



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Addendum Report

ABP-321229A-24

Development	ABP 321229A-24
Location	Eir Exchange, Inches, Eyeries, Co. Cork.
Planning Authority	Cork County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	22618
Applicant(s)	Eircom Ltd.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Eircom Ltd.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	22 nd January 2026.
Inspector	Carol Smyth

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. This report is an addendum report to the Inspector's report in respect of ABP-315410-22 dated 2nd August 2023. I am a new Planning Inspector assigned to this case and I am assessing this current appeal de novo.
- 1.2. An Coimisiún Pleanála granted permission under ABP-315401-22, subject to 6 no. conditions on 29th February 2024, for the replacement of a 10 metre high timber monopole with a 15 metre high monopole telecommunications structure with associated equipment and site development works at the Eir Exchange, Inches, Eyeries, Co. Cork. The Board's decision was brought under Judicial Review and the decision was QUASHED on the 7th October 2024 by High Court Order (H. JR.2024.0000569). The High Court ordered that the matter be REMITTED to An Coimisiún Pleanála to be determined in accordance with law.
- 1.3. A Section 131 notice, in accordance with the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, was issued to participants. This report considers the responses made on foot of the Section 131 notice. The Commission should note a copy of the first inspectors report on file dated 2nd August 2023 which contains the particulars of the appeal as submitted in the first instance. This addendum report should be read in conjunction with this inspectors report.

2.0 Response of Relevant Parties/Observers to the Section 131 Notice

2.1. First Party

- 2.1.1. A response was received from the First Party which reiterates and expands upon the points made in the initial first party grounds of appeal. The submission summarised as follows:
 - Sets out an overview and statistics for the Irish market.
 - The proposal will provide critical infrastructure and services for this rural area for Eir and Tetra Ireland, a provider for the emergency services.
 - Tetra Ireland serves a total of 54 no. different organisations including, *inter alia*, An Garda Síochána, fire services, emergency and rescue organisations, a number of HSE organisations and local authorities.

- Tetra Ireland provides a communications network that delivers voice and data land mobile radio communications to thousands of first responders.
- There are difficulties with coverage in the area especially 5G, due to the topography of the village, therefore it is necessary to provide a structure at a height above the village. The 15 metre proposed height is the minimal functional height required.
- The monopole has been designed to be immediately available for Eir and Tetra Ireland, however it is also designed to accommodate Vodafone (letter of support provided with appeal).
- The proposed monopole will provide coverage over land and out beyond the coastline.
- The existing timber monopole is inadequate to accommodate new technologies for Tetra Ireland or operator's coverage needs and has limited flexibility to secure the necessary coverage for Eyeris.
- The existing installation at Gortnabulliga site, 1.4 km from the subject site is not suitable to enable Eir, Tetra or Vodafone achieve the coverage and secure utilities gained from the existing Eir exchange and does not meet locational advantages that the proposed site can provide.
- Network operators are obliged to meet certain licence requirements. Coverage maps submitted which indicate weak and no 5G services for area. 4G services deteriorate on lands to north and east of the site.
- Improving coverage will meet the requirements of the Development Plan in relation to the rural economy. Government policy promotes improved access to digital and broadband communications. Predicted Coverage Map submitted. The proposal would allow Eir and Vodafone to provide high speed mobile broadband to residents in this area and the surrounding areas.
- Notes that the designated High Value Landscape covers an exceptionally wide area and that it is impossible to avoid this designation within the area. By their nature, masts are going to be visible on landscape to varying degrees. Similarly, to provide coverage to routes around West Cork, it is virtually impossible to

secure a site that does not impact a scenic route. Contends that there is a conflict of objectives in Development Plan and a balance needs to be achieved.

- Photomontages of the proposed development have been included.
- Contends that the greatest visual impact is coming up the hill of the L4908 when leaving the village and it is submitted that the B&B is the dominant feature at the junction and not the proposed structure.
- Contends that there will be no adverse obstruction or degradation of the views towards and from vulnerable landscape features.
- No empirical evidence that telecoms infrastructure has a devaluation impact on property. Where there isn't the benefit of coverage, a negative impact can arise.
- References PL26.247800 in relation to Inspector's opinion on concerns regarding proximity to housing. ABP have previously ruled that that there is no evidence that a development of this nature can have an impact on the value of property.
- References other 15 metre high telecommunication structure permitted by ABP in village settings.

