



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2025

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2003/D/25/3363845

91A High Street, Belton, DN9 1NR

- 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 Thomas Malkin against the decision of North Lincolnshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PA/2025/6.
 - The development proposed is erection of 17m steel support pole with 9m high radio antenna.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and the effect on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring dwellings.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modern detached two-storey dwelling, which is situated in closely knit residential area fronting High Street. Properties in the locality vary in terms of their age, scale, and appearance.
4. The proposal is to erect a 17m steel support pole with 9m radio antenna on the rear of the dwelling. It would facilitate the applicant's hobby as an amateur radio enthusiast. The applicant states in his appeal submission that the pole can be lowered and that it would normally be used at a 10m height.
5. The Council considers that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area and that it would be visually intrusive and overbearing on the three neighbouring dwellings. It cites a conflict with Policies DS1, DS5 and DS20 of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan and with Policy CS5 of the North Lincolnshire Core Strategy.
6. Policy DS5 concerns itself with residential extensions and it does not appear to me to be of relevance. However, Policies DS1 and CS5 generally seek (amongst other things) to ensure that the design of new development is of a high standard and reflect the character and appearance of the area in which it is located.
7. Policy DS1 also seeks to ensure that new development does not result in an unacceptable loss of amenity to neighbouring land uses. Policy DS20, concerns itself with development associated with telecommunications equipment. It seeks to minimise the impact of domestic equipment by requiring it to be located on the rear

elevations of buildings. It states that proposals that would have a detrimental impact on the character, appearance or amenities of the area will be refused.

8. Although the appellant has sought to minimise the visual impact of the proposal by attaching the pole and antenna to the rear wall of the property, its maximum height of some 26m would be clearly visible above the roof of the dwelling. Despite its slim construction, it would appear as a discordant feature both when viewed from High Street and from the three closest dwellings at numbers 89a, 91 and 93 High Street. Whilst I am not persuaded that the amenities of the occupants of these properties would unacceptably harmed (and I note that no objections have been raised by neighbours), the proposal would appear out of place in this location, where dwellings are positioned close to each other.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to two radio antennas in Belton, on Westgate Road and Carr House Road. I viewed these from both road frontages during my site visit. From what I observed, both appear further from the road than the appeal proposal would and with greater separation distances to other dwellings. I consider that their impact on the streetscene and on other dwellings is significantly less than the appeal proposal would be.
10. I have given weight to the fact that the proposal would enhance the appellant's enjoyment of his hobby and that there may be some benefits in terms of communication during periods of emergency. However, these do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
11. Furthermore, whilst the appellant states that the pole would mainly be used at a height of 10m, the overall height would still be some 19m, which would be well above the height of the dwelling.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR