



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

### ABP-322123-25

---

|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Development</b>                  | Installation of a 20m monopole and associated telecommunications equipment |
| <b>Location</b>                     | Ballyrandle Road, Dungarvan, Co. Waterford                                 |
| <b>Planning Authority</b>           | Waterford City and County Council  |
| <b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b> | 24/236   |
| <b>Applicant(s)</b>                 | On Tower Ltd   |
| <b>Type of Application</b>          | S.254 Licence  |
| <b>Planning Authority Decision</b>  | Refuse   |
| <b>Type of Appeal</b>               | First Party  |
| <b>Appellant(s)</b>                 | On Tower Ltd   |
| <b>Observer(s)</b>                  | None   |
| <b>Date of Site Inspection</b>      | 22 <sup>nd</sup> of November 2025  |
| <b>Inspector</b>                    | Karen Hamilton   |

# Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1.0 Site Location and Description .....                             | 4  |
| 2.0 Proposed Development .....                                      | 4  |
| 3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....                               | 4  |
| 3.1. Decision .....   | 4  |
| 3.2. Planning Authority Reports .....                               | 5  |
| 3.3. Prescribed Bodies .....  | 6  |
| 3.4. Third Party Observations .....                                 | 6  |
| 4.0 Planning History.....   | 6  |
| 5.0 Legislative Context .....                                       | 6  |
| 5.1. Planning and Development Act, 2000 .....                       | 6  |
| 6.0 Policy Context.....   | 7  |
| 6.1. National Policy .....  | 7  |
| 6.2. Regional Policy .....  | 9  |
| 6.3. Waterford City & County Development Plan 2022-2028 (CCDP)..... | 10 |
| 6.4. Natural Heritage Designations .....                            | 12 |
| 7.0 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening .....           | 12 |
| 8.0 The Appeal .....  | 12 |
| 8.1. Grounds of Appeal .....  | 12 |
| 8.2. Planning Authority Response.....                               | 14 |
| 8.3. Observations.....  | 14 |
| 9.0 Assessment .....  | 14 |
| 9.1. Compliance with Section 254 Criteria .....                     | 14 |
| 10.0 Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening .....                    | 19 |

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
| 11.0 | Water Framework Directive (WFD) Screening..... | 19 |
| 12.0 | Recommendation .....                           | 20 |
| 13.0 | Reasons and Considerations.....                | 20 |
| 14.0 | Conditions .....                               | 20 |
| 15.0 | Appendix 1 - EIA Pre-Screening – Form 1 .....  | 23 |

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located within the to the east of Dungarvan within a suburban settlement of Ballinroad, Co. Waterford. Ballinroad is located within the defined settlement of Dungarvan.
- 1.2. The subject site is to the south of the built-up urban area, adjacent to the Clonea Road, Greenway Car Park. The site is to the south of the Waterford Greenway and north of the Ballyrandle Road which links the main regional road network south, to Clonea Bay. The location of the proposed mast is located to the west of a public carpark, associated with the greenway. The Railway Café is beside the greenway and public carpark and there is a pedestrian/ cyclist crossing point on the greenway beside the cafe.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises of:
  - Installation of a 20m metre monopole and 2 cabinets.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

Decision to refuse permission for one reason stated below:

It is considered that the granting of a licence under section 254 of the Planning and Development Act, 200 (as amended), for the erection of the proposed twenty metre high telecommunications structure and associated infrastructure, having regard to the scale and nature of the proposed development in a prominent location adjoining the Waterford Greenway and in close proximity to other tourist amenities in the area, that the proposed development would constitute a highly obtrusive feature in the receiving landscape, would have a significant adverse visual impact and would thereby be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the planner reflects the above decision to refuse permission and refers to the following:

#### Background

- The location proposed beside the Waterford Greenway is noted.
- The design of the telecommunication infrastructure and cabinets on land owned by Waterford County Council and no consent from the council has been given for the use of the lands.

#### Justification

- The applicant has submitted justification for the infrastructure on the basis of the broadband coverage for customers in the area.
- The area planner notes the submitted plans indicate the existing indoor coverage in Ballinroad to be good-marginal, it is unclear if this is only for Three customers.
- The applicants states that options for all other alternative sites have been exhausted.

#### Visual Impact

- Section 4.3 of the 1996 Guidelines refer to visual impact and the fact that masts may be 'noticeable' and 'intrusive'.
- The applicant's photomontages are poor and grainy and would not accurately reflect the visual impact of the proposed development.
- The applicant's visual impact concludes that the impact of the proposed development would be slight to moderate.
- The site is in a prominent location, would be highly visible, there Waterford greenway is a tourist amenity area
- Section 4.10 of the development plan states that the greenway should be protected as an important amenity

- The proposal would read as a seriously injurious feature of the landscape.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

No reports received.

### 3.2.3. Conditions

Not relevant.

## 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None received.

## 3.4. Third Party Observations

None received.

## 4.0 Planning History

No relevant planning history on the site.

## 5.0 Legislative Context

### 5.1. Planning and Development Act, 2000

Section 254(1)(ee) of the Planning & Development Act, 2000 (as amended), states that a person shall not erect, construct, place or maintain overground electronic communications infrastructure and any associated physical infrastructure on, under, over or along a public road save in accordance with a licence under this section.

Section 254(6)(a) states that any person may appeal to the Board in relation to the granting, refusing, withdrawing, or continuing of a licence.

Section 254(5) states that, in considering an application for a licence, the planning authority, or the Board on appeal, shall 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.

## 6.0 Policy Context

### 6.1. National Policy

*Telecommunications Antennae & Support Structures Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 1996*

- The Guidelines have the status of ministerial guidelines as per section 28 PDA 2000 and, as such, the Board has a duty to “have regard” to them.
- The Guidelines reference the location of masts in upland/mountainous areas, within or in the immediate vicinity of smaller towns or villages and in the vicinity of larger towns and in city suburbs. In terms of visual impact, justification for locating free standing masts within the city suburbs, towns, and villages is required.
- Section 4.3 includes: “*In the vicinity of larger towns and in city suburbs operators should endeavour to locate in industrial estates or in industrially zoned land*”. Other possibilities should also be explored, including some commercial or retail areas (e.g. rooftop locations, locating “disguised” masts), existing ESB substations and preference is given to the use tall buildings or other existing structures over a new independent support structure. It also includes that only as a last resort and if the suggested alternatives (possibilities) are either unavailable or unsuitable should free-standing masts be located in a residential area or beside schools. In that event, existing utility sites should be considered, and specific design solutions should be employed including that the support structure should be kept to a minimum height consistent with effective operation and should be monopole (or poles) rather than a latticed tripod or square structure.
- Care should be given when dealing with sensitive landscapes and other designated areas. Proximity to listed buildings should be avoided.

*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.

*Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011)*

Section 3.11: Management of Architectural Conservation Areas.

- Consideration given to the management of infrastructural developments.
- Large scale infrastructural development adjacent to an ACA may have an impact on the character.

*Climate Action Plan (CAP) 2025*

- CAP 2025 to be read in conjunction with CAP 2024, the relevant part being Section 11.2.4.
- Section 10.1.8: Digital Transformation. The CAP supports the national digital transformation framework and recognises the importance of this transformation to achieve Ireland's climate targets.
- The transition towards green and digital societies is highlighted throughout the CAP 2025, as an overarching aim to achieve decarbonisation and net zero commitments.
- Section 15 of the Climate and Low Carbon Development Act 2015 as amended (the Climate Act), obliges the Board to make all decisions in a manner that is consistent with the current CAP.

*Harnessing Digital. The Digital Ireland Framework.*

- Section 2.1: Enable the physical telecommunication infrastructure and services delivering digital connectivity in line with the National Broadband plan.

### *National Planning Framework 'Project Ireland 2040'*

- First Revision (April 2025)
- National Policy Objective 31: Support and facilitate delivery of the National Broadband Plan as a means of developing further opportunities for enterprise, employment, education, innovation, and skills development for those who live and work in rural areas.
- National Policy Objective 62: In co-operation with relevant Departments in Northern Ireland, develop a stable, innovative and secure digital communications and services infrastructure on an all-island basis.

### *National Development Plan 2021-2030*

- The government recognises that access to quality high speed broadband is essential for today's economy and society.

### *National Broadband Plan 2020*

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

## **6.2. Regional Policy**

### *Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy for the Southern Region 2040*

- Section 4.7: Guiding principles for enterprise include the availability of different types of infrastructure including telecommunications.
- Section 6.2: Telecommunications infrastructure is essential to ensure digital connectivity.

