



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2020

by Andre Pinto BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/W/19/3239449

Tesco Lamp Post B17, Tesco Roundabout A127/B1013, Southend-on-Sea SS0 0JR

- 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 EE Ltd & Hutchinson 3G UK Ltd against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00994/FUL, dated 21 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed upgrade to existing telecoms apparatus. Proposed phase 7 monopole c/w wraparound cabinet at base and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on a grassed verge, off a roundabout, along Prince Avenue (A127) and in close proximity to a large supermarket, a hotel and other commercial and business uses. The area is predominantly urban and commercial in character, but with residential development on the opposite side of Prince Avenue, mostly obscured by large bushes.
4. The development proposal is for the replacement of an existing 10 metre high monopole with a 20 metre high monopole located approximately 12 meters further south along the same Avenue, closer to a pedestrian crossing. The proposal also includes four new equipment cabinets to be installed and an equipment cabinet to be retained. Two existing cabinets to the north of the existing pole are proposed to be removed.
5. At present, the monopole is of a similar height and colour to other tall street furniture in the area (lighting columns) such that it is well integrated with the street scene.
6. The proposed development would be approximately double the height of the existing monopole and therefore a much more prominent feature in the street scape. Furthermore, the diameter of the proposed monopole would be

substantially larger, thereby causing it to be an even more prominent and discordant feature of the street scape.

7. Despite the development proposal being at quite some distance from nearby residential developments, the area is heavily used and therefore likely it would be seen by many people. The appeal site is prominent, located along a busy road and in close proximity to a busy roundabout. It is also located close to a pedestrian crossing that links the residential to the commercial area. Therefore, the impact of the development proposal would be very marked in terms of prominence and, due to its height and bulk, be of a significant discordant appearance.
8. Therefore, the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, in that regard, it would be contrary to Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Southend-on-Sea Core Strategy (2007) which require development to positively contribute to the creation of high quality urban environments, Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Southend-On-Sea Development Management Document Appendix B (2015) which require development to be of high design quality and the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework).

Other Matters

9. It is accepted that mobile connectivity, and the upgrading of the existing network, is essential to the success of the economy. While the network upgrade is important, there may be other means of achieving the upgrade which may be found to be less harmful to the character and appearance of area. As it stands, the proposed increase in the overall bulk of the installation, for the reasons set out above, would detract from the character of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons stated above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andre Pinto

INSPECTOR