
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2024

by J D Clark BA (Hons) DpTRP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V4305/D/24/3350590

89 Bearwood Road, Liverpool, Merseyside L33 2AF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Marian Andrade Martins against the decision of Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00113/FUL.
 - The development proposed is antenna mast – telescopic 5.5 – 8.5m and tilting over antenna 9m wide.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal form includes the appellant's company in the appellant details, Charity and Taylor Marine Ltd and the proposal is described as a retrospective application for antenna. I have taken the details above from the application form. I have noted the differences between the two forms and assessed the proposal accordingly.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of outlook.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached two-storey house located in an area of relatively new two and three storey residential properties. The mast is located to the rear of the house and the antenna, when fully extended would rise above the ridge of the roof.
5. The appellant explains that since Covid, whilst not working onboard commercial and navy ships, he now works at home for some of the time. In his job as a marine electronics engineer this requires him to test radios for repairs and "on air" testing. The proposed industrial model antenna allows him to access marine and aviation high frequencies.
6. Working patterns have changed for many people since Covid and it is well documented that more people are working from home. However, the scale, design and appearance of the proposed mast and antenna is not appropriate in a residential area. It would stand out as an alien and intrusive feature in this residential area. The general lack of aerials or roof top additions on this

modern estate means the antenna would appear particularly prominent and out of character with the surrounding area.

7. I appreciate that the antenna is on a telescopic and collapsable pole which means that when retracted it is only visible from the houses that back onto the appeal site. However, for the reasons outlined above, it would present a poor outlook for the occupiers of neighbouring properties. Its design and scale are inappropriate in this residential area and would therefore have a harmful effect on their living conditions.
8. The proposal would not meet the criteria set out in UDP¹ Policy ENV8 which specifically relates to telecommunications developments. Amongst other things, this only allows such developments in sensitive areas, such as residential areas, where there are no other suitable alternative sites. Furthermore, it seeks to avoid developments that would have an unacceptable impact on the character or appearance of the surrounding area or the amenity of nearby residents. Although the proposal is required in this location to enable the appellant to work from home, this is insufficient reason to overcome the harm to the surrounding area and the living conditions of nearby residents.
9. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with UDP Policy ENV8 and Core Strategy² Policies CS2 and CS19 which collectively require development to enhance local character and promote quality of place by understanding, respecting, responding and integrating with the characteristics of its surroundings. It would also conflict with the aims for well-designed and beautiful places as set out in paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework³.
10. I conclude therefore that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby residential properties due to a poor outlook.

Other Matters

11. The Council refer to other appeal decisions which have been dismissed on appeal. However, I have limited information about these and in any case have based my decision on the basis of the scheme before me and my observations on site.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Consequently, the appeal should be dismissed.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

¹ Knowsley Council – Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, Adopted June 2006 (UDP).

² Knowsley Council – Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy January 2016

³ Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, December 2023.