



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2023

by R Sabu BA(Hons), MA, BArch, PgDip, RIBA, ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/22/3299295

**Great South West Road, North Feltham, Hounslow, Greater London
TW4 7BF**

- 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 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO).
 - The appeal is made by CK Hutchison Networks (UK) Ltd against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00504/C/COM1, dated 29 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of 5G 18m high street pole with wrap around cabinet and three additional equipment cabinets.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The main parties have referred to development plan policies in their evidence. However, the principle of development is established by the GPDO and the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the GPDO do not require regard be had to the development plan. I have had regard to the policies of the local development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) only in so far as they are a material consideration relevant to matters of siting and appearance.
3. I have used the address as stated in the application form in the header above in the interests of certainty. Since the description of development is not stated in the application form, I have used the description from the decision notice in the header above.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. Great South West Road is a busy dual carriageway with grass verges either side. The proposed site is an area of grass verge adjacent to a public footpath. Notwithstanding the width of the road, to both sides of it are residential properties that give the area a residential character. The area on the same side as the site is largely characterised by two storey semi detached houses and bungalows with front gardens and grass verge as well as a regular rhythm of lampposts and trees. There are residential apartments on the opposite side of

- the road that are three and four storeys high as well as two storey dwellings that contribute to the spacious character of the area.
6. As such, although the site does not lie in a conservation area or is subject to other such designations, the area has a pleasant, domestic, and spacious feel.
 7. The proposed monopole would be significantly taller than the surrounding two storey dwellings, trees and lampposts such that the abrupt change in scale would appear discordant in the street scene.
 8. The proposed monopole would be closer in height to the three and four storey apartments. However, given the intervening distance and highway, the proposal would not be primarily viewed against these buildings. As such, the siting of the monopole would adversely affect the residential character of the area.
 9. In terms of appearance, the colour of the monopole could be controlled by a suitably worded condition. However, this would not mitigate the harm to the character of the area that would result from its height. The monopole would also have a greater girth than the lamp posts in the area, resulting in a more prominent appearance and greater impact on the street scene. Taken as a whole, the development would be visually intrusive, dominant and give the street and site an unacceptably cluttered appearance.
 10. Consequently, the siting and appearance of the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would conflict with Local Plan 2015-2030 Policies CC1, CC2 and EC4 which together seek development that responds to an area's character. It would also conflict with the Framework in this respect.

Other Matters

11. I note the evidence which sets out the general economic and social benefits of this technology and its importance in national terms. However, the contribution that the equipment subject of this appeal would provide in national terms would be limited. I also note the technical design constraints for the monopole and that the installations are designed to be fully compliant with the public exposure guidelines established by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection.
12. While I note the evidence relating to 5G coverage in the area, little substantial evidence is before me to demonstrate that the proposed siting of the monopole would fully mitigate any such shortfall. I have had regard to the alternative sites considered by the appellant for the proposed equipment and that no mast sharing opportunities or suitable buildings, or structures were identified. However, while I acknowledge local and technical constraints, given the number of buildings in the locality, I am not persuaded that other, less prominent, sites cannot be found.
13. Furthermore, I do not consider that the above points or the operational and locational needs of the operators or national strategy to provide 5G services outweigh the significant harm I have identified from the siting and appearance of the pole and cabinets in this particular location.
14. The Framework encourages the use of existing masts, buildings and other structures for new electronic communications capability and where new sites

are required, equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate. I am also aware of local and regional development plan support for digital infrastructure. However, given the significant harm to the character and appearance of the area that would result from the siting and appearance of the scheme, these matters do not outweigh the adverse effects of the proposal.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR