid's Roman Catholic (RC) church is located further along to the east. The church is listed on the Record of Protected Structures (RPS) and is described as a free standing, single storey R.C. church on cruciform plan dated 1842; with three bay, two storey presbytery attached at the west end, RPS ref 1100186 refers. The public

realm in the vicinity of the appeal site and nearby dwellings is informal, with low boundary walls and no defined footpath. The area can be classed as urban and sits within the 50kph speed limit zone. The area is lit by modern public lamp standards that are simple in design and diminutive in scale, there are also timber telegraph poles carrying a variety of wires. The proposed pole (now in situ) is much taller and far wider than other above ground infrastructure in the vicinity and this sets it apart from the existing character of the village. Existing pole infrastructure (lamp standards and telegraph poles) satisfactorily blend into the streetscape, assisted by mature hedging and trees to their back. The new pole is located at a point in the village where scale is characterised by planting, moderately scaled pole infrastructure, and single storey buildings with the exception of the church. It is my opinion that the new pole, because of its girth and height presents a dominant, negative and heavy handed approach to what is an attractive village character that it is worthy to protect.

7.2.5. With reference to the church and its RPS status, I am satisfied that a detailed report of visual impact is not necessary. It is my view that the church and its attendant grounds will not be directly impacted upon. But as I have already explained, the church and the precinct around it, adds an attractive village character that is impacted upon by the scale and design of the new pole. In this respect I am mindful of chapter 4 Towns and Villages in general and section Development Management Standard 12.16 Urban Character and Streetscape in particular, of the current plan and its advice in relation to showing respect for existing streetscapes in terms of design, height and scale.

7.2.6. The proposed development, will and does impact upon the visual amenities of the village as a whole due to its dominant height and scale when compared to the low height and fine scale of the existing streetscape. Permission should be refused on the basis that the development militates against the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

7.2.7. Proximity to school – the appellant points out that the proposed pole will be located close to a school and that this goes against the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures guidelines. In response the applicant identifies that the same guidelines state that any support 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. In this respect I can see that the generality of the

guidelines and policy objective ITC 7.63 of the statutory plan have been complied with and as a result a monopole structure is proposed.

7.3. Co-location

- 7.3.1. In accordance with section 254(5)(c) of the 2000 Act, the Board is required to have regard to the number and location of existing appliances, apparatuses or structures on, under, over or along the public road. The appellant has raised a concern that a proper examination of other masts in the area and if co-location is feasible has not been made by the applicant. In response to this, the applicant states the pole covers a black spot in coverage, a 500 metre sweep of the area was made and the closest mast is almost 5 km distant, co-location was not possible in this case.
- 7.3.2. From my observations of the site and the wider area, I noted a telecoms mast situated on a hilltop, 2km to the west of the appeal site, ABP-309405-21 may possibly refer. More proximate, I observed a telecoms mast in the village of Kilmore, 1.2km to the east, ABP-302557-18 refers. I also observed a telegraph pole, with a small south facing repeater dish attached and erected at the north eastern corner of the school site, adjacent to the community centre. There are telecoms masts and other infrastructure in the area and the applicant has elected not to provide a detailed assessment of their locations and the feasibility of co-location. In the absence of any such report, I am not satisfied that there is a black spot in coverage that needs to be plugged. Whilst compliance with policy objective ITC 7.63 of the statutory plan is broadly achieved, the applicant has not responded to policy objective ITC 7.65 that encourages co-location of antennae on existing telecommunications structures. In that regard, the plan states that 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. The applicant has not demonstrated that this is not the case and based upon my observations I suggest that opportunities for co-location could exist and should be examined. Permission should be refused for the licence based upon the lack of any considered information with respect section 254(5)(c) of the 2000 Act.

7.4. Road Safety

- 7.4.1. In accordance with section 254(5)(d) of the 2000 Act, the Board is required to have regard to the convenience and safety of road users including pedestrians. Though

not directly addressed by the appellant in the grounds of appeal, the matter of road safety and convenience is something the Board must consider. In this respect I note that the planning authority raised no issues about road safety and the licence was granted unconditionally.