### 6.3. Waterford City & County Development Plan 2022-2028 (CCDP)

This combined City and County Development Plan (CCDP) is the overarching plan for policy and guidance on telecommunications infrastructure. A review of the Dungarvan/ Ballinroad Local Area Plan 2023-2029 was undertaken in 2023; no Local Area Plan has been finalised. The following policies from the CCDP are relevant in the determination of this appeal:

#### 6.3.1. Land Use Zoning (Volume 4 of the CCDP)

The site is located to the east of Dungarvan, south of Ballinroad on lands zoned as High Amenity HA, where it is an objective to 'Protect highly sensitive and scenic location from inappropriate development that would adversely affect the environmental quality of the locations

#### 6.3.2. Settlement Hierarchy

- Dungarvan & Ballinroad is identified as a Key town in the Waterford CCDP settlement strategy

#### 6.3.3. Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment

- The site is located in a landscape which has been classified in the CCDP as 'Low Sensitive', a common character type with a potential to absorb a wide range of new developments.

#### 6.3.4. Telecommunications Infrastructure

Chapter 6: Utilities Infrastructure, Energy & Communication

##### **Policy Objective UTL 16: ICT/ Communications**

We will work in collaboration with service providers to deliver a more enhanced connectivity service experience in a way that protects our footway and road surfaces and delivers the economic and community benefits of technology. We will facilitate the continued provision of communication networks, smart infrastructure, broadband and appropriate telecommunications infrastructure and services, subject to environmental considerations, in order to contribute to economic growth, development, resilience and competitiveness. In considering proposals for such infrastructure and associated equipment, the following will be taken into account:

- The installation of the smallest suitable equipment to meet the technological requirements,
- Solutions to deliver shared telecommunication physical infrastructure in new development to facilitate multiple service providers at a non-exclusive basis and at economically sustainable cost to service providers and end users,
- Concealing or disguising masts, antennas, equipment housing and cable runs through design or camouflage techniques; or
- A description of the siting and design options explored and the reason for the chosen solution, details of the design, including height, materials and all components of the proposals,
- A landscaping and screen planting plan (if appropriate),
- An assessment of the cumulative effects of the development in combination with existing equipment in the area; and a visual impact assessment (if relevant).

Proposed development will be required to have regard to the “Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures - Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 1996 and Circular Letter PL07/12” issued by the Department of the Environment Heritage and Local Government and to any subsequent amendments as may be issued.

#### 6.3.5. Chapter 11: Landscape, Coast/ Marine and Blue Green Infrastructure.

##### **Section 10.3.1 Greenways**

- The expansion of Waterford Greenways is an important part of the tourism

Policy Objective BG1 06: Enhancing Waterford Greenway: Supporting the enhancement and expansion of Waterford Greenways

Policy Objective BG1 07: Support the development of the South Eatas Greenway Network

Volume 2: Development Management Standards

- Table 11.2: Utility is open for consideration in the High Amenity zoning

## 6.4. Natural Heritage Designations

None of relevance.

## 7.0 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening

- 7.1.1. 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. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

## 8.0 The Appeal

### 8.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal are submitted from the applicant in relation to the refusal from the planning authority (PA).

The issues raised are summarised below:

#### 8.1.1. Visual Impact

- The quality of the photomontage is the same as prepared for hundreds of applications across the country and this is the first time the issues has been raised.
- The quality of the visuals is sufficient to undertake an assessment.
- The applicant disagrees with the planner's opinion that there will be a visual impact on the Waterford greenway and associated tourist areas.
- The design of the monopoles are slender by their nature and innocuous type structures.
- An extract from an Inspector's report for ABP 309598 is quoted and notes these structures are becoming a normal part of the urban streetscape and while the visual impact is unavoidable it would not have an undue adverse impact on the surrounding lands uses of the protected structures.

- An extract from an inspector's report for ABP 311526 is quoted and notes that the mast will be more prominent than some existing structures in the vicinity, including overhead powerlines. Although did not consider it would be so visually disruptive that it would seriously injure the visual and residential amenities of the area.
- An extract from an inspector's report for ABP 306440 is quoted and notes that the structure of the pole is nondescript in character and design and not dissimilar in scale or design to a lamp standard or traffic light pole. The report notes that the structure would not be out of character or be visually obstructive.
- It is accepted that most of these references relates to urban areas although it is considered relevant as the proposed development includes a slender type of structure which would not have a negative impact on the landscape.
- The Board if referred to other structures which have been granted licences elsewhere, in similar settings. Google maps links have been provided for monopoles in Portlaoise, South Dublin and Cork.
- The site has a 'low sensitive' landscape classification.
- The High Amenity zoning is acknowledged although the landscape classification should be given more weight.
- The Visual impact assessment submitted with the application includes CGI images. 9 reference points have been included, and the structure will only be visible or partially visible from 4 of the reference points.
- The area planners report did not provide any analysis of the visual impact only it would be unacceptable in close proximity to an area used by tourists.
- While the proposed monopole will be tall and visual it will not be a dominant structure or have a materially negative impact on the amenity of the area to deter tourists.
- Extract from VRP5 which is the most visible and considered the worst-case scenario.