2.2. Planning Authority

A response was received from the Planning Authority which welcomes the quashing of the previous decision and restates the two reasons for refusal. The Planning Authority considers that the First Party has not submitted any new information that would warrant a change of decision. The justification for the development is not accepted and an investigation of alternative sites and/or mast sharing is advised.

3.0 Assessment

3.1. Introduction

- 3.1.1. The proposed development provides for the replacement of an existing 10 metre high timber telecommunications monopole with a 15 metre high galvanised steel telecommunications monopole, together with associated equipment. Having examined the submitted documentation, I note that the overall stated height of the structure, inclusive of aerials, is 18.6 metres (15 metre monopole plus 3.6 metre high

aerials). The existing structure on site has a maximum stated height of 13.2 metres, when the height of the existing aerial is included. Therefore, taking the additional aerials into account, the proposed structure exceeds the existing telecommunications structure on site by 5.4 metres. The proposed monopole is positioned circa 10 metres further to the east of the existing monopole to be replaced as part of the development.

3.1.2. The Planning Authority refused the development for 2 no. reasons. In summary, the first reason for refusal raised concerns in relation to the proliferation of telecommunications structures in the area and that the height, scale and nature of the proposed development would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area and interfere with the character of the landscape. The proposal was considered to materially contravene Objectives GI 14-9, GI 14-13 and GI 14-15 of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028. These objectives relate primarily to the protection of visual and scenic amenities of Cork's built and natural environment; protection of Scenic Routes and ensuring that the approach roads to towns and villages are protected from inappropriate development respectively.

3.1.3. The second reason for refusal considered that the proposal would seriously injure the residential amenities and depreciate the value of nearby property in the vicinity, by reason of proximity and visual intrusion and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.1.4. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the Local Authority and Prescribed Bodies, further responses, having inspected the site and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal are the two reasons for refusal which issued from the planning authority namely:

- Principle of Development
- Visual Impact
- Residential Impact

3.2. Principle of Development

- 3.2.1. The Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028, referred to hereafter as the Development Plan, acknowledges that access to high quality digital and mobile telecommunications infrastructure is critical to the social and economic wellbeing of communities and can support the revitalisation of towns, villages and rural areas. Section 13.18 – Communications and Digital Connectivity, of the Development Plan, emphasises the importance modern communications infrastructure and digital connectivity which is essential to regional economic development and improved quality of life in both urban and rural areas, while also recognising the importance of protecting the landscape from any significant impact caused by such infrastructure. In this regard, I also note the provisions of Objective ET: 13-28 - Information and Communications Technology of the Development Plan, which supports the delivery of high-capacity digital and broadband infrastructure, the rollout of the National Broadband Plan and the promotion of Smart Region initiatives. In addition, Objective EC: 8-7 - Smart Working/Remote Working recognises and promotes the need for remote working throughout the County.
- 3.2.2. I am satisfied that the objectives of the Development Plan recognise the importance and need for such infrastructure to support social and economic wellbeing and quality of life in rural areas, subject to protecting the landscape from any significant adverse impacts. I further consider that the provision of appropriate telecommunication infrastructure is key in enabling successful remote working in rural areas.
- 3.2.3. I note national government policy in relation to telecommunications and the need to place such infrastructure on appropriate sites in appropriate locations and I have had regard to the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures- Guidelines for Planning Authorities (1996) and Circular Letter PL07/12 Telecommunications Antanae and Support Structures Guidelines (2012) in the assessment of this appeal.
- 3.2.4. Having regard to the documentation submitted and having visited the site, I note the existing Eir exchange building and timber monopole on the subject site. I am satisfied that there is an established use of the site for telecommunications infrastructure and therefore I consider the proposal to be acceptable in principle at this location.

3.2.5. The Planning Authority's first reason for refusal refers to the proliferation of telecommunication structures in the area and the sharing and clustering of facilities as required by the Development Plan and Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures Guidelines for Planning Authorities (1996). The Guidelines state that in order to avoid an unnecessary proliferation of masts, the co-location of antennae with other operators is expected to be facilitated. In this instance I note the existing monopole on this site is being removed to facilitate the proposed development, therefore there will be no increase in the number of monopoles in the area as a result of the proposed development. In terms of other telecommunications infrastructures in the area, the documentation submitted with the application indicates that there is a 24 metre high communication mast at Gortnabulliga permitted under Cork County Council Reg. Ref. 21/281, located circa 1.4 km to the southwest of the appeal site, and further from the village of Eyeries. I have reviewed the ComReg siteviewer and I confirm that there are no other mobile masts in the area. Therefore, I do not consider that there is a proliferation of telecommunication structures in this area.

3.2.6. In terms of site selection and justification the grounds of appeal states that notwithstanding that the structure at Gortnabulliga has capacity for sharing and clustering of facilities, it does not provide the locational advantages of the appeal site. The Appellant outlines that the subject site is the best option to ensure high quality coverage particularly for 5G services, given its proximity and elevated location to the village of Eyeries and that the proposed installation must be located in reasonable proximity to the area in which it is intended to serve. Furthermore, the grounds of appeal state that the existing Eir exchange on the site provides utilities that no other location can provide. The grounds of appeal includes letters from Tetra Ireland and Vodafone in support of the application. Vodafone states that existing coverage levels in Eyeries are such that they are unable to provide good indoor reliable voice and data services to the village and surrounding area and that the proposed structure would significantly improve this service. I have examined the ComReg website Coverage Map on the 9th February 2026 and can confirm that there is no outdoor Vodafone 5G coverage for much of this area. The letter from Tetra Ireland states that it has existing equipment at this location, which forms part of the National Digital Radio Service (NDRS) for emergency services. Tetra outlines the

importance of the site to the overall emergency services network and that in the event that the proposed monopole is permitted, there is potential for them to transfer the equipment to the new structure. Tetra further outlines that it would benefit emergency service users as the increased height of the new structure would improve coverage in the area and increase coverage overlap with adjacent sites in the event of network faults.

- 3.2.7. In terms of the justification for proposed development and sharing and clustering of facilities, I note that national guidance emphasises the importance of co-location and sharing of such structures by more than one operator and I acknowledge the concerns of the Planning Authority. I am satisfied that the development is in accordance with national policy in this regard given that it is proposed that Tetra Ireland and Vodafone will share the proposed structure with Eir which will lead to an improvement in coverage within the wider area. I consider that the proposal would aid in improving access to high quality digital and mobile telecommunications infrastructure in order to improve the social and economic wellbeing of communities and that such facilities can support the revitalisation of towns, villages and rural areas, in accordance with Development Plan policy.
- 3.2.8. I acknowledge the concerns of the Planning Authority in relation to the proliferation of such structures and the justification, sharing and co-location concerns, given the High Value Landscape and Scenic Routes designations that apply to the site context. However, I do not consider that there is a proliferation of such structures in the vicinity, and I accept the justification put forward in the submitted documentation for the need for this structure at this location and why co-location on the existing structure at Gortnabulliga is not appropriate in this instance. Having visited the site and having regard to the characteristics of the surrounding environment I do not consider that the proposed development would have a negative visual impact on the area. In addition, I note that the submitted photomontages indicate that there is no significant impact, see further visual impact assessment below. I consider that the appellant has demonstrated that this is a much-needed development that will provide better coverage for customers, including the emergency services and first responders.
- 3.2.9. To conclude this section, having regard to the existing telecommunication structure on site which is proposed to be replaced and the established use on the site and the

existing Eir exchange that currently offers power, access to utilities and is part of an existing network that offers emergency service coverage in the area, the justification for the new structure and the stated unsuitability of the existing structure at Gortnabulliga, the proximity and elevated location of the site to the village of Eyeries, I am satisfied that the development proposal is in accordance with national and local policy.

3.3. Visual Amenity and Material Contravention

- 3.3.1. The Planning Authority's first reason for refusal also relates to the visual impact of the development on the character of the area. The Planning Authority considered that the proposal would interfere with the character of the landscape at this location and would materially contravene Objectives GI 14-9, GI 14-13 and GI 14-15 of the Development Plan.
- 3.3.2. Objective GI 14-9 – Landscape, seeks to protect the visual and scenic amenities of Cork's built and natural environment, while Objective GI 14-13 - Scenic Routes, seeks to protect the character of the views and prospects obtainable from scenic routes. Policy Objective GI 14-15 - Development on the Approaches to Towns and Villages, seeks to ensure that the approach roads to towns and villages are protected from inappropriate development, which would detract from the setting and historic character of these settlements. I consider these objectives to be reasonable.
- 3.3.3. The subject site is located within a designated High Value Landscape outside the settlement boundary of Eyeries. In addition, as identified in Table 2.5.1 Scenic Routes – Views and Prospects and Scenic Route Profiles, of the Development Plan, there are two designated scenic routes proximate to the site, the R571 Road between Castletownbere, Eyeries, Kilcatherine and Ardgroom (Scenic Route Ref. S115) and the road between Eyeries, Kilcatherine and Ardgroom (Scenic Route Ref. S116). These routes form part of the Wild Atlantic Way. I acknowledge that the proposed development would be visible from these scenic routes.
- 3.3.4. Section 13.18 – Communications and Digital Connectivity of the Development Plan, acknowledges the importance of telecommunications infrastructure, while stating that it is equally as important that the landscape is considered and protected from any significant impact caused by such infrastructure. In addition, I note the provisions of Section 4.3 - Visual Amenity, as set out in Telecommunications Antennae and

Support Structures, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (1996) which acknowledges that some masts will remain quite noticeable in spite of the best precautions. The Guidelines set out that along major roads or tourist routes, masts may be visible but yet are not terminating views and, in such cases, it might be decided that the impact is not seriously detrimental. In addition, the Guidelines consider that were views of the mast are likely to be intermittent and incidental, in that for most of the time viewers may not be facing the mast and in these circumstances, while the mast may be visible or noticeable, it may not intrude overly on the general view or prospect. The Guidelines further state that there will be local factors which have to be considered in determining the extent to which an object is noticeable or intrusive such as, *inter alia*, intermediate objects (buildings or trees), topography and the scale of the object in the wider landscape.

- 3.3.5. The designated High Value Landscape within which the site is located, covers an expansive area of the peninsula. The grounds of appeal set out that if all High Value Landscape areas were excluded from the installation of telecommunications infrastructure such as the proposed development, then it would exclude a significant area of the peninsula. Furthermore, the grounds of appeal contend that to exclude all scenic routes within the area would also preclude a significant area of land which would have subsequent effects on coverage within the wider area.
- 3.3.6. The appeal site is located within a cluster of the development which comprises a B&B, a single storey dwelling, the Eir exchange building and the existing monopole and associated equipment. The B&B is positioned forward of the adjacent single storey dwelling, the Eir exchange building and the existing monopole. The alignment of the Scenic Route Ref. S115 (R571) at this location is such that it veers from a south-westerly direction to a southerly direction at the B&B. Having visited the site and having regard to the photomontages submitted with the grounds of appeal, I note that the subject site does not have direct frontage onto the Scenic Route Ref. S115 (R571) but instead fronts onto a local road (L8919), which runs parallel to the site. In terms of the visibility of the existing structure on the site, given the alignment of the R571, I note that the existing monopole is visible but is partially screened by the B&B, planting and the Eir exchange building. Given its height and nature, it reads very much like many of the ESB poles in the vicinity. Given the 5 metre

increase in height proposed, I acknowledge that the proposed structure would have greater visibility at this location than that currently on site.

