



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

### ABP-322282-25

<b>Development</b>	Installation of a 21m lattice telecom antennae support structure with associated equipment.
<b>Location</b>	Tromaty, Quigley's Point, Lifford PO., Co. Donegal.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Donegal Co. Co.
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	24/62074
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	On Tower Ireland Ltd.
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant with Conditions
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Towercom Ltd.
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	13 <sup>th</sup> June 2025
<b>Inspector</b>	Karla McBride

## 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 .....	5
3.4. Third Party Observations .....	5
4.0 Planning History .....	6
5.0 Policy Context .....	6
5.1. Development Plan .....	6
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations .....	9
6.0 EIA Screening .....	9
7.0 The Appeal .....	10
7.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	10
7.2. Applicant Response .....	11
7.3. Planning Authority Response .....	12
7.4. Observations .....	12
7.5. Further Responses .....	12
8.0 Assessment .....	13
9.0 AA Screening .....	19
10.0 Recommendation .....	19
11.0 Reasons and Considerations .....	20
12.0 Conditions .....	20

**Appendix 1 –**        Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening  
AA Screening Determination

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The appeal site is located within the townland of Tromaty at Quigley's Point on the SE end of the Inishowen peninsula in County Donegal, and to the W of the R238 which extends along the peninsula. The site is located within a mainly rural area on the periphery of a small village, and to the rear of an existing farm building. Access to the site is off a local road known as Foyle View Point (L-7191-1) which slopes up in a SW direction and there are several houses in the surrounding area. The site is relatively flat, and the boundaries are defined by mature trees that form part of a linear wooded area that extends along the Tromaty / Bogstown River which drains into Lough Foyle c.380m to the E.
- 1.2. The appeal site is located within an area of High Scenic Amenity. It is also located close to an Area of Especially High Scenic Amenity that extends E across the R238 to Lough Foyle. The R238 forms part of the Wild Atlantic Way and Lough Foyle is a designated SPA. There are no other recorded heritage features of in the vicinity.
- 1.3. The attached photographs and maps describe the site in more detail.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. Planning permission is being sought develop the c.0.007ha site to provide:
  - A 21m high lattice telecommunications antennae support structure (carrying antennas, dish & remote radio units).
  - Ground based equipment cabinets.
  - Palisade fencing & associated site works.
  - Vehicular access off the local road (L-7191-1).

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Decision**

Following the receipt of further information in relation to the submission of a Technical Justification report in line with policy TC-P-2 which requires the

consideration of co-location on existing masts as a first preference, the PA decided to grant permission subject to 5 standard conditions.

- Nos. 1 & 2 requires compliance with terms and conditions.
- No.3 required aeronautical obstacle lighting & liaison with the IAA.
- No.4 required decommissioning & reinstatement.
- No. 5 deals with surface water run-off

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

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

- The Planning Officer's report assessed the proposed development under the standard range of issues (incl. policy compliance, siting & design, access / traffic safety, public health, European sites & development contributions), it concluded that the proposed development was acceptable, and it recommended a grant of planning permission subject to conditions.

#### **3.2.2. Other Technical Reports**

- No reports received.

### **3.3. Prescribed Bodies**

- No submissions received.

### **3.4. Third Party Observations**

One submission received from Towercom Ltd the owner and operator of a recently constructed telecom mast to the NE of the site who raised concerns in relation to:

- The potential of the existing mast for site sharing and co-location.
- The existing mast is capable of being extended in height to accommodate additional telecommunications equipment, subject to planning permission.

## 4.0 Planning History

### ***Appeal site:***

None of note for appeal site.

### ***Nearby:***

**ABP-311217-21:** Permission granted following a first party appeal for the removal of two existing 10m wooden pole structures and installation of a 21m monopole structure at Quigley's Point, c. 280m to the NE of the appeal site. The height was reduced from 21m to 18m so as to reduce the visual impact of the structure on the village and surrounding landscape.

- **Condition no.1** stated that 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 proposing a structure height of 18m (overall height 19.5m) received by ABP on the 25th day of August, 2021, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Reason: In the interest of clarity.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. National & Regional Policy/Guidance

- 5.2. ***The National Planning Framework (NPF):*** acknowledges that telecommunications networks play a crucial role in enabling social and economic activity. It states that broadband is essential enabling infrastructure that affords rural communities the same opportunities to engage with the digital economy as it does to those who live in our cities and towns. NPO 24 aims to support & facilitate delivery of the National Broadband Plan as a means of developing further opportunities for enterprise, employment, education, innovation & skills development for people in rural areas.

**NWRA Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy 2020-2032:** Section 6.5 deals with 'Broadband Connectivity' and highlights the importance of improving coverage in rural areas. RPO 6.36 supports the roll-out of the National Broadband Plan. Section 6.6 deals with the 'Smart Region', and RPO 6.52 aims to facilitate infrastructural needs (incl. immediate priorities for access to ultra-fast & rural broadband initiatives).

**Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (1996):** set out the criteria for the assessment of telecommunications structures.

- Section 3.2 sets out that an authority should indicate in their Development Plan an acceptance of the importance of a high-quality telecommunications service, as well as any locations where telecommunications installations would not be favoured or where special conditions would apply. Such locations might include high amenity lands or sites beside schools.
- Section 4.3 outlines that the visual impact is among the more important considerations which have to be taken into account in arriving at a decision on a particular application. Whatever the general visual context, great care will have to be taken when dealing with fragile or sensitive landscapes. The sharing of installations and clustering of antennae is encouraged, as co-location would reduce the visual impact on the landscape.
- Section 4.5 states that only as a last resort should free-standing masts be located within or in the immediate surrounds of smaller towns or villages, within 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.

**Circular Letter PL07/12 – Telecommunications Antennae & Support Structures 2012:** revises elements of the 1996 Guidelines as follows: - temporary permissions

should only be used in exceptional circumstances where particular site / environmental conditions apply; separation distances between telecommunication structures and sensitive receptors should not be incorporated into statutory plans; bonds for the removal of structures should not apply; and a register of approved structures should be maintained.

### 5.3. Donegal Development Plan 2024-2030

The appeal site lies within a rural area on the edge of a small village that is covered by the policies and objectives of the Development Plan. The site lies within an area that is identified as being within an Area of High Scenic Amenity and Under Strong Urban Influence, close to An Area of Especially High Scenic Amenity, and within c. 380m of the Lough Foyle SPA. The following policies and objectives are relevant.

**Objective TC-O-1:** seeks to facilitate the development & delivery of a sustainable telecommunications network through a range of telecommunication systems including those arising out of: NSO 6 of the National Development Plan (NDP); the Government's 'Harnessing Digital-The Digital Ireland Framework'; and the National Broadband Plan, the National subvention plan to deliver High Speed Broadband to every rural household outside the commercially served areas as defined on the National Broadband Plan Map, subject to having due regard to natural and built heritage and to environmental considerations.

**Policy TC-P-2:** seeks the co-location of new or replacement antennae & dishes on existing masts as a first preference, and the co-location and clustering of new masts on existing sites as a second preference, unless a fully documented case for new facilities is made explaining the precise circumstances which militate against co-location and/or clustering. Proposals for replacement antennae and dishes, support structures & associated access roads shall be generally supported where they can be sited & located in a manner that does not negatively impact on the visual amenities, built & archaeological heritage or qualifying interest of any given area.



**Policy L-P-1:** seeks to protect areas identified as ‘Especially High Scenic Amenity’ on Map 11.1 ‘Scenic Amenity’. Within these areas, only developments of strategic importance, or developments that are provided for by policy elsewhere in this Plan may be considered.