- The proposed development is located close to a public road which is tree lined and includes tall streetlights.

## 8.2. **Planning Authority Response**

None received

## 8.3. **Observations**

None received.

## 9.0 **Assessment**

Having regard to the above and having inspected the site and reviewed all documents on file, the following is my assessment of this case. Issues to be considered in the assessment of this case are as follows:

- Compliance with Section 254 Criteria

### 9.1. **Compliance with Section 254 Criteria**

#### 9.1.1. **Introduction**

9.1.2. The subject site is located to the south of Ballinroad, on Council owned lands along the edge of the Waterford Greenway. The grounds of appeal have been submitted by the applicant in relation to a refusal by the PA for the licence. The PA refused the application for one reason, the significant negative visual impact of the proposal having regard to the prominent location along the Waterford Greenway and in close proximity to other tourist amenities in the area.

9.1.3. The report of the area planner notes that the Council have not given permission to the applicant for the proposed telecommunication structure. This was not included in the reason for refusal for the licence. I am not aware of any requirement to have consent from the PA for submitting a S.254 application and the Commission is not precluded from assessing the appeal. I also note that any grant from the Commission does not entitle the applicant to undertake works without permission

from the landowner. Therefore, any agreement to undertake the works on public lands is a separate matter for the Council.

- 9.1.4. In considering an application for a licence under this section a planning authority, or the Board on appeal, shall have regard to the items listed under subsection 254 (5);
- a) The proper planning and sustainable development of the area,
  - b) Any relevant provisions of the development plan, or local area plan,
  - c) The number and location of existing appliances, apparatuses, or structures on, under, over or along the public road.
  - d) The convenience and safety of road users, including pedestrians.

I have addressed each of these requirements separately below.

**9.1.5. The proper planning and sustainable development of the area,**

9.1.6. The site is located along the edge of a public carpark on lands zoned for HA: High Amenity, in the Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-2028. Table 11.2 of Volume 2 of the CCDP list the use type 'utility' is open for consideration in the HA zoning. The principle of locating telecommunications infrastructure on the site is acceptable in principle.

9.1.7. The PA refused permission for the s.254 licence having regard to the national guidance 'Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures: Guidelines for Planning Authorities', the location of the site on a prominent location of the town centre and considered it would represent a significant and visually discordant features in the urban landscape. This is further details below, although the Commission will note my analysis and conclusion that there is no significant negative visual impact from the proposed development.

9.1.8. Chapter 9 of the Waterford CCDP integrates Waterford's Climate Adaption Strategy 2019 and includes polices which support the Climate Action Plan 2021 and the Low Carbon Act. I note the CAP highlights the need for green and digital societies as an overarching aim to achieve decarbonisation and net zero commitments. Section 15 of the Climate and Low Carbon Development Act 2015 as amended (the Climate Act), obliges the Commission to make all decisions in a manner that is consistent with the current CAP. Policy UTL 16 of the development plan also supports the

delivery technology taking into account solutions to deliver shared telecommunications physical infrastructure to support a sustainable economy.

9.1.9. Therefore, having regard to National and local policy, the characteristics of the proposed works, along the edge of a public carpark in an urban setting, it is not considered the proposal will have a negative impact on the surrounding area and is in keeping with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

9.1.10. **Any relevant provisions of the development plan, or local area plan,**

9.1.11. The PA reason for refusal relates to the location of the mast near the greenway, and other tourist amenities, and the visual impact of the mast on the receiving landscape as detailed below:

- It is considered that the granting of a licence under section 254 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended), for the erection of the proposed twenty metre high telecommunications structure and associated infrastructure, having regard to the scale and nature of the proposed development in a prominent location adjoining the Waterford Greenway and in close proximity to other tourist amenities in the area, that the proposed development would constitute a highly obtrusive feature in the receiving landscape, would have a significant adverse visual impact and would thereby be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

9.1.12. I note the PA reason for refusal does not refer to any specific policy or objectives of the development plan, but in the interest of completeness and compliance with the requirements of the S254 licence assessment, I have provided an assessment of those relevant policies and objectives of the development plan, with an emphasis on the visual impact of the proposed development.

