



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

**ABP-322830-25**

### **Development**

Installation of a 15m monopole and associated telecommunications equipment

### **Location**

Lacken Road, Summerfields, Co. Waterford

### **Planning Authority**

Waterford County Council

### **Planning Authority Reg. Ref.**

25/39

### **Applicant(s)**

Shared Access Limited

### **Type of Application**

S.254 Licence

### **Planning Authority Decision**

Refuse

### **Type of Appeal**

First Party

### **Appellant(s)**

Shared Access Limited

### **Observer(s)**

None

### **Date of Site Inspection**

22nd of November 2025

### **Inspector**

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 .....	7
5.1.    Planning and Development Act, 2000 .....	7
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 .....	11
7.0 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening .....	11
8.0 The Appeal .....	11
8.1.    Grounds of Appeal .....	11
8.2.    Planning Authority Response .....	13
8.3.    Observations .....	14
9.0 Assessment .....	14
9.1.    Compliance with Section 254 Criteria .....	14
9.2.    Conclusion .....	19

10.0	Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening .....	19
11.0	Water Framework Directive (WFD) Screening.....	20
12.0	Recommendation .....	20
13.0	Reasons and Considerations.....	20
14.0	Conditions .....	21
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 south of Waterford City, along the side of a public road. The road has been constructed used LIHAF funding and radiates from the south of Waterford, north to meet the site. Further north of the site, the road radiates into Waterford Town but has a rural characteristic in comparison to the southern road.
- 1.2. The site is along the public footpath, adjoining a grass verge. There is a relatively new housing estate to the southwest of the site and there are agricultural fields directly east. There is street lighting along the edge of the public footpath, beside the subject site

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises of:

- Installation of a 15m metre monopole designed to support 1 no canister antenna, 1 no. 0.3 dish and 1 no. GPS.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

Decision to refuse permission for one reason stated below:

1. Having regard to the proposed location of the proposed telecommunication pole and associated infrastructure on a public footpath/ cycle path at the Lacken Road L5522, the Planning Authority considered that the proposed development would **represent a hazard to users of the public footpath/ cycle way**. The proposed development would represent an unacceptable hazard to the public, and would result in a potential traffic hazard, would set an undesirable precedent for similar types of development in the area and would therefore 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

- Part of the site is located on lands zoned for open space although this section of the site is on the footpath associated with the public road.
- Utilities are open for consideration.
- The applicant has submitted a planning report, visual impact assessment and technical justifications for the proposed development.
- The proposed location is part of the LIHAF distributor Road with the cabinet and mini pillar along the eastern side but within the existing concrete footpath.
- The submitted photo montage illustrates the pole will be of a similar height to the streetlights along the road although the photomontage does not appear to accurately reflect the location of the mast.
- The Roads Engineer has raised concerns regarding the proposed development including:
  - the location of the site on the photomontage illustrations which indicate the mast sitting south of the proposed development,
  - the applicant should be required to provide updated photomontages to clearly show the proposed infrastructure from a pedestrian eyeline walking on the footpath directly towards the proposed structure from the south, from 10m, 50 m and 100m.
  - The applicant should be requested to provide photographs of similar installations they have completed elsewhere.
  - The area of search identified a number of alternative sites but not any on public open space which would be preferable from a road's perspective
  - In the absence of full consideration to the use of the public open green space it is recommended that the licence is refused.

- On the basis of the comments from the Roads Engineer, it is recommended that permission be refused.
- The discrepancies in the photomontage drawings are noted and indicate the mast and infrastructure on the grass verge while the location is on the footpath.
- The site is located in an area designated as the 'least sensitive' as per the Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment.
- The site is located within a National Monument Zone of Notification however on a newly constructed works where the grounds have already been disturbed.
- No comments have been received from the DAU and there are no concerns with regard impacts on any national monument.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Roads Section: Refusal of the licence recommended as concerns raised regarding the location, photomontage and absence of investigation location on public open space (as summarised above in the planners repot).

### 3.2.3. Conditions

Not relevant.

## 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Traffic Infrastructure Ireland (TII): No observations.

## 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.

*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

*Design Manual for Urban Roads and Street (DMURS) Government of Ireland*

## 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 Waterford City and County Development Plan (CCDP) is the overarching plan for policy and guidance on telecommunications infrastructure. 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 south of Waterford City, within the settlement boundary, along a public footpath and beside lands zoned as Open Space and Recreation (OS) where it is an objective to 'preserve and provide for open space and recreational amenities'.

#### 6.3.2. Settlement Hierarchy

- Waterford is a City- Metropolitan Area in the settlement plan

#### 6.3.3. 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.

#### **6.4. 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:

## **1. Appeal Site**

- The appeal site is along the edge of a paved concrete footpath on the eastern side of Lacken Road.
- The grid reference and the photograph included in the appeal statement are the approximate location of the mast and associated cabinet equipment.
- The site is beside a newly built residential housing estate and open agricultural field.
- The site location has been sited using laser measuring equipment.
- The concrete footpath is 3.95m in width.
- The nearest dwelling is 250m away.
- The location of the site does not perform any critical function in terms of road visibility splays and is set back from the carriageway

## **2. Planning History**

- There is no planning history on the site.

## **3. The Proposal**

- The proposal is a slim structure and resembles infrastructure suitable for semi-urban and urban areas where space is limited.
- The antennas themselves are on the top of the mast and limited to strike a balance between visual impacts and operator requirements.
- Photographs of similar installations have been submitted.
- The installations provide a real-world understanding (5 photographs submitted).
- The applicant's drawings are to scale and can be relied upon to determine the dimensions of the proposal.
- The existing footpath is 3.95m wide. The equipment will occupy 0.8m of the footpath which leaves 3.15m of unobstructed footpath.
- The remaining footpath is sufficient space to ensure the safe and comfortable movement of both pedestrians and cyclists.

#### **4. Planning Policy**

- The Section 254 requirements are listed.
- The applicants state the proposal will comply with the National Development Plan, regional policy and the policies of the Waterford Development Plan, in particular Policy Objective UTL 16 ICT/Communications

#### **5. Case for the applicant**

- The proposed development will not have an adverse impact on the existing pedestrian/ cycleway and has been designed to comply with DMURS.
- The site has been selected because there is sufficient space to accommodate the proposal.
- Examples of other similar structures submitted.
- There will be 3.15m of footpath remaining, DMURS recommends a width of 1.8m to allow tow mobility scooters to pass.
- The proposal will not cause a hazard to users of the footpath.
- The proposal is the most suitable location for the delivery of essential infrastructure.
- The proposal would constitute sustainable development.

#### **6. Conclusion**

- The proposal is designed to provide 2G, 3G, 4G and 5G networks.
- There is clear requirement in the Waterford Development Plan that telecommunications infrastructure should be supported.

6. Appendix 1: PA Decision to refuse the licence

7. Appendix 2: Planners Report for the application

8. Appendix 3: Site location Plan

#### **8.2. Planning Authority Response**

A response from the planning authority notes the grounds of appeal submitted, has consulted with the Roads Engineer and remains opposed to the 15m

telecommunication infrastructure. The reason for refusal is reiterated, and the planning authority request the Commission uphold the refusal of the S254 licence.

### **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 along the side of a distributor road to the south of Waterford city. 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 relating to the location of the infrastructure along the side of the public footpath as it would constitute a traffic hazard and represent an unacceptable precedent for other similar developments.

9.1.3. The report of the area planner did not raise any issues with regards to the siting or location of the telecommunication infrastructure and had regard to the applicant's technical justification report and the photomontages. Noting the substantive issues relating to the impact on pedestrians/ traffic, I have focused the assessment on these issues. In the interest of completeness with the Section 254 Licence requirements I have briefly set out for the Commission how the proposal can comply with these requirements.

9.1.4. In considering an application for a licence under this section a planning authority, or the Commission 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 footpath, within the settlement boundary of Waterford City, on lands zoned for open space in the Waterford City and County Development Plan (WCCDP) 2022-2028. I note from the zoning map this open space zoning relating to the agricultural field to the east of the site. The existing footpath is marked as grey until this point, where the zoning map appears to miss the natural boundary of the footpath. This aside, even if the zoning boundary is not a mapping error, then I note Table 11.2 of Volume 2 of the WCCDP list the use type 'utility' is open for consideration in the Open Space Zoning. The principle of locating telecommunications infrastructure on the site is acceptable in principle.

9.1.7. Therefore, having regard to the characteristics of the proposed works, along the edge of a public footpath 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.

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

9.1.9. The applicant's submission refers to the National, Regional and Local policy which supports the roll out of telecommunications infrastructure as the country implements the digital transformation network. I note the CAP further 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.

9.1.10. 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.

9.1.11. The site is within the settlement boundary of Waterford City. Section 4.3 of the Guidelines 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.

9.1.12. The applicant's documentation to the planning authority includes a statement of compliance with ICNIRP and EU RED, photomontage illustrations, and a technical justification for locating the infrastructure at this location. I note the appeal statement reiterates the applicants need to locate at the site. In general, the applicant confirms that the outdoor coverage for 3G and 4G is poor at this location. They submit that it is a requirement both nationally, regionally and locally to deliver improved connectivity to business and homes and this infrastructure will provide connection within this cell area. I note from the publicly available ComReg information<sup>1</sup> that the 4G coverage is good rather than very good for a number of telecommunications

---

<sup>1</sup> [Service Coverage - Commission for Communications Regulation](#)

providers. In addition, I note the site is centrally located within an area designated for the expansion of Waterford City.

