



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2022

by Benjamin Clarke BA (Hons.) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/W/22/3300496

High Street, Longstanton, Cambridgeshire CB24 3DR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under 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 CK Hutchinson Networks (UK) Ltd against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref: 22/00199/PRIOR, dated 12 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is a proposed 18.0m Phase 8 Monopole C/W wrapround Cabinet at base and associated ancillary works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and approval is granted under the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for the installation of a proposed 18.0m Phase 8 Monopole C/W wrapround Cabinet at base and associated ancillary works at High Street, Longstanton, Cambridgeshire CB24 3DR in accordance with the terms of application Ref: 22/00199/PRIOR, dated 12 January 2022, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matters

2. The application was submitted pursuant to Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO). The principle of development is established by the GPDO. The development is, however, subject to the developer firstly applying to the local planning authority as to whether prior approval will be required for the siting and appearance of the development. Therefore, I have limited my considerations to matters pertaining to the siting and appearance of the development. 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 material considerations relevant to matters of siting and appearance.

Main Issue

3. The main issue relevant to this appeal is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site consists of a grass verge located adjacent to the edge of the highway. The surrounding area contains a variety of residential developments

and from the evidence before me, it appears that planning permission has recently been granted for a new residential development nearby. Therefore, the surroundings of the appeal site have a suburban character.

5. The proposed development would result in an increase in the overall level of built form in the surrounding area. However, such an increase would be limited by reason of the relatively narrow width of the proposed monopole and the small footprint of the proposed development.
6. In addition, the proposed development would be viewed alongside a backdrop that includes many other buildings. Therefore, this developed context means that the proposed development would not appear incongruous. In addition, the proposed development would also be viewed alongside other engineered features, such as a roundabout.
7. The proposed development would also be viewed alongside other items of street furniture within the surrounding area. These include items such as street lighting, road signs and other equipment cabinets. Therefore, within this context the proposal would not be incongruous or strident for the development would contribute to a generally developed context. This would occur even though the items of street furniture would have a lower overall height than the proposed development.
8. Some views might be possible from nearby dwellings. However, these would generally occur at an oblique angle. In result, the siting of the proposed development would not be prominent when viewed from the surrounding dwellings.
9. Furthermore, the proposed development would also be relatively well screened due to the proximity of buildings to the proposed development. In addition, there are several trees nearby. Although the screening effects offered by these would be less than total it would serve to soften the edges of the development and would render it less prominent in result.
10. Concerns have been raised regarding whether the proposed development could be accommodated on sites elsewhere. Although I acknowledge that the planning application does not appear to have included an assessment of alternative sites, the evidence before me as part of this appeal include such an assessment. Therefore, on this basis, it is apparent that there are no suitable locations within the required search area that could accommodate the proposed elements with any less harm than in this location.
11. In addition, the council has not been able to suggest any locations that have yet to be considered by the appellant. Therefore, I do not believe that the proposed development could be accommodated in an alternative location. This is of note due to the fact that the increase in telecommunications accessibility is a matter of particular importance.
12. By reason of the siting of the proposed development, it would not conflict with the movement of users of the highway. In addition, the siting and scale of the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on trees and ecology.
13. The development would therefore be in conformity with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018); and policies NS/2, NS/12, and NS/22 of the Northstowe Area Action Plan (2007). Amongst other matters, these seek to ensure that developments be of a high-quality design; create

neighbourhoods with their own character and legibility; minimise any adverse visual or landscape impacts; and minimise visual impact.

14. I therefore conclude that the siting and design of the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The siting and design of the development would therefore be in conformity with the requirements of the Framework.

Other Matters

15. Concerns have been raised regarding potential noise emanating from the proposed development. However, given the surrounding area features several roads, which are likely to have activities associated with them, I do not believe that any noise generated from the proposal would lead to an erosion of the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.
16. The appeal documentation contains an International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection declaration. Therefore, in line with the requirements of the Framework, I have no reason to believe that the proposed development would lead to an adverse effect upon the health of individuals.
17. Although the proposed development might be amended in the future, this would need to be assessed under the relevant legislation at that time. Therefore, I cannot give this matter a significant amount of weight in my assessment of the development.

Conclusion

18. For the preceding reasons, I conclude that the appeal should succeed, and prior approval be given.

Benjamin Clarke

INSPECTOR