**Policy L-P-2:** seeks to protect areas identified as ‘High Scenic Amenity’ and ‘Moderate Scenic Amenity’ on Map 11.1 ‘Scenic Amenity’. Within these areas, only development of a nature, location & scale that integrates with, and reflects the character and amenity of the landscape may be considered, subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan.

**Map 11.1 Scenic Amenity:**

*Areas of Especially High Scenic Amenity:* located nearby.

*Area of High Scenic Amenity:* site lies within.

**Policy BIO-P-1:** requires compliance with the requirements of the EU Habitats Directive and EU Bird Directive, including ensuring that development proposals:

- a. Do not adversely affect the integrity of any European/Natura 2000.
- b. Provide for the protection of protected animal & plant species.
- c. Protect & enhance features of the landscape (i.e. rivers, field boundaries, ponds & small woods) that are important for wildlife the Natura 2000 network.

#### 5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

- Lough Foyle SPA is located to the E.

#### 6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development does not come within the definition of a ‘project’ for the purposes of EIA, that is, it does not comprise construction works, demolition or intervention in the natural surroundings. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

## 7.0 The Appeal

### 7.1. Grounds of Appeal

One Third Party appeal against the decision of DCC to grant planning permission was received from Towercom Ltd, who own and operate a recently permitted and constructed telecom mast c. 280m to the NE of the site.

They raised concerns in relation to:

- The two sites are c.280m apart, located on either side of the R240, and with houses and commercial uses in-between.
- Appeal site is located at 15m ASL and the existing site is located at 9m ASL.
- Dev. Plan policies & objectives seek to promote the telecom network and co-location to eliminate demand & protect visual amenity (TC-O-1 & TC-P-1 to 4).
- DoE 1996 Guidelines advise on design, setting, visual impact & co-location.
- Inadequate examination of potential of the existing mast for site sharing and co-location, and it is capable of being extended in height to accommodate additional telecommunications equipment, subject to planning permission.
- Appeal site lies within an Area of High Scenic Amenity, close to a wooded area and close to the village & several houses, therefore the lattice design is inappropriate, and proximity to the woodland would restrict future co-location.
- Inadequate consideration of other masts in the surrounding area and inappropriate inclusion of 3G services which are being phased out.
- Any future height increase at the existing structure would not result in adverse visual impacts from several Viewpoint locations because of the topography and level of natural coverage.
- **Conclusion:**
  - No need for the proposed structure.
  - Inappropriate lattice design.
  - Possible site clearance required & tree loss.

- Unacceptable references to 3G services.
- Several existing masts omitted from Technical Justification.
- No consideration of extending the existing mast.

## 7.2. Applicant Response

- Clear lack of coverage for Three Ireland for both Indoor & Outdoor coverage and the proposed development is crucial in providing high-speed broadband.
- There is a technical requirement for a 21m high structure height to avoid the signal being blocked by dense tree cover.
- The lattice design is suitable for rural area as it is “see through” and not solid.
- Suggested extension to the existing monopole is not suitable for several reasons, including:
  - Structural integrity of monopole.
  - Coverage outage during replacement (c.1-4 weeks).
  - Unsuitable configuration of antennas on monopole structure.
  - Line of sight from the suggested extended monopole is inferior to that of the proposed 21m lattice structure.
- DCC already refused permission for an identical proposal to the extension of the Towercom site for a 21m structure, and a reduced structure of 18m was granted permission by ABP (311217).
- Legal agreement with Eircom requires its equipment to be located on the top 3m slot, unclear if this can be accommodated on the extended monopole, and a much higher structure may be required with resultant visual impacts.
- The Appellant’s photomontage is inaccurate and misleading (report attached) and significant visual impacts are predicted by the extended monopole.
- Broadband is an essential public service like water & electricity.
- Proposal is in accordance with the 1996 Guidelines.

### **7.3. Planning Authority Response**

- No new issues raised.

### **7.4. Observations**

- None received.

### **7.5. Further Responses**

- None received.

