



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP317661-23

---

<b>Development</b>	Construct a 33-meter lattice mobile and broadband tower with associated equipment and all associated site works.
<b>Location</b>	Cregmore, Claregalway, County Galway.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Galway County Council.
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	23189.
<b>Applicant</b>	On Tower Ireland Limited.
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission.
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Permission with conditions.
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellants</b>	Anne Ryan and others.
<b>Observers</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Sean and Helen Doheny.</li><li>2. Cregmore Primary School BoM.</li><li>3. Cregmore Athenry Anglers</li><li>4. Angela and David Cummins and others.</li><li>5. Jamie and Ross Cunningham and</li></ol>

others.

6. Sean Canney T.D.

7. Carla and Enda Kenny.

8. Demelza Glynn and Ronan Kenny.

9. Noel Grealish T.D.

**Date of Site Inspection**

29<sup>th</sup> September 2023.

**Inspector**

Derek Daly.

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

1.1. The proposed site is located in a rural area approximately 0.5 kilometres northwest of Cregmore Crossroads / village and approximately 5 kilometres east of Claregalway in County Galway. Access to the site is from an access track of an approximate length of 284 metres which is off a public road and concrete yard. There are dwellings on either side of the access point onto the public road. In the vicinity of the access point from the public road there is a large number of dwellings and the road network in the general area has a large number of dwellings fronting onto the local road network.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

The proposed development provides for the construction of a 33-meter multi use lattice mobile and broadband tower with associated equipment and all associated site works. The lattice structure will support a headframe carrying telecommunications equipment with provision for future antennae for future operators and associated dishes. The development also provides for four cabinets for proposed and future operators and other associated equipment. A concrete plinth is proposed and the proposed development will be enclosed within a 2.4 metre high palisade fence. A three metres wide access track is also proposed connecting the site to the public road. The site is stated as having an area of 0.04 hectares.

2.1. In addition to the drawing submitted with the application a planning statement was submitted referring to development in the area and visual impact, a technical justification was also submitted in the context of national policy and county policy and meeting future needs. A visual impact assessment was also submitted.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Decision**

The decision of the planning authority was to grant planning permission subject to nine conditions. Condition 4(ii) limits the development notwithstanding the provisions

of Class 31 of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001.

### **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

#### **3.2.1. Planning Reports**

The planning report dated the 4<sup>th</sup> July 2023 refers to national policy and the provisions of the current County Galway Development Plan 2022-2028 and submissions received. Reference is made to technical justification submitted by the applicant which is considered acceptable. Permission was recommended.

### **4.0 Planning History**

No relevant planning history.

### **5.0 Policy and Context**

#### **5.1. Development Plan**

##### **5.1.1. The relevant plan is the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 as adopted in June 2022.**

Chapter 7 refers to Infrastructure and section 7.8 to Information and Communication Technology in which it is indicated *that the Council actively supports the provision of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) within the county and consider that development and enhancements in this area to be crucial in both the economic and social development of the County.*

In relation to section 7.8.2 Telecommunications it is indicated *that the provision of telecommunications information is considered to be important in terms of the economic development of the County. To ensure appropriate telecommunications infrastructure are provided within the county the council will have regard to the guidelines issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, 'Planning Guidelines for Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures' (1996) and Circular Letter PL 07/12. The assessment of individual*

*proposals will be governed by the guidelines and the controls scheduled in the Development Management Standards chapter of this plan.*

Objectives in relation to ICT are;

#### ICT 3 Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures

To ensure the orderly development of telecommunications throughout the County in accordance with the requirements of the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, DECLG, 1996, except where they conflict with Circular Letter PI07/12 which shall take precedence, and any subsequent revisions or expanded guidelines in this area.

#### ICT 4 Co-location of antennae

To require co-location of antennae support structures and sites where feasible. Operators shall be required to submit documentary evidence as to the non-feasibility of this option in proposals for new structures.

#### ICT 5 Siting and Design of Telecommunications Infrastructure

To require best practice in both siting and design in relation to the erection of communication antennae and support infrastructure, in the interests of visual amenity and the protection of sensitive landscapes.

#### ICT 6 Visual Impact and Antennae Support Structures

To operate a presumption against the location of antennae support structures where they would have a serious negative impact on the visual amenity of sensitive sites and locations

Chapter 8 refers to Tourism and Landscape and section 8.13.2 Landscape Sensitivity and the site is located within Class 1 landscape – Low Sensitivity: Unlikely to be adversely affected by change. Objective LCM 2 Landscape Sensitivity Classification refers to the Planning Authority shall have regard to the landscape sensitivity classification of sites in the consideration of any significant development proposals and, where necessary, require a Landscape/Visual Impact Assessment to accompany such proposals. This shall be balanced against the need to develop key strategic infrastructure to meet the strategic aims of the plan.

Chapter 15 refers to Development Management and DM Standard 42 to Telecommunications Masts in which it is indicated *in order to facilitate the evaluation of development proposals for the erection of antennae and support structure with regard to the DoEHLG, Planning Guidelines for Telecommunications Antennae and Support (1996 including any updated/superseding document) and DECLG Circular PI 07/12 regarding the 1996 Planning Guidelines. While the current state of technology requires the construction of masts and antennae in the countryside the following standards will apply:*

*a) Landscape Sensitivity In instances where telecommunications masts are essentially required in landscape sensitivity Class 3(Special) or Class 4 (Iconic), a Visual Impact Assessment shall be required with all planning applications for these locations.*

*b) Amenity Impacts Masts and associated base station facilities should be located away from existing residences and schools.*

*c) Landscape Impacts Masts should be designed and located so as to cause minimum impact on the landscape. If possible, sites should be located within forest plantations. Access roads shall be permitted only where essential. Where provided, they should not scar the landscape on which they are located. Roads should follow the natural contours of the site in order to minimise their visual intrusion, and should be bordered with shrubs after construction. Masts should be sited to avoid the location of such structures in sensitive landscapes, in nature conservation areas, in highly sensitive landscapes and where views are to be preserved.*

*d) Co-Location Licensees shall be required to co-locate their services by sharing a single mast or, if necessary, locating additional masts in cluster form. Co-location agreements to be provided where possible. Where new facilities are proposed applicants will be required to satisfy the Council that they have made a reasonable effort to share facilities or to locate facilities in clusters.*

*e) Security Mast compounds should have security fencing and anti-climbing devices designed to local aesthetic and safety requirements.*

*f) Redundancy In the event of the discontinuance of any mast installation the mast and its equipment shall be removed from the site and the land shall be reinstated. All planning applications shall be required to furnish a statement of compliance with the*

*International Radiation Protection Association (IRPA) Guidelines or the equivalent European Pre-Standard 50166-2 in the interest of health and safety.*

DM Standard 46: refers to Compliance with Landscape Sensitivity Designations and the control of permissible development shall be in accordance with the policies as they relate to the four sensitivity classes of landscape in Section 8.13.2 of the plan. It will deem the following types of development generally to be acceptable in the various areas of sensitivity as follows:

Class 1 – Low Sensitivity All developments which are of appropriate scale and design and are consistent with settlement policies.

## **5.2. National Planning Guidelines**

- 5.2.1. Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures; Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 1996. Section 4.3 refers to Visual Impact and that visual impact is among the more important considerations which have to be taken into account in arriving at a decision on a particular application. In most cases the applicant will only have limited flexibility as regards location. In relation to locating along major roads or tourist routes, or viewed from traditional walking routes, masts may be visible but yet are not terminating views. In such cases it might be decided that the impact is not seriously detrimental.

Only as a last resort should freestanding masts be located within or in the immediate surrounds of smaller towns and 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 guidelines further state that only as a last resort and if the alternatives suggested in the previous paragraph 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 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.

5.2.2. Circular Letter PL 07/12, DoECLG 2012 This includes further advice on the issue of health and safety and reiterates that this is regulated by other codes and is not a matter for the planning process.

### 5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

Site is not within a Natura site.

### 5.4. **EIA Screening**

5.5. The proposed development is not one to which Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended, applies and therefore, the requirement for submission of an EIAR and carrying out of an EIA may be set aside at a preliminary stage.

## 6.0 **The Appeal**

### 6.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

6.2. The main grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

6.2.1. It is submitted that the development is not in compliance with current government guidelines. Circular letter 07/12 recommended a flexible approach but cannot be used to disregard the potential negative impacts on health and in this regard, reference is made to paragraph 2.3 and separation from sensitive receptors and this is also referred to in paragraph 4.3 of the planning guidelines. Reference is made to a Board decision ABP 312528 in support of this.

There are 28 residences close to this facility within 300 metres, a school and a further 71 houses within 750 metres.

6.2.2. The proposed development contravenes the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028. Reference is made in this regard to DM Standard 42(b) and that masts should not be located away from existing residences and schools.

6.2.3. Reference is made to potential health issues and these should be taken into account by the Board notwithstanding previous government guidelines. the Board need to be cognisant to recent research in this regard and appendix 2 of the grounds of appeal

outlines a report on the effects of Radio Frequency Radiation (RFR) which indicates more complex effects of RFR than previously known and the need for updating the 1996 guidelines. Reference is made to other studies on the effects of masts and there are situations therefore that masts be kept at a distance.

Reference is also made to impact on property prices and the negative impact of masts in this regard.

- 6.2.4. Insufficient effort has been made by the applicant to investigate co-location with other masts and the Board should satisfy themselves that the issue has been properly examined as Three Ireland have a number of masts in the area.
- 6.2.5. The access is restricted with limited sightlines and the access would not be considered appropriate for a normal commercial and residential development and is a source of traffic hazard. There will be considerable problems during the construction phase given the limited width of access.
- 6.2.6. It is important to state contrary to what is stated in the documentation existing coverage in the area is good and any poor coverage addressed by repeater units.
- 6.2.7. The visual impact assessment considerably underestimates the likely impact of the mast. The chosen viewpoints are questioned in particular the impact from the village.
- 6.2.8. There are contradictory comments in the documentation in relation to proximity of houses and a number of references which are inaccurate.
- 6.2.9. Reference is made to bat roosts in the area which are not assessed.
- 6.2.10. The grounds include four appendices in support of the submissions made in the grounds of appeal.

### 6.3. **Applicant Response**

- 6.3.1. The main grounds of the response can be summarised as follows;
  - The proposal was assessed in accordance with local and national guidance.
  - A statement is included from the host mobile operator of compliance with the guidelines in relation to The International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICIRP), that all base stations in Ireland adhere to the

guidelines and the communications regulator does random testing to ensure all base stations are transmitting below the limits defined by ICIRP.

- Reference is made to 2012 Circular Letter PL07/12 and what planning authorities should be primarily concerned with and the Board has adjudicated on these matters on multiple occasions.
- It is accepted that telecommunications support structures due to design, nature and height have the potential to negatively impact on the visual amenities of the area but in relation to this project the impact is within acceptable limits as demonstrated by the visual impact assessment and supported by the planner's report.
- In relation to the Board decision ABP 312528 the circumstances differ in relation to the current proposal which is to install an entirely new support structure in Cregmore village and there is no structure in the village and the nearest is c3.5 kilometres to the north.
- All existing sites were ruled out for co-location as part of the technical justification and the need for the site was established in terms of technical and locational requirements to meet future needs.
- The site will also be offered to other operators.
- Reference is made to DM 42, the site is a greenfield site and in an area of low sensitivity. The site is not beside or adjacent to residences or schools.
- There is no evidence in relation to depreciation of property values. It might be reasonable to assume values might be positively impacted given the necessity of having telecommunications infrastructure.
- The development will have minimal impact in relation to traffic given the low level of traffic generated. During the construction phase of 2-4 weeks a traffic management plan will be put in place.
- The planning authority assessed the issue of visual impact.
- It is acknowledged that typos have occurred in the documentation but the details as submitted are sufficient to enable assessment of the proposal.

#### 6.4. **Planning Authority Response**

No response

#### 6.5. **Observers**

6.5.1. Sean and Helen Doheny in a submission refer to;

- Reference is made to the 1996 guidelines and the location of masts on suitable sites with reference to sensitive receptors, schools and villages.
- Issues arise in relation to the documentation and in particular the need for the tower and there is no issue with coverage in the area.
- Reference is made to the dangerous and unsafe entrance.
- There are alternative locations and co-location alternatives available.

6.5.2. Cregmore Primary School Board of Management in a submission refer to;

- School is 750 metres from the proposed mast
- Observations similar to those stated by in the submission of Sean and Helen Doheny.

6.5.3. Cregmore Athenry Anglers in a submission refer to;

- There is no evidence submitted which justifies a new mast.
- Reference is made to the site as within the Clare River and Corrib SAC and the proposal will be a blight on the landscape.
- The site is in a rural area and there is no commercial development in this environment.
- Guidance has not been taken into account in the assessment in relation to proximity to residential areas.
- Reference is made to health implications co-location and traffic.
- It will impact on amenities of the area including angling.

6.5.4. Angela and David Cummins and others c/o Leahy Planning Ltd in a submission refer to;

- The submission supports the third party appeal.

- No evidence submitted to justify the new mast.
- Reference to national guidance and the CDP and to the location of development in proximity to villages and schools.
- Issues are raised in relation to health.
- The site is a tranquil rural area and the mast will dramatically change the area.
- Insufficient effort made in relation to co-location.
- Concern is raised in relation to the access.

6.5.5. Jamie and Ross Cunningham and others in a submission refer to;

- The submission supports the third party appeal.
- The mast will be obtrusive in the landscape and a visible scar.
- The development will be injurious to the residential amenities of the area in a highly residential rural setting with 28 residences within 300m and 71 within 750 metres.
- Reference is made to alternative locations.
- Reference is made to the implication on health.
- The requirement for the mast is questioned.
- The impact on the Clare River is referred to and the impact on wildlife in the SAC.
- Reference is made to impact on agriculture and livestock in the area.

6.5.6. Sean Canney T.D. in a submission refers to;

- The observation supports the appeal of local people and that the mast is too near residences and local school.
- Reference is made to the issue of traffic hazard.
- Broadband is best served by fibre optic cable and co-location.

6.5.7. Carla and Enda Kenny in a submission refer to;

- The submission supports the third party appeal.

- Insufficient effort has been made to comply with national recommendations in relation to visual impact.
- Reference is made to the proximity to villages and schools and the provision of DM42(b).
- The ownership and title is questioned.
- Reference is made to health implications, to issues of co-location, traffic hazard, on the depreciation of property in the area and the development being contrary to the CDP.

6.5.8. Demelza Glynn and Ronan Kenny in a submission refer to;

- Reference is made to the issue of health.
- No justification for a new mast at this location.
- They are currently building a house within 200 metres of the proposed site.
- Current coverage in the area is more than adequate and support co-location of existing masts.
- Traffic is raised and the proximity to dwellings and the school.

6.5.9. Noel Grealish T.D. in a submission refers to;

- No evidence or justification for a new mast at this location.
- There are no issues with existing coverage which is well serviced with fibre optic or that it is sub standard in the area.
- Issues are raised in relation to traffic.
- The proposal contravenes the CDP referring in particular DM42 in relation to proximity to existing residences, a school and creche.

## 7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. The main issues in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal and related documentation. Appropriate Assessment also needs to be considered. I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise.

The issues are addressed under the following headings:

- Principle of the development
- Site selection/need for the development.
- Impact on visual and residential amenity.
- Traffic.
- Appropriate Assessment