9.1.13. The report of the area planner refers to Section 4.3 of the 1996 Guidelines refer to visual impact and the fact that masts may be 'noticeable' and 'intrusive' and raise concern over the quality of the photomontage illustrations submitted with the application. This is reflected in the reason for refusal without specific reference to the 1996 Guidelines.

9.1.14. The applicant's grounds of appeal note the PA comments on the quality of the photomontage drawings and considers they are adequate as they have been

acceptable by other planning authorities on a significant number of S 254 applications and they clearly indicate the visual impact of the proposal.

- 9.1.15. Map 5 of the Waterford County Development Plan indicated that the site is located within a landscape and seascape character area designated as low sensitivity. This landscape area is defined as a common character type with the potential to absorb a wide range of new developments. Map 2 of the plan indicates the site is located within the settlement of Dungarvan & Ballinrod on lands zoned as HA- High Amenity, where it is an objective to “protect highly sensitive and scenic location from inappropriate development that would adversely affect the environmental quality of the locations”. The applicants refer to the landscape characterisation of the area, with a low sensitivity and they consider this takes precedence over the HA zoning.
- 9.1.16. Policy Objective UTL 16 of the Waterford CCDP requires proposal to have regard to the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures; Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DEHLG 1996); (the Guidelines) and requires the Council to have regard to these. The Guidelines places high quality telecommunications services at the forefront of support for the economy, personal connection and protection of the environment and requires that in larger towns, cities and smaller towns and villages, the location should be necessary, and masts and antennae should be designed and adapted for the specific location.
- 9.1.17. Dungarvan & Ballinroad is a Key Town in the settlement strategy for the County. Section 4.3 includes: “*In the vicinity of **larger towns and in city suburbs** operators should endeavour to locate in industrial estates or in industrially zoned land*”. Other possibilities should also be explored, including some commercial or retail areas (e.g. rooftop locations, locating “disguised” masts), existing ESB substations and preference is given to the use tall buildings or other existing structures over a new independent support structure. It also includes that only as a last resort and if the suggested alternatives (possibilities) are either unavailable or unsuitable should free-standing masts be located in a residential area or beside schools. In that event, existing utility sites should be considered, and specific design solutions should be employed including that the support structure should be kept to a minimum height consistent with effective operation and should be monopole (or poles) rather than a latticed tripod or square structure.

- 9.1.18. In terms of the location of the proposal, I note it is not located beside a residential area or a school. There is a small cluster of one-off dwellings to the north of the site. The subject site and immediate surrounding area are rural in nature and although within the settlement area, I note the applicant's justification for need in the search area, the nearest telecommunications structure to the site and the absence of alternative locations. The planning authority did not raise any concerns with the justification for the proposal at this location referring to the ComReg data and the investigation of alternative sites. I consider the technical need to locate in this area has been justified by the applicant.
- 9.1.19. The applicant refers to the design of mast as a state-of-the-art monopole. The design of which lends the visual impact to be minimal. The application and appeal have been accompanied by photomontage illustrations (VRP 1-9). VRP 5 and 6 are the closest to the site, short range, whilst VRP 4, 8 and 9 are the furthest, long range. I have had regard to the photomontage illustrations, and I consider they clearly indicate the visual impact; I have no reason to believe that they are not representative of the proposal at this location. In my opinion the long-range photomontage illustrations indicate the visual impact to be negligible and similar in design to the street lighting pole on the opposite side of the Ballyrandle Road. The short range photomontage illustrations (VRP 5 and 6) clearly illustrate the proposed development will be visible from the greenway and the approached road from the north, although I do not consider it will have a significant negative impact on the surrounding area due to the distance from the closest area (railway cottage café), the absence of visibility from residential properties in the vicinity of the site and the flat topography of the site.
- 9.1.20. Having regard to the assessment above, I do not consider the proposal would adversely affect the environmental quality of the area and is appropriate within the landscape area of low sensitivity and the HA land use zoning. In addition, I consider the proposal can meet the requirements of Section 4.3 of the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures; Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DEHLG 1996) and is therefore in compliance with Policy Objective UTL 16 of the Waterford CCDP.