## 8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. The main issues arising are:

- Principle of development
- Visual amenity
- Residential amenity
- Drainage
- Vehicular access
- Other issues

### 8.1.1. **Principle of development**

The proposed development would be located within the mainly rural townland of Tromaty on the periphery of a village at Quigley's Point on the SE end of the Inishowen peninsula. It would lie within an "Area of High Scenic Amenity" that is "Under Strong Urban Influence" and close to an "Area of Especially High Scenic Amenity" as designated in the Donegal County Development Plan 2024 to 2030.

National policy for telecommunications structures is summarised in section 5.1 above. The National Planning Framework (NPF) acknowledges that telecommunications networks play a crucial role in enabling social and economic activity. The NWRA Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy aims to facilitate the roll out of broadband and telecommunications infrastructure. The Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (1996) set out the criteria for the assessment of telecom structures. Section 4.3 recommends the avoidance of high amenity lands and encourages the sharing of installations and clustering of antennae, and co-location to reduce visual impacts on the landscape. Section 4.5 states that only as a last resort should free-standing masts be located within or in the immediate surrounds of smaller towns or villages.

Local policy is summarised in section 5.2 above, and it seeks to comply with national and regional policy. Development Plan Objective TC-O-1 seeks to facilitate the

development and delivery of a sustainable telecommunications network through a range of systems, subject to having due regard to heritage and environmental considerations. Policy TC-P-2 seeks the co-location of new or replacement antennae and dishes on existing masts as a first preference, and the co-location and clustering of new masts on existing sites as a second preference, unless a fully documented case for new facilities is made explaining the precise circumstances which militate against co-location and/or clustering.

The applicant submitted a Justification Report which identified a lack of coverage for Three Ireland for both Indoor and Outdoor coverage and stated that the proposal is crucial in providing high-speed broadband in the area. The applicant referenced a technical requirement for a 21m high structure, and the need to occupy the upper 3m slot, to avoid the signal being blocked by dense tree cover or other obstructions. The report concludes that co-location and mast sharing is not an option.

The Appellant (Towercom Ltd.) operates the existing telecom monopole structure to the NE of the site. The appeal submission referred to the national and local policy context and queried the lack of consideration for mast sharing and co-location. It stated that their existing mast is capable of being extended in height to accommodate additional telecommunications equipment, subject to planning permission. It queried the lack of consideration of other masts in the surrounding area and noted the phasing out of 3G services. In response, the applicant stated that the existing monopole is not suitable for several reasons (as above) and referenced the Board's decision to reduce its height for reasons related to visual impact.

Having regard to foregoing, I am satisfied that the proposed development is acceptable in principle as it would contribute the roll out of broadband and related telecommunication networks to rural areas, which would be in line with national, regional and local policy and objectives. I also note that the applicant submitted a Justification Test report in support of the application which concluded that co-location and mast sharing is not an option, although I am not entirely satisfied that all possible options have been investigated.

However, and notwithstanding this conclusion, further assessment is required of compliance with the more detailed aspects of national guidance and local planning policy in relation to siting and visual impact, having regard to the masts location

within an Area of High Visual Amenity, on the perimeter of a small village and close to an Area of High Scenic Amenity and the Wild Atlantic Way. These concerns will be addressed in more detail in section 8.1.2 below.

I have had regard to the alternatives proposed by the Appellant in relation to shared facilities and co-location. Although the Board previously granted permission for a telecommunications structure on lands c.280m to the NE of the appeal site under ABP-311217-21, it reduced the height from 21m to 18m (overall height 19.5m) by way of Condition no.1, so as to reduce the visual impact of the structure on the village and surrounding landscape, as summarised in section 4.0 above.

Furthermore, a planning application would be required to alter the scale and height of the existing structure, the outcome of which is outside the Commission's remit.