9.1.13. In relation to the visual impact, I note the photomontage illustrations indicate that whilst the pole will be visible from the surrounding area, it is not unlike the impact from the street pole located close by. The site is not directly beside any residential properties, schools or areas of built heritage. Upon site inspection I noted there are no tall buildings or structures in the vicinity of the site. I do not consider there would be any significant adverse impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding area. The Commission will note no objection to justification for the proposal or visual impact by the PA or third parties.

9.1.14. Policy Objective UTL 16: ICT/ Communications of the WCCDP requires the following considerations in proposals to 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).

9.1.15. As stated above, I consider the monopole structure is visually acceptable at this location, and the applicant have submitted sufficient evidence to justify the proposal. I consider the applicant has submitted sufficient information to determine that the proposal can meet the last resort test as required in the "Telecommunications Antennae and Support Structures - Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 1996.

9.1.16. Having regard to the forgoing, I consider the proposal complies with the requirements of the development plan.

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

9.1.18. Lacken Road is a relatively long straight and wide road which joins onto a newly built bypass built under the LIHAF funding. This infrastructure is intended to open expanses of residential zoned lands to the south of Waterford City. Aside from the standard public lighting poles along either side of the road, there are no other taller structures. The telecommunications infrastructure is proposed along the side of the road, between the existing street lighting pole. Having regard to the current layout and number of street poles, I do not consider the proposed development would lead to an excessive number of existing appliances, apparatuses, or structures on, under, over or along the public road.

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

9.1.20. Having regard to the proposed location of the proposed telecommunication pole and associated infrastructure on a public footpath/ cycle path at the Lacken Road L5522, the Planning Authority considered that the proposed development would represent a hazard to users of the public footpath/ cycle way. The PA refused permission as they considered it would represent an unacceptable hazard to the public, and would result in a potential traffic hazard, would set an undesirable precedent for similar types of development in the area and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

9.1.21. The report of the traffic engineer notes the location of the site slightly south of the last streetlight along the Laken Road although the photomontage drawings illustrate the site on the open space area, slightly south. It is stated that the applicant should be required to submitted further photomontages and photographs of other similar installations. The Roads Engineer further states that their preference would be for the infrastructure to be located off the public footpath where possible and it is unclear if any further consideration was given to the use of the public open space area. In absence of this additional information the Area District Engineer recommends a refusal of the S254 Licence application.

9.1.22. The applicant states in the appeal submission that the proposed location of the telecommunication infrastructure along the side of the footpath will only require 0.8m and as the footpath measures 3.95m in width there will remain 3.15m of unobstructed footpath. The ground of appeal argues that this is sufficient to accommodate the minimum width in DMURS (1.8m) to allow two mobility scooters to pass.

9.1.23. I note the Area Engineer did not raise any concerns with the scale of footpath removed for the infrastructure and notes a preference for the infrastructure to be located on the open space. The refusal reason does not include a specific reason as to why the proposed location of the telecommunications infrastructure would cause an obstruction or a traffic hazard to pedestrians or vehicles.

9.1.24. As stated above the applicant's photomontage drawings are sufficient to ensure a visual impact assessment is undertaken. I note the site plans at a scale of 1:100 clearly indicates the location of the equipment along the side of the footpath with c.3m remaining for the pedestrians, mobility scooters and bicycles to pass. I note Figure 4.34 of DMURS requires a minimum of 3m for small groups to pass comfortably in areas of moderate to high pedestrian activity. Whilst the area would not have a significant amount of pedestrian activity at present, undeveloped lands, in the future there may be a requirement for moderate pedestrian activity.

9.1.25. Having regard to the location of the site, along the public footpath, the scale of the proposed equipment and the remaining width of the public footpath, I do not consider the proposal would lead to an unacceptable hazard to the public, or result in a potential traffic hazard or inconvenience to pedestrians.

## 9.2. Conclusion

9.2.1. Therefore, having regard to the policies and objectives of the development plan, the siting and massing of the proposed works, the applicant's justification for locating the proposal at this location and absence of any significant negative visual or residential impact, I consider the proposed acceptable.

## 10.0 Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening

10.1. Having regard to the modest nature and scale of the proposed development, its location in an urban area, 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 Waterford City;
- 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 County and City 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
- e) The location of the site along the edge of a public footpath;

it is considered that the proposed development would not have a significant negative on the convenience and safety of road users, including pedestrians and would be in keeping with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 14.0 Conditions

1.	<p>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 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</p>

shall be reinstated in accordance with the agreed details at the operators expense.

Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area

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

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

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

<b>An Bord Pleanála</b>		<b>ABP-322830-25</b>
<b>Case Reference</b>		
<b>Proposed Development</b>		15m telecommunications pole and associated works
<b>Summary</b>		
<b>Development Address</b>		s. 254 Licence, Lacken Road, Summerfields, Co. Waterford.
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b> (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		
<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 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	<b>Screening determination remains as above (Q1 to Q4)</b>
Yes		<b>Screening Determination required</b>

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