- 3.3.7. It is my opinion that the main views along the Scenic Route Ref: S116 (R571) are those to the west towards the coast. In this regard I note that the subject site is not located on the seaward side of the roadway. In terms of the impacts on Scenic Route (Ref: S116) the local road between Eyeries, Kilcatherine and Ardgroom, I note that the existing B&B adjacent to the existing mast terminates the road at the junction. Photomontage View 5 submitted with the grounds of appeal indicates the existing and proposed monopole is visible in the distance. Given the limited scale, extent and nature of the proposed development on an established utilities site, which involves the replacement of an existing telecommunication structure, with a monopole that is 5 metres taller than the existing monopole on the site, it is my opinion that the impact on scenic routes or the designated High Value Landscape at this location would not be so great as to warrant a refusal of permission. I have had regard to the photomontages submitted with the appeal, in particular Photomontages View No's 1 – 3, which indicate that views of the development will be fleeting and intermittent and that the proposed monopole reads very much like other utility poles in the area. Therefore, I do not consider that the proposal represents a material contravention of Policy Objectives GI 14-9 and GI 14-13 of the Development Plan.
- 3.3.8. I do not consider that the local road onto which the subject site fronts, is a main approach road into the village of Eyeries. Notwithstanding, I acknowledge that this local road is an approach road into the village and therefore I consider Objective GI 14-15 is relevant in this regard. I acknowledge that the proposal will be visible on the landscape at this location and that the development will also have greater visibility than that currently on site given the increased height as evidenced in Photomontage View 4 submitted with the grounds of appeal. However, in my opinion, in many instances these views will be fleeting and intermittent given the vertical and horizontal alignment of the road. I refer the Commission to my assessment above, where I note that the subject site is not located on the seaward side of the roadway and my opinion that the main views are those to the west towards the coast. I do not consider that the proposal would detract from the setting and historic character of the settlement Eyeries and therefore, I do not consider that the proposal would materially

contravene Objective GI-15 of the Development Plan in relation to development on approach roads to towns and villages.

3.3.9. To conclude this section, I acknowledge the concerns of the Planning Authority regarding impacts on the visual and scenic amenities, given the High Value Landscape and scenic routes designations of the Development Plan that apply to this location. I am satisfied that the views of the development will be intermittent and incidental and for most of the time viewers will not be facing the mast. I am further satisfied that the proposed mast does not terminate a view. While I accept that the mast will be visible, I am satisfied that it will not overly intrude on the general view or prospect of the area, or negatively impact on the designated scenic route and High Value Landscape in the vicinity of the site. I have had regard to section 37(2)(b) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 as amended in relation to the matter of material contravention. I consider that the proposed development would not represent a material contravention of Policy Objectives GI 14-9, GI 14-13 and GI 14-15 of the Development Plan. Given the scale of the works proposed and the design and colour of the proposed structure; the established use of the site for the provision of utilities and its proposed location behind an existing Eir Exchange building, I consider that the proposal does not represent inappropriate development at this location. I therefore consider that the development accords with Section 4.3 Visual Amenity as set out in Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (1996). I am satisfied that the landscape has capacity to absorb a development of the nature and scale proposed, without detriment to the visual and scenic amenities of the area and I consider the proposal to be consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.4. Residential Amenity

3.4.1. The Planning Authority's second reason for refusal relates to the scale, height and proximity of the development to existing residential properties. The Planning authority considered that the proposal would seriously injure residential amenities and depreciate the value of their property by reason of its proximity and visual intrusion and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

- 3.4.2. The submitted drawings indicate that the proposed structure and associated ground equipment cabinets are located 10 metres closer to an existing residential dwelling to the east, than the existing structures on site. I note Section 4.3 of the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (1996) which sets out that free standing masts in residential areas or near schools should only be used where no suitable alternatives exist. Where required, sites already developed for utilities should be preferred. The Guidelines further set out that structures should be designed for the location, kept to the minimum effective height, and be monopoles rather than latticed, tripod or square structures.
- 3.4.3. I refer the Commission to my assessment in Section 3.2 above where I concluded that the alternative site was not appropriate in this instance. The proposed development is located outside the defined settlement boundary of Eyeries within a rural area and is located within a small cluster of development at this location, namely a B&B, a dwelling, Eir exchange building and the existing monopole. There is also an additional residential property further south. I therefore do not consider that the proposed development is located within a residential area. Furthermore, the site is not located beside a school, and I note that the site is already developed for utilities. The support structure is a monopole replacing an existing monopole on site and the grounds of appeal have outlined that the height of the monopole as proposed is that which is required and the reason why the smaller existing monopole is being replaced. I therefore consider that the proposal is in accordance with Section 4.3 of the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (1996) and I am satisfied in this regard.
- 3.4.4. I note that the positioning of the closest residential dwelling on site is such that their front windows are oriented towards the sea, away from the location of the proposed monopole. I acknowledge however that there are windows in their gable elevation, from which the proposed monopole would be visible. The dwelling further south does not have windows in their northern gable elevation. There are windows in the gable of the B&B, however the proposed positioning of the monopole is such that it will be behind the main rear building line of their property. On balance I consider that impacts on residential amenities would not be so great as to warrant a refusal of permission.

