



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2023

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/22/3298363

Area of Grass Verge, Bedfont Road, Lower Feltham, Hounslow, London TW13 4SN

- 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 GPDO).
 - The appeal is made by CK Hutchison Networks (UK) Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00096/AB/COM1, dated 17 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is a H3G Phase 15m high street pole c/w wrap-around cabinet and 3 further additional equipment cabinets.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and approval is granted under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the GPDO for the siting and appearance of a H3G Phase 15m high street pole c/w wrap-around cabinet and 3 further additional equipment cabinets, at Area of Grass Verge, Lower Feltham, Hounslow, London TW13 4SN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00096/AB/COM1, dated 17 November 2021, and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary Matters

2. The provisions under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the GPDO requires 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, having 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 the matters of siting and appearance.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the siting and appearance of the proposed installation on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The proposed 15 metre high mast and associated equipment cabinets would be sited within a landscaped area at the junction of Redford Close with Bedfont Road. The surroundings are residential in character with buildings of two and three stories in height. Street lights are spaced regularly along this

part of the road and there is also a plethora of traffic lights and other street furniture at the signalised Chertsey Road junction which lies just a short distance to the west.

5. The mast would therefore be located within an area that is already populated by other vertical built features and within urban surroundings where it would be a relatively unremarkable feature in the street scene. It would be taller and wider than the street lighting columns and some of the roadside trees it would be seen in immediate context with, but not so significantly that it would be overdominant. Colouring the mast black, as proposed, would further help it to assimilate with the existing street lighting columns.
6. In terms of the equipment cabinets, such structures are not uncommon on urban roadsides, and given their limited spread and siting amongst landscaped surroundings, would not appear visually cluttered or obtrusive.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the siting and appearance of the proposal would not unacceptably harm the character or appearance of the area. Whilst not determinative, in this respect the proposal complies with the telecommunications infrastructure requirements of Policy EC4 of the Hounslow Local Plan (2015), and the Framework.

Conditions

8. Any approval for development under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A is subject to the conditions set out in Paragraphs A.3(9), A.3(11) and A.2(2), which specify that the development must 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

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

A Caines

INSPECTOR