7.4.2. However, I have concerns that a proper assessment in the context of pedestrian safety and comfort was not carried out by either the applicant or the planning authority. Specifically, I note that the site is located in a village setting, well within the posted speed limit of 50kph, therefore the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS) has relevance. Pedestrian facilities are at a minimum in the village with the space apportioned to pedestrians defined by a dashed yellow line and a small strip of pavement to the front a former shop now a dwelling opposite the church. Whilst motorised vehicles pass through the village unhindered, pedestrian convenience and safety is not provided at all and will be hampered by poorly located telecoms infrastructure. DMURS regards street clutter negatively and with reference to all forms of lighting, signage and other infrastructure should be located with a view to minimising their impact on the streetscape, while not creating an obstruction or hazard to pedestrians, section 4.2.5 of the design manual refers. In the undefined public realm assigned to pedestrians in Dangan village I am not satisfied that the proposed (now in situ) pole and equipment cabinet assists with the convenience and safety of road users in this case pedestrians and could present a traffic hazard. This is especially so, in close proximity to the school, community centre and church to which pedestrians would be frequent visitors and where no upstanding physical definition of pedestrian space currently exists.

7.4.3. Finally, I note that DoHELG Circular Letter PL 11/2020, clarifies matters with respect to the planning exemptions applicable to telecommunications works. Specifically, if it is agreed that the imposition of the proposed infrastructure is a traffic hazard it should be noted that the planning exemptions for telecommunications infrastructure along public roads do not apply in the scenario where the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard or obstruction of road users; article 9(1)(iii) of the Regulations refers.

7.5. Other Matters

- 7.5.1. Consent – the proposed development is planned to take place in the public domain, for the which the applicant has supplied a letter of consent from the Council. I note that the letter supplied at appendix A of the applicant's report, states that the lands in question are in the charge of the Council. Taken in charge does not necessarily mean that such an entity has outright ownership over a portion of land. However, as this is potentially a matter of legal title and a dispute between landowner and consent, then it is best taken up under the relevant legal statutes to do with property rights and legal ownership.
- 7.5.2. Conditions – the planning authority granted a licence without conditions and the appellant is concerned that without conditions there will be no effective control over development. The applicant points out that this is not the case and conditions are not always required. I note that section 254(4) of the 2000 Act states that a licence may be granted under this section for such period and upon such conditions as the authority may specify. My reading of the 2000 Act is that it is at the discretion of the planning authority to attach conditions as they see fit.
- 7.5.3. EIA and AA Screening – given the nature of the development proposed and its location, I am satisfied that no EIA or AA issues arise, section 5.3 and 5.4 and appendix 1 of my report all refer.
- 7.5.4. Health – the appellant is concerned about the health and safety aspects of telecommunications infrastructure and the location of the proposed pole, close to a school, community centre and church. The applicant points out that Appendix II of the Telecommunications guidelines sets aside hazard to health concerns in terms of radio signals and non-ionising radiation. The monitoring, control and policies in relation to Non-Ionising Radiation in the state falls to the Commission for Communications Regulation, the EPA and the Department of the Environment, Climate and Communications. I am satisfied that health concerns and the proposed telecoms pole are not a planning matter in this instance.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that a licence be refused for the proposed development.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the government's guidelines on Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, DoE, 1996, the policies of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 - 2028, the location of the proposed development within a rural village and where existing telecommunications structures are located less than 2 kilometres to the east and west of the application site, it is considered that insufficient technical justification and evidence has been provided in respect of alternative sites, to support the location of the development. Policy objective ITC 7.65 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 that encourages co-location of antennae on existing telecommunications structures. In that regard, the plan states that 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. It is considered, therefore, that the proposed development would be contrary to government guidelines, to County Development Plan policy and to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. The site of the proposed development is located on space that is informally assigned to the pedestrian, and within a rural village where the existing street furniture including lamp standards and other poles are of a small scale commensurate with such a village setting. It is considered that the proposed development would constitute a visually obtrusive feature at the centre of a rural village, it would have an adverse visual impact on community buildings, and would, therefore, conflict with Chapter 4 Towns and Villages and Development Management Standard 12.16 Urban Character and Streetscape of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 and militate against the street furniture principles advised by the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets. The proposed development would, thereby, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
3. The site is located on a country road within a village where the 50 kph limit applies, no formal pedestrian facilities are provided. The obstruction of limited space currently set aside for the comfort and convenience of the pedestrian

generated by the proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and obstruction of such a road user, in this instance the pedestrian.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.



Stephen Rhys Thomas
Senior Planning Inspector

9 January 2024

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-317084-23		
Proposed Development Summary	Section 254 Licence for the provision of a smart streetpole and operator cabinet.		
Development Address	Dangan, Kilmore, Carrick-on-Shannon, Co. Roscommon		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	Y
		No	No further action required
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	N		Proceed to Q.3
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)
No		Not within a class.	Not within a class. No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes		N/A	Not within a class. Proceed to Q.4

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No		Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector:

J. A. Rhys-Lewis

Date:

09/01/24