

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2016

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 10 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3155311
117 Parkfield Crescent, Ruislip HA4 0RD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Graham Bean against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 71535/APP/2016/832, dated 24 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is an updating radio mast and aerial.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an updating radio mast and aerial at 117 Parkfield Crescent, Ruislip HA4 0RD in accordance with the application Ref 71535/APP/2016/832, dated 24 February 2016.

Procedural Matter

2. The development has already been carried out.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on i) the character and appearance of the area and ii) the living conditions of nearby residents with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The development comprises a telescopic mast, finished in a matt green colour, which supports the antenna arrangement fixed to the top. The antenna essentially consists of six slender curved arms adjoining the mast that form a frame and which are connected by several lines of wiring. The resulting hexagonal shape of the antenna structure resembles the form of a large rotary washing line.
 5. The mast, when fully extended would be very tall, extending above the ridgeline of the roofs of adjacent dwellings. However it has a relatively slim form, the bulk of which, because of its telescopic design, would be progressively reduced as it gains in height. The antenna element, though wide, would because of the slender form of its components have minimal mass, and would allow for visibility between the various parts.
-

6. When in its extended position, the antenna would be visually absorbed to a degree against the open sky background. The visual impact of the mast and antenna would be further reduced at distance from the structure. In terms of the public realm, the main viewpoint would be from the Parkfield Crescent highway to the front of the site via the space to the side of the appeal dwelling and above the ridgeline of dwelling roofs. From this location, though visible, the structure would not be significantly imposing and because of its backland location, behind the more imposing and massive structures of dwellings, would not naturally tend to draw the eye.
7. I conclude that the development would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with Policy BE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part One Strategic Policies 2012 (LP) and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies 2012 insofar as they seek to promote good design that protects local character and harmonises with its surroundings.

Living conditions

8. During my visit, I viewed the structure in its retracted position from the rear garden area of No 113 Parkfield Crescent. This property is next door but one to the appeal site. From this location and from the rear of the adjacent dwellings, the structure would be viewed in relatively close proximity. However, due to the orientation of houses around the curve in the street, the structure would be offset from the direct outlook away from the rear of adjacent and nearby dwellings on Parkfield Crescent. Furthermore for the reasons given above in relation to its limited massing, it would not naturally tend to draw the eye as an imposing and oppressive feature, but rather due to its unusual form. Whilst I acknowledge that the appearance of the structure would not be to everybody's taste, equally I do not consider it would result in excessive clutter or visual harm.
9. There is significant separation between the appeal site and the dwellings situated on Torbay Road, the adjacent residential street to the east of Parkfield Crescent. The gardens of those properties are also offset from the rear of the appeal site by an intervening service road and a line of mature planting which would help to mitigate visibility of the structure. The structure would not therefore result in any significant visual harm to residents on Torbay Road.
10. I conclude that the proposal would not result in harm to the living conditions of nearby residents. Accordingly the proposal would be in keeping with Policy BE1 of the LP and the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as they seek to protect the living conditions of residents.

Other Matters

11. Concern has been raised with regard to television and radio interference, alleged to be caused by the mast and antenna. However, concerns of this nature would need to be investigated by an alternative agency and are not for my deliberations in this appeal.
12. Reference has also been made to the scale of the structure exceeding the limitations for domestic property. I have been provided with very limited information in this regard however, whilst I acknowledge that the Town and

Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 places limitations on the scale of antenna development that can be undertaken at a domestic dwelling without planning permission, this would not prevent a planning application being made with a view to developing beyond these limitations.

13. I am aware that concerns have been raised with regard to additional aerials sited within the rear garden of the appellant's property. However it would be for the Council to consider whether these structures amount to unauthorised development. This matter is not therefore within the scope of the current planning appeal.

Conclusion and Conditions

14. The Council has suggested the imposition of conditions regarding the timescale for commencement of development, adherence to plans and control of constructions materials. However as the structure has already been carried out, such conditions are unnecessary.
15. For the above reasons, and having considered all other points raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed and planning permission be granted.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR