



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2025

by **K Savage BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/W/25/3364073

Land at Manor Lane, Opposite Stock Road junction, Sheffield S2 1AD

- 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 GPDO).
- The appeal is made by Cornerstone against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
- The application reference is 24/02559/TEL.
- The development proposed is a 17.5m high street furniture style mast (RAL6009 Green), 6 No. antennas (RAL7035 Grey), 4 No. cabinets (1 No. 1900x600x1722mm; 1 No. 823x600x1722mm; 1 No. 993x600x1722mm; 1 No. 655x255x1015mm) (RAL6009 Green) 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 a 17.5m high street furniture style mast (RAL6009 Green), 6 No. antennas (RAL7035 Grey), 4 No. cabinets (1 No. 1900x600x1722mm; 1 No. 823x600x1722mm; 1 No. 993x600x1722mm; 1 No. 655x255x1015mm) (RAL6009 Green) and all ancillary development, at Land at Manor Lane, Opposite Stock Road junction, Sheffield S2 1AD, in accordance with application Ref 24/02559/TEL and details submitted with it, including drawings 100 RevA; 200 RevA; 201 RevB; 300 RevA; 301 RevB.

Preliminary Matter

2. Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the GPDO establish the principle of telecommunications development and require the local planning authority to assess proposed development solely on the basis of its siting and appearance, taking into account any representations received. I have assessed the appeal on this basis, having regard to the development plan and National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as material considerations so far as they are relevant.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the siting and appearance of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and, if any harm would occur, whether this is outweighed by the need for the installation to be sited as proposed taking into account any suitable alternatives.

Reasons

Siting and Appearance

4. The appeal site is located to the northern side of Manor Lane, opposite its junction with Stock Road. On his side of the street, between the dwelling at No 33 and the

junction with Skye Edge Avenue, are areas of open ground in a natural and in places overgrown state, interspersed with a number of trees, bushes and other foliage. A row of four garages stands immediately behind the appeal site, perpendicular to the road and accessed via an unsurfaced track. To the front of the appeal site is a partial stone wall that borders the back edge of the footway. The site is located near the brow of the hill where Manor Lane descends steeply to the west towards City Road.

5. The proposed monopole and associated cabinetry would be installed between the stone wall and the garages. At 17.5 metres tall and located in an area of open space, the monopole would be a significant and highly visible feature in the street scene. It would extend above the height of the terraced housing opposite, as well as other street furniture such as lighting and electricity poles. It would also exceed the height of the tallest surrounding trees which are indicated to be around 10 metres. The cabinets would be located around the base of the pole and a palisade fence would enclose the whole development.
6. The monopole would be prominent in what is a relatively quiet residential street scene absent any comparable scale of development. However, it would adopt a slender, functional form akin to the lighting and electricity poles that are ubiquitous on this and other streets. The monopole and ancillary structures would be inset from the footway and aligned with the row of garages behind in a relatively ordered layout. The inset position of the cabinets and fencing means they would be visually contained in views from either direction on Manor Lane by existing foliage.
7. I accept that, for residents living directly opposite, the proposal, including the palisade fencing and ancillary cabinetry, would be clearly visible and would form an imposing and isolated development within an area of hitherto unassuming open space, introducing utilitarian structures into a part of the public realm that, although not appearing to be used for recreational purposes, is green open space that contributes to the area as a break in the built form and source of greenery.
8. However, beyond the immediate setting, the visual impact would be limited to the upper part of the monopole as seen on approach from either direction on Manor Road, and in short vistas along Stock Road. Though prominent in these views, the monopole would appear as a functional element of the streetscene, and would not detract from any notable view. In particular, it would not intrude harmfully into the panorama towards the city centre as this only comes into full view once past the site and over the brow of the hill travelling westwards.
9. The Council has not cited harm to any designated heritage assets, though an interested party refers to potential effect on Sheffield Manor Lodge, a Grade II listed ruin with extensive grounds some 240 metres to the east of the site. Although there may be some distant visibility of the mast from within the grounds of the listed building, I find that its setting is defined primarily by its own grounds and the significant amount of surrounding residential development. I am satisfied that the physical separation from the proposed mast means the setting of the listed building would be preserved.
10. Overall, due to its conspicuous height and form, and position within a green open space, the siting and appearance of the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. However, given the surrounding urban

context and the small geographic area affected, I find that the scale of harm would be limited in this case.