## 7.2. Principle of the development

- 7.2.1. National Policy in developing and improving telephony and broadband infrastructural services is set out within the 1996 Telecommunications Guidelines, and the revisions/updates to these Guidelines within Planning Circular PL 07/12. More recently, the National Broadband Plan (NBP), was published in 2020 and reflects the Government's ambition to ensure that the opportunities presented by this digital transformation (provided by the NBP) are available to every community in Ireland. The delivery of the NBP will play a major role in empowering rural communities through greater digital connectivity, which will support enterprise development, employment growth and diversification of the rural economy.
- 7.2.2. The Telecommunication Guidelines set out the need for the facilitation of a high quality telecommunications service and set out the issues for consideration within planning assessments including location, access, co-location / shared facilities, design, visual impact, health and safety.
- 7.2.3. The provisions of the current County Development Plan reflects national guidance as set out in section 7.8.2 Telecommunications where it is indicated that the provision of telecommunications information is considered to be important in terms of the economic development of the County and objectives ICT 3 which provides for ensuring the orderly development of telecommunications throughout the County in accordance with the requirements of the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, DECLG, 1996, except where they conflict with Circular Letter PI07/12 which shall take precedence, and any subsequent revisions or expanded guidelines in this area and ICT 4 in relation to co-location of antennae of the current 2022 county development plan as it will promote shared telecommunications.

7.2.4. The proposal to improve telecommunications and broadband services is therefore consistent with the guidance as set out within the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures Guidelines for Planning Authorities (1996) and the County Development Plan. I consider that the principle of a proposed telecommunications structure, would be acceptable subject to assessment based on the criteria outlined in national and local guidance and in particular DM 42 of the CDP.

**7.3. Site selection/ need for the development.**

7.3.1. The Telecommunication Guidelines and Planning Circular PL07/12 seek to encourage co-location of antennae on existing support structures and to require documentary evidence as to the non-availability of this option in proposals for new structures. It also 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. Similarly, the Guidelines state 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.

7.3.2. The applicant has stated the need for the upgrading of the telecommunications network, that the existing service in the area is deficient and there is a need to make provision for an improved service provision in the area in an area where there is currently a known coverage deficit and this deficit has been questioned by third parties in submissions.

7.3.3. In the response to the grounds of appeal and third party submissions the applicant submitted details relating to coverage, existing masts in the wider area to demonstrate justification of the need for the proposed development. In addition, the applicant states there are no other suitable sites available within the area for co-location where the current proposal could be facilitated, as confirmed within the ComReg mobile telephony mapping data.

7.3.4. There is no substantive evidence within the application or appeal regarding any suitable alternative sites available within the wider area. Having reviewed the information submitted, I am satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated an adequate technical justification for the proposed development.

7.3.5. On the basis of the information submitted the need therefore for an improved telecommunications network is accepted and the planning authority would also recognise this. It is also noted the applicant is making provision for sharing the proposed development and in this regard the proposal largely is in compliance with National guidance and the provisions as set out in section 7.8.2 of the CDP.

**7.4. Impact on visual and residential amenity.**

7.4.1. The primary grounds of appeal refer to seriously injure the visual and residential amenity of the existing adjacent residential amenity referencing National guidance and objectives in the current County Development Plan in particular DM 42.

7.4.2. It is well recognised that placing infrastructure of this nature is challenging and this is reflected in the advice contained in Section 4.3 of the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures Guidelines (the Guidelines) that it should only be as a last resort located in or in proximity to small towns and villages. No specific guidance in relation to what defines proximity is stated.

7.4.3. The appeal site is not adjacent to or in close proximity to any existing dwelling, the nearest dwelling is in excess of 250 metres and is removed from the road running through the village.

7.4.4. In relation to visual impact, it is accepted that a structure of the height proposed cannot be screened and will be visible but it is removed from existing dwellings and the public road network and views from the public road network are very intermittent given the high level of road frontage properties in the immediate and wider area. The site is also located in a designated as an area of low sensitivity with mature vegetation and natural screening which is capable of absorbing and moderating visual impact and any visual impact is immediate to the site.

7.4.5. The impact on the residential amenity is essentially the major issue and is raised in the context of impact on health and devaluing property.

7.4.6. Specifically in relation to the issue of health both in relation to human health and animal health which is raised in submissions, I first note the concerns raised by the appellants and observers in relation to health matters. This however is an issue which Circular Letter: PL 07/12 has addressed and clearly states that this is regulated by other codes and is not a matter for the planning process. Based upon this Circular, there can be no reasonable consideration given to this issue in this

assessment. The Board is limited to considering the location and design of the proposed development, with due regard to the provisions made in the Guidelines to such matters, primarily in relation to other impacts and but not health related matters.