#### **8.1.2. Visual amenity**

The proposed development would be located within the mainly rural townland of Tromaty and on the periphery of a small village at Quigleys Point. The site is located within c.170m of the R238 which extends along the E side of the Inishowen peninsula, and within c.380m of Lough Foyle. The site lies within a designated Area of High Scenic Amenity and within c.150m of an Area of Especially High Scenic Amenity that extends across the R238 to Lough Foyle. The R238 also forms part of the Wild Atlantic Way. The elevated site is located to the rear of an existing farm building along a local road known as Foyle View Point and there are several houses in the surrounding area. The local road and surrounding lands slope up in a SW direction, and there is a small dense wooded area around the site which extends down to and along the Tromaty / Bogstown River to form a linear woodland.

Policies L-P-1 and L-P-2, which are summarised in section 5.1 above, seeks to protect areas identified as Especially High Scenic Amenity and High Scenic Amenity. Only developments of strategic importance, or developments that are provided for by policy elsewhere in this Plan may be considered in Areas of Especially High Scenic Amenity, and only development of a nature, location and scale that integrates with, and reflects the character and amenity of the landscape may be considered in Areas of High Scenic Amenity, subject to compliance with other relevant policies.

The proposed 21m high lattice telecommunications antennae support structure, ground-based equipment, and associated site works would occupy a c.70sq.m. site. The structure would be located c.15m above sea level (ASL) as per the submitted drawings. I note that a supporting photo montage document was submitted with the application and appeal submission which illustrates views of the proposed and existing structures from various locations.

I also note that the Board previously granted permission for a telecommunications structure on a nearby site c.280m to the NE of the appeal site under ABP-311217-21. However, the Board reduced the height from 21m to 18m (overall height 19.5m) by way of Condition no.1, so as to reduce the visual impact of the structure on the village and surrounding landscape, as summarised in section 4.0 above.

I note from my site inspection that this permitted and now constructed structure is located at the bottom of a hill, and at a lower level than the proposed structure. The proposed structure would occupy an elevated position c.15m ASL while the permitted structure is located at c.9m ASL (as per the Appellant's submission). Taking account of the c.6m difference in site levels, along with the overall height of the permitted structure (19.5m) and the height of the proposed structure (21m), the proposed structure would be c.7.5m taller when viewed from the surrounding scenic amenity areas, including from along the R238 Wild Atlantic Way and Lough Foyle.

In relation to national guidance, I note that the Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (1996) sets out the criteria for the assessment of telecommunication structures (incl. avoidance of high amenity lands & small villages). At local level, in terms of the siting of such structures, Development Plan Objective TC-O-1 seeks to have due regard to natural and built heritage and to environmental considerations, and Policy TC-P-2 seeks to avoid negative impacts on the visual amenities. Furthermore, Policies L-P-1 and L-P-2 (summarised in section 5.2 above) seek to protect areas identified as Especially High and High Scenic Amenity, and only development of a nature, location and scale that integrates with, and reflects the character and amenity of the landscape may be considered within Areas of High Scenic Amenity.



The proposed structure would occupy an elevated position adjacent to a wooded area, and it would be highly visible from several locations, including from various points along the R238 to the E and from along the shore of Lough Foyle. Having regard to the policy provisions for these areas of Especially High and High Scenic Amenity, the village, rural and coastal character of the site and surrounding area, its proximity to the R238 (Wild Atlantic Way), and the relatively narrow separation distance to Lough Foyle, taken in conjunction with the concerns raised by the Board in relation to the visual impact of a similar structure to the NE of the site which occupies a lower level than the appeal site, I am satisfied that the visual impact concerns raised in the previous application and appeal for a telecom structure at Quigleys Point remain valid.

The proposed structure would be visually dominant within an Area of High Scenic Amenity and when viewed from within an Area of Especially High Scenic Amenity. It would have an adverse impact on the visual amenities of the surrounding rural and nearby coastal areas, and it would set an undesirable precedent for future developments within and close to visually sensitive locations. Furthermore, having regard to the presence of an existing telecom structure c.280m to the N of the site, it would also give rise to a proliferation of msts in an around the small village of Quigleys Point.