9.1.21. **The number and location of existing appliances, apparatuses, or structures on, under, over or along the public road.**

9.1.22. The site is a relatively flat area with no visibility of any significant structures in the vicinity. Aside from the standard public lighting poles along the main road, there is no other appliances, apparatuses or structures. The report of the area planner, whilst noting visual impacts, did not raised concern with regard the overconcentration of current infrastructure. Whilst the current street poles will be visible from the surrounding area, I do not consider the cumulative effect will lead to an over dominance of other structures in the vicinity.

9.1.23. **The convenience and safety of road users, including pedestrians.**

9.1.24. The proposed pole and associated boxed infrastructure will be set back from the public footpath, along an area grassed for open space. It is not considered the location of the infrastructure will cause any hazard to either pedestrians or road users. The Roads Department have no objection to the proposed development.

## 10.0 **Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening**

10.1. Having regard to the modest nature and scale of the proposed development, its location on a public carpark, connection to existing services and absence of connectivity to European sites, it is concluded that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise as the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

## 11.0 **Water Framework Directive (WFD) Screening**

11.1. Having regard to the modest nature and scale of the proposed development, it is concluded on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

## 12.0 Recommendation

12.1. I recommend that permission is granted for the proposed licence in accordance with the following reasons and considerations.

## 13.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to:

- a) The provisions of section 254 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended,
- b) the applicant's justification for telecommunications infrastructure on this site and the strategic and locational advantage for delivering digital connectivity for the settlement of Dungarvan and Ballinroad, designated as a Key town in the County Waterford settlement strategy.
- c) the government's guidelines on Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures; Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DEHLG 1996);
- d) the policies and objectives of the Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-2028 specifically Policy Objective UTL 16 and the overall design of the infrastructure and its minimal impact as demonstrated in the submitted photomontages; and

it is considered that the proposed development would not have a significant negative visual impact of the Greenway or any other tourist amenity and would be in keeping with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 14.0 Conditions

|    |   |
|----|---|
| 1. | The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted, 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 |
|----|---|

|    |  |
|----|--|
|    | <p>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>No advertisement or advertisement structure shall be erected or displayed on the proposed structure or within the curtilage of the site without a prior grant of planning permission.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the visual amenity of the area.</p>   |
| 3. | <p>Details of the proposed colour scheme for the pole, antennas, equipment containers shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the visual amenity of the area.</p>  |
| 4. | <p>In the event of the telecommunications structure and ancillary structures hereby permitted ceasing to operate for a period of 3 months, the structures shall be removed, and the site shall be reinstated within 3 months of their removal. Details regarding the removal of the structures and the reinstatement of the site shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing, within 3 months of the structures ceasing to operate, and the site shall be reinstated in accordance with the agreed details at the operators expense.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area</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.

---

Karen Hamilton  
Assistant Director of Planning

26<sup>th</sup> of January 2026

## 15.0 Appendix 1 - EIA Pre-Screening – Form 1

|  |  |          |                                |
|--|--|----------|--------------------------------|
| <b>An Bord Pleanála</b><br><b>Case Reference</b>   | <b>ABP-322123-25</b>                                       |          |                                |
| <b>Proposed Development</b><br><b>Summary</b>  | 20m telecommunications pole and associated works           |          |                                |
| <b>Development Address</b>   | s.254 Licence, Ballyrandle Road, Dungarvan, Co. Waterford. |          |                                |
| <b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b><br>(that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings) | <b>Yes</b>   | <b>X</b> |                                |
|  | <b>No</b>  |          |                                |
| <b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>  |  |          |                                |
| <b>Yes</b>   |  |          | Proceed to Q3.                 |
| <b>No</b>  | <b>X</b>   |          |                                |
| <b>3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?</b>  |  |          |                                |
| <b>Yes</b>   |  |          | EIA Mandatory<br>EIAR required |
| <b>No</b>  | <b>X</b>   |          | Proceed to Q4                  |
| <b>4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?</b>   |  |          |                                |

|     |  |  |   |
|-----|--|--|---|
| Yes |  |  | Preliminary examination required (Form 2) |
|-----|--|--|---|

| 5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted? |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| No   | X | Screening determination remains as above (Q1 to Q4) |
| Yes  |   | Screening Determination required                    |

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_