



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 November 2025

by J Smith MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/W/25/3373519

Land adjacent to Verdon Recreation Centre, 218 Verdon Street, Sheffield S3 9QN

- 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 & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Cornerstone Telecommunications Infrastructure Limited against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00311/TEL.
 - The development proposed is erection of 20m high monopole with 6no. antenna, 1no. 0.3m dish, 2no. cabinets and ancillary development (application to determine if prior approval required for siting and appearance).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and 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 the siting and appearance of installation of 20m high monopole with 6no. antenna, 1no. 0.3m dish, 2no. cabinets and ancillary development (application to determine if prior approval required for siting and appearance) at land adjacent to Verdon Recreation Centre, 218 Verdon Street, Sheffield S3 9QN in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 25/00311/TEL and the plans submitted with it including drawing numbers:
 - 100 REV A (SITE LOCATION MAPS)
 - 201 REV A (SITE LAYOUT PROPOSED)
 - 301 REV A (SOUTH-EAST ELEVATION PROPOSED)

Preliminary Matters

2. The provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (GPDO 2015), 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 representations received. My determination of this appeal has been made on the same basis.

Main Issue

3. It is sought to erect a 20m high monopole with associated antennae, a dish and cabinets (the mast). The provisions of Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the GPDO 2015 do not require regard be had to the development plan. I have had regard to the policies of the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework

(the Framework), only in so far as they are a material consideration relevant to matters of siting and appearance.

4. As such, I have considered Policy CS 74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 (CS), Policies H14 and BE14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan 1998 (UDP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) only insofar as they are material considerations relevant to the matters of siting and appearance. These policies are those which are cited in the decision notice.
5. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the siting and appearance of the mast on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The proposed mast, with a height of 20 metres, would be positioned at the brow of Verdon Street, next to the highway and at the entrance to a small car park. Nearby buildings are set back from the proposed mast location. This setting contributes to a sense of openness within this urban environment. The mast would be clearly visible when travelling along Verdon Street in this proposed location.
7. However, this section of Verdon Street contains a varied mix of building heights. These range from single-storey properties to a notable number of buildings which are four storeys in height. This is alongside street furniture that extends from low bollards to taller streetlights. Although the proposed mast would exceed the height of these surrounding elements, it would be situated within a context where vertical features are a defining characteristic and are visually well-established. Its height would not be significantly higher than the tallest building within its vicinity.
8. In addition, the immediate surroundings comprise a mix of residential, community and commercial uses. The proposed mast would be positioned adjacent to a car park serving these premises. The proposal would have a functional appearance, which is typical of telecommunications equipment. In this context, it would be read as an ancillary service feature placed within an area of community and commercial activity. Accordingly, I do not consider that the mast would present as an overtly incongruous or alien structure, given the established presence of these uses in the locality.
9. As previously noted, the mast would be located within an area of elevated topography. Rising topography is a characteristic which can be visibly appreciated from the appeal site across the wider Sheffield area. Consequently, buildings across the landscape, such as Astrea Academy immediately to the north-west of Verdon Street, and the tall buildings which make up the general Sheffield City Centre backdrop, appear taller in the landscape due to their elevated positions.
10. While tall buildings across the wider landscape can be appreciated from Verdon Street, the Council note that the mast would appear less prominent when viewed from longer-distance vantage points towards the appeal site. This reduced prominence arises from its overall design and its positioning among buildings of varying heights.
11. When these matters collectively considered, the mast would be perceived against a backdrop of community, commercial and residential buildings where structures are visually accentuated in the immediate, but also wider landscape.

12. In conclusion, the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Whilst only a material consideration, the proposal would therefore comply with Policy CS 74 of the CS and Policies H14 and BE14 of the UDP. These policies require development to respect the townscape in its design. It would also comply with the Framework's requirements for supporting high quality communications, whilst achieving well-designed places. Consequently, I consider that the siting and appearance of the proposal would be acceptable.

Other Matters

13. The appellant has certified that the proposal has been designed to comply with the guidelines published by the International Commission Guidelines on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection.

Conditions

14. Any planning permission granted for the erection of a 20m high monopole with 6no. antenna, 1no. 0.3m dish, 2no. cabinets and ancillary development under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A is subject to conditions set out in Paragraphs A.3(9), A.3(11) and A.2(2), which specify that the development must, except to the extent that the local planning authority otherwise agree in writing, be carried out in accordance with the details submitted with the application, must begin not later than the expiration of 5 years beginning with the date on which the local planning authority received the application, and must 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

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

J Smith

INSPECTOR