- 7.4.7. In relation to impact on residential amenities and devaluation of properties in the area as already indicated there is no dwelling adjacent to or in immediate proximity to the proposed mast and the mast structure will be removed at a distance from the road network. Based on the distance involved and the absence of evidence to indicate devaluation will arise I do not consider that any significant impact will arise in relation to residential amenities.
- 7.4.8. I would also note reference to the site's proximity to the school and in this regard there is no specific guidance in relation to proximity to schools but the site is a minimum of 750 metres from the nearest school and the issue of potential impact does not I consider arise.

#### **7.5. Traffic**

- 7.5.1. In relation to traffic related matters the site will be access from the public road via a yard between two properties and reference is made to the issue of traffic hazard given the alignment of public road serving the site. In considering traffic impact there are two phases to consider, the constructional phase and the operational phase. During the construction phase there will be additional traffic generated using the entrance but this phase is a short term period and the traffic during the operational phase will be low.
- 7.5.2. The public road serving the development is a local road which has bends to the west and east but at the location of the entrance point sight line visibility is adequate and currently serves as a farm yard entrance which accommodates varying forms of vehicles. It is noted that the proposal also includes a construction management plan which addresses movements into and out of the site. From an inspection of the access and examination of the adjoining network I do not consider that the issue of a traffic hazard arises.

#### **7.6. Appropriate Assessment Screening**

- 7.7. In third party submissions the impact on the Clare River is referred to and the impact on wildlife in the SAC and that the site is located is within a Natura site and in proximity to the Clare River.

- 7.8. The site is not located within a Natura site and the nearest site is the Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code 000297) approximately 300 metres distance from the mast site and the Clare River forms part of this SAC. The Lough Corrib SAC includes a large number of qualifying interests and includes the Lough and a number of rivers within the SAC as they are important for Atlantic Salmon including the Clare River. There is no direct hydrological pathway from the site of the mast and the river.
- 7.8.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, to the absence of emissions therefrom, the absence of a pathway between the application site and any European site it is possible to screen out the requirement for the submission of an NIS and carrying out of an EIA at an initial stage.

## 8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that permission be granted.

## 9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to

- National Planning Framework,
- the current Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028,
- the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures-Guidelines for Planning Authorities 1996 and Circular Letter PL07/12, and
- the scale and design of the proposed development,

it is considered that the proposed development would be in accordance with National Policy for telecommunications infrastructure and the current Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028. It is also considered that, subject to compliance with the following conditions, the proposed development would not adversely impact the character of the area or be seriously injurious to the visual or residential amenities 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.	<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><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>Surface water drainage arrangements shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such services and works.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of public health.</p>
3.	<p>The developer shall allow, subject to reasonable terms, other licensed mobile telecommunications operators to co-locate their antennae onto the subject structure.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In order to avoid the proliferation of telecommunications structures in the interest of visual amenity.</p>
4.	<p>Details of the specific colour finish for the telecommunications structure shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development. The applicant shall also submit to and agree with the planning authority prior to commencement of development a landscaping scheme for the site which shall include an enhanced screen boundary.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of the visual amenities of the area and to protect residential amenity.</p>
5.	<p>The transmitter power output, antenna type and mounting configuration shall be in accordance with the details submitted with this application and, notwithstanding the provisions of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, and any statutory provision amending or replacing them,</p>

	<p>shall not be altered without a prior grant of planning permission.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> To clarify the nature and extent of the permitted development to which this permission relates and to facilitate a full assessment of any future alterations.</p>
6.	<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 without a prior grant of planning permission.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of the visual amenities of the area</p>
7.	<p>On decommissioning of the telecommunications structure, the structure and all ancillary structures shall be removed and the site reinstated at the developer's expense.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of clarity.</p>
8.	<p>The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with the Construction Management Plan as submitted to the planning authority on the 11<sup>th</sup> May 2023.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> in the interest of public safety and residential amenity.</p>

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.

---

. Derek Daly  
 Planning Inspector

4<sup>th</sup> October 2023