- 3.4.5. There are no requirements for separation distances from residential properties within the Guidelines and I highlight Section 2.3 of Circular Letter PL07/12 Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures Guidelines (2012) which sets out the planning authorities should not impose separation distances as they can impact on the roll out of the telecommunications network. I consider that it is not uncommon for such telecommunication structures to be in proximity to residential dwellings within urban areas, and can see no reason why the same would not apply to a rural area.
- 3.4.6. I have no information before me which demonstrates that the proposal would lead to the depreciation of property values in the vicinity. Having regard to all of the above, I consider that any impacts on the residential amenities of the area would not be so great as to warrant a refusal of permission and I therefore consider that the proposal is consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area in this regard.

4.0 EIA Screening

- 4.1. See completed Form 1 on file. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination.

5.0 AA Screening

- 5.1. The proposed development comprises the replacement of a 10 metre high timber pole with a 15 metre high monopole telecommunications. The subject site is located approximately 1.1 km west of the Kenmare River SAC (Site Code:002158).
- 5.2. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 5.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, and taking account of the screening determination of the Planning Authority, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site.

5.4. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Appropriate Assessment, therefore, is not required.

6.0 Water Framework Directive

6.1. The subject site adjoins the river Kealincha IE_SW_21K020300. The subject site is located circa 403 metres to the east of the river Kealincha.

6.2. The proposed development comprises the replacement of a 10 metre high timber pole with a 15 metre high monopole telecommunications.

6.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

6.4. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seeks to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the small scale and nature and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

7.0 Recommendation

7.1. I refer to the previous Inspector's Report and recommendation to refuse permission on this application dated 2nd August 2026. Having regard to my de novo assessment of this First Party appeal, and the further submissions from the First Party and the Planning Authority, I am satisfied that all matters have been fully addressed and I recommend that permission be granted.

8.0 Reasons and Considerations

8.1. Having regard to national, regional and local policy objectives, as set out in the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028, to support the development of a sustainable telecommunications network, to the Department of Environment, Heritage and Local

Government Section 28 Statutory Guidelines, Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures: Guidelines for Planning Authorities 1996, as updated by circular letter PL 07/12 in 2012, and to the nature and scale of the development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

9.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and particulars submitted with the planning application except as may be otherwise required by the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2	<p>The site shall be re-instated on removal of the telecommunications structure and ancillary structures at the applicants expense. Details relating to the removal and reinstatement, shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area.</p>
3	<p>Surface water drainage arrangements for the proposed development shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: in the interest of public health.</p>
4	<p>Details of a colour scheme for the mast and any ancillary structures hereby permitted shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with the planning authority, prior to the commencement of development, and the agreed colour scheme shall be applied to the mast and any ancillary structures</p>

	<p>upon erection.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area</p>
5	<p>The construction of development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development. The plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including a detailed traffic management plan, hours of working, and noise management measures.</p> <p>Reason: in the interests of public safety and residential amenity</p>
6	<p>The developer shall provide and make available at reasonable terms the proposed support structure for the provision of mobile telecommunications antenna of third party licenced telecommunications operators</p> <p>Reason: To avoid a multiplicity of telecommunications structures in the area, in the interests of visual amenity and proper planning and sustainable development</p>
7	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of [7.00am to 6.00pm] Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between [8.00am to 2.00pm] on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity</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.

Carol Smyth

Planning Inspector
17th February 2026

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-321229-24
Proposed Development Summary	Replacement telecommunications monopole
Development Address	Eir exchange, Inches, Eyeries, Co. Cork
In all cases check box /or leave blank	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a ‘project’ for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, “Project” means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a ‘Project’. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

<p>development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	

<p>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____ Date: _____