



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2019

**by John Wilde CEng MICE**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 16 July 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/18/3208902**

**Opposite 292 Wandsworth Bridge Road, London SW6 2TZ**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (as amended).
  - The appeal is made by Maximus Networks Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
  - The application Ref 2017/00679/TEL56, dated 20 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 9 February 2018.
  - The development proposed is a call box.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and approval is granted under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 16 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for the siting and appearance of a call box at land opposite 292 Wandsworth Bridge Road, London SW6 2TZ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2017/00679/TEL56, dated 20 February 2017, and the plans submitted with it.

### Procedural matters

2. The provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (GPDO 2015), under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A, Paragraph A.3(4) require the local planning authority to assess the proposed development solely on the basis of its siting and appearance, taking into account any representations received. My determination of this appeal has been made on the same basis.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) supports high quality communications infrastructure and requires that local planning authorities must determine applications on planning grounds only. In accordance with the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 16 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), and subject to any relevant exception, limitation or condition specified therein, development by or on behalf of an electronic communications code operator for the purpose of the operator's electronic communications network is permitted development. Therefore, matters such as the need for the development are not at issue in this appeal.
4. The principle of development is established by the GPDO 2015 and the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the GPDO 2015 do not require

regard be had to the development plan. I have had regard to the policies of the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) only in so far as they are a material consideration relevant to matters of siting and appearance.

5. The Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan was adopted on 28 February 2018. This replaced the Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Local Plan 2013 and along with the London Plan forms the Development Plan for the Borough.

### **Main Issue**

6. The main issue is the effect of the siting and appearance of the proposed kiosk upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

### **Reasons**

7. The proposed location for the kiosk is on the outside of the footway on the opposite side of the road from 292 Wandsworth Bridge Road. Behind the metal railings that border the footway is a grassed area which in turn fronts St Mathews Church. The church is not listed and the site is not in a conservation area, although it does border the Hurlingham Conservation which is directly opposite.
8. There is very little in the way of street furniture within the immediate area, with only a litter bin, a few bollards, two trees and a post for signage. There is a conventional style telephone kiosk some way to the south on the opposite side of the road. The proposed kiosk would be sited between the two trees. It would be three sided, of contemporary design and made out of PPC steel and polycarbonate.
9. I acknowledge that the area exhibits a sense of openness relative to other more congested areas, engendered by the lack of street paraphernalia and the green area behind the railings. However, I do not consider that the proposed kiosk, in isolation, would be unacceptably harmful to this sense of openness and whilst I accept that there would be some impact upon views of the church, this is not in any way listed. Furthermore, the presence of one kiosk on the far side of the road would not, in my view, cause harm to the setting of the adjacent conservation area.
10. In arriving at this conclusion I note that Policy 6.10 of The London Plan seeks to significantly increase walking trips by, amongst other things, de-cluttering and simplifying the street scene, and I acknowledge that the Council has invested a significant amount in de-cluttering throughout the borough which is supported within the council's Streetsmart design guide. This guidance states that the aim is to return visual order to the streets by de-cluttering, using a limited palette of materials and introducing street furniture only where absolutely necessary.
11. Such an aim is completely laudable but nonetheless somewhat at odds with the Framework's support of high quality communications networks. Furthermore, as I have previously stated, need for the development is not a matter for consideration in this appeal.

12. Consequently, I do not find that the proposed kiosk would be harmful to the character or appearance of the area. There would therefore be no conflict with policies in the development plan designed to prevent such harm.

### **Conditions**

13. Any planning permission granted for the call box under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A is subject to conditions set out in Paragraphs A.3(9), A.3(11) and A.2(2), which specify that the development must, except to the extent that the local planning authority otherwise agree in writing, be carried out in accordance with the details submitted with the application, must begin not later than the expiration of 5 years beginning with the date on which the local planning authority received the application, and must be removed as soon as reasonably practicable after it is no longer required for electronic communications purposes and the land restored to its condition before the development took place.

### **Conclusion**

14. In light of the above reasoning, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and prior approval should be granted.

*John Wilde*

INSPECTOR