***Conclusion:***

Having regard to the foregoing, I am not satisfied that the proposed development would not have an adverse visual impact on the village, rural and coastal character of the surrounding area which is designated as an Area of High Scenic Amenity, located close to Area of Especially High Scenic Amenity, and it would set an undesirable precedent for further similar development in such areas.

**8.1.3. Residential amenity**

There are existing rows of houses to the N and SW of proposed development, and the village at Quigleys Point is located nearby. The proposed structure would not overlook or overshadow any houses, given the substantial setbacks form the nearest properties which is in excess of c.60m. I note that no submissions were received

from any residents in the area. I am satisfied that the proposed development would not have any significant adverse impacts on the residential amenities of the occupants of the nearby houses.

#### 8.1.4. **Site drainage**

The appeal site and adjoining fields slope up moderately along the local road in a NW direction, the site boundaries are defined by a small, wooded area that extends along the Tromaty / Bogstown River, which in turn flows E through the village towards Lough Foyle. I note that no drainage details were submitted, however given the nature and scale of the proposed development, it is unlikely to generate any significant surface water runoff. Furthermore, the land felt firm underfoot and there was no evidence of waterlogging or ponding (note that I carried out my site inspection on the day after very heavy and prolonged rainfall). The proposed development would not generate any wastewater, and it would not give rise to a flood risk down gradient at the stream, along the local road or at adjoining lands.

#### 8.1.5. **Vehicular access**

Vehicular access to the proposed structure would be directly off the adjoining local road (L-7191-1) and via the existing undefined entrance to the farm building. There is adequate space for off street parking during the installation works. Given the nature and scale of the proposed development, it is likely to require car parking for maintenance purposes only. I am satisfied that the proposed development would not give rise to a traffic hazard or endanger the safety of other road users.

#### 8.1.6. **Other issues**

**Development contributions:** None required.

**WFD Assessment:** not required given the small scale and nature of the works.

## 9.0 AA Screening

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the Lough Foyle European Site (SPA) in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration.

Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- Nature and scale of the works.
- Distance from the nearest European site.
- Lack of connections over a reasonable distance.
- Lack of suitable support habitat.

## 10.0 Recommendation

10.1. Having regard to the foregoing, I recommend that planning permission be refused for the proposed development.

## 11.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The proposed development would comprise the installation of a 21m high lattice telecommunications antennae structure on the periphery of a small village at Quigley's Point. It would be located within an area that is designated as being within an "Area of High Scenic Amenity" and "Under Strong Urban Influence", in the County Donegal Development Plan, 2024 to 2030, and close to an "Area of Especially High Scenic Amenity". Objective TC-O-1 and Policies TC-P-2, L-P-1 and L-P-2 apply in relation to appropriate siting and visual impacts of such structures. The proposed structure would be visually dominant within an "Area of High Scenic Amenity" and when viewed from within the nearby "Area of Especially High Scenic Amenity", and it would have an adverse visual impact on the small village, surrounding high amenity landscapes and nearby coastal area. It would set an undesirable precedent for future developments within sensitive locations that lie within and close to designated "Areas of High Scenic Amenity" and "Areas of Especially High Scenic Amenity". Furthermore, having regard to the presence of an existing telecommunications structure in the area, also on the periphery of the village, the proposed development would give rise to a proliferation of telecommunication structures in an around Quigleys Point. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 12.0 Conditions

None recommended.

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.

---

Karla McBride  
Planning Inspector

26<sup>th</sup> June 2025

## Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

### No EIAR Submitted

<b>Case Reference</b>	ABP-322282-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	21m lattice telecommunications antennae support structure, ground-based equipment & site works.
<b>Development Address</b>	Tromaty, Quigley's Point, Lifford PO, Co. Donegal
	<b>In all cases check box /or leave blank</b>
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>  (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 type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.  <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	State the Class here
<input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>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?</b>	
<input 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><b>No Screening required.</b></p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p><b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b></p>	<p><b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b></p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p><b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b></p>	<p><b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b></p>

<p><b>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)?</b></p>	
<p><b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p><b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	

**Inspector: Karla McBride     Date: 26<sup>th</sup> June 2025**

## Template 2: Standard AA Screening Determination Template

### Test for likely significant effects

(For use in all cases beyond de minimis criteria)

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects				
<b>Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics</b> 21m lattice telecom antennae support structure, ground based equipment & site development works. Rural area, beside an agricultural shed, moderate slope, surrounded by mature trees, downstream water course & several houses in vicinity.				
<b>Brief description of project</b>		Installation of a 21m lattice telecom antennae support structure, ground based equipment, and all associated site development works.		
<b>Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms</b>		21m lattice telecom antennae support structure. Ground based equipment & site works. Moderately sloping agricultural field bound by mature trees. Downgradient watercourse c.80m. Lough Foyle SPA c.380m (direct) & c.450m (aquatic) to E. Aquatic connection between downgradient watercourse & SPA		
<b>Screening report</b>		N		
<b>Natura Impact Statement</b>		N		
<b>Relevant submissions</b>		None		
<b>Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model</b>				
European Site (code)	Qualifying interests <sup>1</sup> Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections <sup>2</sup>	Consider further in screening <sup>3</sup> Y/N
Lough Foyle SPA (004087)	<a href="#">Lough Foyle SPA National Parks &amp; Wildlife Service</a>	380m (direct) 450m (aquatic)	None	No



<sup>1</sup> Summary description / **cross reference to NPWS website** is acceptable at this stage in the report

<sup>2</sup> Based on source-pathway-receptor: Direct/ indirect/ tentative/ none, via surface water/ ground water/ air/ use of habitats by mobile species

<sup>3</sup>if no connections: N

### Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination) on European Sites

[From the AA Screening Report or the Inspector's own assessment if no Screening Report submitted, complete the following table where European sites need further consideration taking the following into account:

- (a) Identify potential direct or indirect impacts (if any) arising from the project alone that could have an effect on the European Site(s) taking into account the size and scale of the proposed development and all relevant stages of the project (See Appendix 9 in Advice note 1A).
- (b) Are there any design or standard practice measures proposed that would reduce the risk of impacts to surface water, wastewater etc. that would be implemented regardless of proximity to a European Site?
- (c) Identify possible significant effects on the European sites in view of the conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other plans and projects)

#### AA Screening matrix

Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
<b>Site 1: Lough Foyle SPA (004087)</b>  <b>QI / SCI list:</b>  Red-throated Diver Great Crested Grebe Bewick's Swan Whooper Swan Greylag Goose Light-bellied Brent Goose Shelduck & Teal Mallard & Eider Red-breasted Merganser Oystercatcher Golden Plover Lapwing & Wigeon	Direct: None   Indirect: None (no aquatic connections over a reasonable distance & no support habitat).	None.

Knot & Dunlin Bar-tailed Godwit Curlew & Redshank Black-headed Gull Common Gull Herring Gull Wetland & Waterbirds		
	<b>Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone):</b>  <b>No</b>	
	<b>If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?</b>  <b>No</b>	
	<b>Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*</b>  <b>No</b>	
<b>Further Commentary / discussion (only where necessary)</b>		
<b>Step 4 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site</b>		
<p>I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on the Lough Foyle SPA. The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European sites. No further assessment is required for the project.</p> <p>No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.</p>		

## **Screening Determination**

### **Finding of no likely significant effects**

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the Lough Foyle European Site (SPA) in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration.

Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- Nature and scale of the works.
- Distance from the nearest European site.
- Lack of connections over a reasonable distance.
- Lack of suitable support habitat.