11. So far as they are relevant to the appeal as material considerations, there would be a degree of conflict with Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Core Strategy 2009 and saved Policies BE5 and H14 of the Unitary Development Plan 1998 which together require high quality development that respects the townscape and heritage of the city; is appropriate in scale and nature to the site and complements the form and architectural style of surrounding buildings. There would also be some conflict with the expectation of the Framework that new electronic communications equipment should be sympathetically designed.

Alternative Locations

12. The Framework advises that applications should be supported by the necessary evidence to justify the proposed development. For a new mast or base station, this includes evidence that the applicant has explored the possibility of erecting antennas on an existing building, mast or other structure.
13. I have had regard to the appellant's site selection process, and evidence in respect of the technical requirements for 5G antennas, including that the cell areas are smaller and the search area is necessarily defined by the need to fit the new cell into the existing network to address areas of poor or no coverage. I also accept that the height of the mast is dictated by operational and health requirements as well as seeking to achieve the maximum coverage.
14. The Council acknowledges the appellant's search area is justified, and describes the evidence as 'fairly compelling,' accepting that the search area does not include any existing masts, buildings or other locations that do not present operational or planning constraints. Nevertheless, the Council takes issue with the conclusions that other sites would cause greater visual intrusion and questions whether a mast mounted on the roof of Dovercourt Surgery would actually be more harmful.
15. On the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the search area is robust. Some 25 alternatives are considered, including locations beyond the search area, which is comprehensive. I have noted the explanations given, which include taking account of operational needs and other constraints, including the varying topography of the area and the presence of buildings, residential dwellings, trees and heritage assets in the area. I consider these reasonable justifications to discount other locations.
16. With respect to Dovercourt Surgery, I am satisfied that the constraints of this site have been adequately explained. In particular, the pitched roof of the building would pose a constraint to erecting a mast indicated to have to reach 20 metres in height to provide sufficient coverage. It is not necessary to see plans to understand the significant visual impact such a mast would have on the building itself. It is also reasonable to discount on the basis that a monopole in the grounds would negatively impact on the operation of the surgery due to the loss of parking and manoeuvring space. There is also no evidence the site is available in any event.
17. Elsewhere, on-street options have been considered along Boundary Road, Southend Road, Haslehurst Road, Skye Edge Avenue and Manor Lane. These would involve installations within the footway and/or close to dwellings. Lower topography, the presence of underground and overhead utilities, narrow footways and greater visibility from more dwellings are cited as discounting factors. No

obvious alternative location within these streets has otherwise been identified by the Council, and I have no other reasons to disagree with the appellant's assessments.

18. Consequently, I am satisfied that a robust search and assessment of alternative sites has been undertaken, and no demonstrably more suitable site has been identified within the search area. The appellant has satisfied the Framework requirement to explore the possibility of installing the equipment on an existing building or other structure. The lack of feasible alternative locations to deliver improved mobile signal coverage and capacity within the required area is a factor which weighs in the proposal's favour in the planning balance.

Other Matters

19. The appellant has set out the economic and social benefits the rollout of 5G coverage in the area would deliver for businesses and the general public. This accords with the strong support within the Framework for digital infrastructure as a key part of delivering economic growth nationally. The upgrading of the network through the appeal scheme would therefore deliver significant public benefits. The Framework also makes it clear that, in determining applications, the need for an electronic communications system should not be questioned.
20. Other matters have been raised in representations, including effects on biodiversity and ground conditions. No objection has been raised on these grounds by the Council, and I have no substantive evidence to indicate the siting of the proposal would be demonstrably harmful in these respects.
21. The appellant has referred to a number of appeal decisions for similar mobile telecommunications installations. Each of these cases had their own specific site circumstances which differ from the proposal before me. Ultimately, I have determined the proposal on its own merits.

Conditions

22. The GPDO does not provide any specific authority to impose conditions when granting prior approval beyond the deemed conditions for development by electronic communications code operators set out in the GPDO.

Conclusion

23. The proposal would result in limited harm to the character and appearance of the area. Set against this, there is a need for the proposal to deliver the rollout of 5G coverage and the associated economic and social benefits this would deliver. The absence of a suitable alternative site to deliver these benefits weighs significantly in favour of the proposal.
24. Overall, I conclude that these benefits would outweigh the limited harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the appeal should be allowed and prior approval given.

K Savage

INSPECTOR