



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025

by **C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/W/25/3362419

Grassed verge at Allende Way, Sheffield S9 5EA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) 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 appeal is made by Cornerstone against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03447/TEL.
 - The development proposed is erection of mast, antennas, dishes, cabinetry and all ancillary development.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and prior approval is granted under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for erection of 17.5m 5G monopole with associated cabinets and ancillary works at grassed verge at Allende Way, Sheffield S9 5EA in accordance with the application Ref 24/03447/TEL and the details submitted with it including plan nos 100 Rev B, 200 Rev B, 201 Rev B, 300 Rev B and 301 Rev B.

Preliminary Matters

2. The postcode in the above address is taken from the application form. Whilst this is different to that used on the Council's Decision Notice, I am satisfied that it accurately reflects the location of the appeal site.
3. The description of development is described as "mast, antennas, dishes, cabinetry and all ancillary development", however in the interests of clarity I consider that a more appropriate description would be "erection of 17.5m 5G monopole with associated cabinets and ancillary works". I have determined the appeal on this basis.
4. The provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (GPDO), under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A, Paragraph A.3(4) require the local planning authority to assess the proposed development solely on the basis of its siting and appearance, taking into account any representation received. My determination of this appeal has been made on the same basis.
5. 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 to be had to the development plan. I have therefore had regard to the policies of the development

plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) only insofar as they are a material consideration relevant to matters of siting and appearance.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

7. The appeal site is a grass verge located on the west side of Allende Way, which lies between an industrial estate and dwellings. The verge rises from the road on top of which is a 2m high palisade fence, which provides the boundary to the adjoining industrial estate. Along the other side of this fence are a row of trees of approximately 10m in height, behind which are three large industrial buildings. Along the west side of Allende Way there are numerous streetlights. On the opposite side of Allende Way is a pavement and an area of mature landscaping which rises upwards towards the adjoining residential area.
8. The proposal would include a 17.5m monopole, with 6 antennas, 1 dish and 4 cabinets. The appellant puts forward that the design utilises the smallest practical components to ensure that the visual impact is kept to the absolute minimum. Near the corner of Clement Street and Allende Way, proximate to the appeal site, there is an existing mast, which provides 2G, 3G and 4G shared network services for both Vodafone and O2 networks. However, in order to provide superfast 5G services a standalone site is required for the Vodafone network, which is not possible at the existing site due to limited space in the footway. Based on the submitted evidence I am satisfied that there is a demonstrable need for the new equipment.
9. Although there are some trees planted along the verge they provide little visual screening to the industrial buildings. In any case the proposed mast would extend significantly beyond the existing tree canopy by approximately 7.5m and above the ridge height of the buildings which are approximately 4m in height.
10. The mast would therefore be a conspicuous feature when viewed in proximity to the appeal site along this short section of Allende Way. However, as the road rises steadily from Darnell Road and curves around towards Clement Street and then again where it meets Coleridge Street, its wider visual impact would be significantly reduced from further along Allende Way. Furthermore, the proposed mast and cabinets would be seen within the context of an industrial, urbanised area on this side of the road. As nearby dwellings are on higher ground and screened by landscaping, this would mitigate the visual impact of the proposal when viewed from within the residential areas.
11. When viewed from east side of Allende Way, directly opposite the appeal site, the mast would be set against the palisade fencing and industrial units. Whilst a significant proportion of the mast and apparatus would be visible against the sky, I noted that when viewed from the pavement on Allende Way towards the appeal site that it would be seen against the backdrop of a high voltage electricity pylon.
12. Therefore, the proposal would not appear overly prominent or visually intrusive and would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Consequently, I consider the siting and appearance of the proposal would be acceptable.

Conditions

13. The GPDO does not provide any specific authority for imposing additional conditions beyond the deemed conditions for development by electronic communications code operators contained within it. These specify that the development must be carried out in accordance with the details submitted with the application, begin within 5 years of the date of the approval and 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

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and prior approval be granted.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR