



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 June 2020

by B Davies MSc FGS CGeol

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/19/3243685

Land at Bridge Road, Isleworth, Hounslow, London, TW3 1SN

- 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 MBNL against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00154/R/P1, dated 30 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is the removal and replacement of the existing 15m monopole, with a 20m monopole, 12 no. apertures, equipment cabinets, the removal of the existing 15m monopole, 3 no. apertures, redundant equipment cabinets and development ancillary thereto.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant's documents refer to a different street and postcode. The appellant has since confirmed that the address should be as described above.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The site is surrounded by trees on a grassed area adjacent to the highway, opposite a Council depot. A public footpath providing access to a neighbouring residential estate runs immediately adjacent and the site is visible from the rear windows of a nearby terrace of houses on Stanborough Road.
5. The new mast would be far more visually intrusive than the current structure because it would emerge above the treeline and would be noticeably higher than the roofline of houses when viewed from nearby Stanborough Road. Given that the scale of the mast is more akin to structures associated with industrial and commercial areas, this would harm the residential character of the estate. In addition, the increased sense of dominance when the mast is experienced from the adjacent public footpath would detract from the character and appearance of the area.
6. I have taken into consideration that the structure would remain narrow and the additional height is a small proportion of the existing mast. The extent of

change in character is also tempered by the presence of an existing mast and the wider mixed use of the area. Nonetheless, there would be considerable detriment to the character and appearance of the area, which would be contrary to Policies CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015 to 2030), which together seek to conserve local character and provide attractive places.

7. Paragraph 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) states that such development is essential and that decisions should support the expansion of electronic networks, including next generation mobile technology. Based on the Framework, there would therefore be public benefits from the proposal. I have also given weight to the fact that the development is a joint venture between two companies, which should reduce the pressure for more masts locally.
8. Overall, however, the public benefit from improvements to communications are not sufficient to overcome the harm to the character and appearance of the residential area, and the conflict with the relevant development plan policies.

Conclusion

9. For these reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Davies

INSPECTOR