



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/25/3374102

Stainbeck Junction SW, Stainbeck Lane, Horsforth, Leeds LS7 2PS

- 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 Cornerstone Ltd against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/03900/FU.
 - The development proposed is installation of a 15m-high streetpole accommodating 6no antennas, 2no transmission dishes, 2no equipment cabinets and ancillary development.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 15m-high streetpole accommodating 6no antennas, 2no transmission dishes, 2no equipment cabinets and ancillary development at Stainbeck Junction SW, Stainbeck Lane, Horsforth, Leeds LS7 2PS, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 25/03900/FU, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: 100 Rev B; 201 Rev D; 301 Rev D.

Background

2. An existing monopole is located on Stainbeck Lane approximately 30 metres to the northwest, and in 2021 prior approval was granted for a new 15-metre monopole around 15 metres from the current appeal site. However, the appellant explains that the previously approved location cannot be implemented due to technical constraints, including insufficient separation from the existing mast and limitations on accommodating the required equipment. The appeal proposal therefore represents a revised siting to achieve the necessary clearance and operational capability, rather than an addition to the earlier prior approval scheme.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the installation on highway safety, having regard to the available width of the shared footway/cycleway.

Reasons

4. The appeal site forms part of the adopted shared footway/cycleway along Stainbeck Lane, close to its junction with Stainbeck Road. The surrounding area is mainly residential with some local services and community uses, including

- Carr Manor Community School immediately to the north. The footway contains street lighting columns, signage, and an existing telecommunications installation.
5. The Council refused permission on highway safety grounds, supported by an objection from the local Highway Authority. The concern is that the proposal would narrow the footway in a busy location near a school and junction, creating risks for pedestrians and cyclists. Reference is made to the Leeds City Council Transport Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which seeks a 3-metre width adjacent to schools. However, paragraph 793 of the same SPD, which deals specifically with utilities apparatus, requires a minimum clearance of 2 metres in areas of high pedestrian flows. The proposal would retain clear widths of at least 2.2 metres at the monopole and between 2.05 and 2.7 metres at the cabinets, exceeding the SPD's utilities provision. It also accords with the Department for Transport's (DfT) Manual for Streets (2007), which advises that footways should generally provide a minimum unobstructed width of 2 metres to allow safe passage, including for wheelchair users, with greater widths where pedestrian activity is higher.
 6. Furthermore, measurements show that existing pinch points along this section of Stainbeck Lane are already reduced to as little as 1.93 metres due to lighting columns and signage, and there is no substantive evidence that this arrangement results in safety problems. The proposal would not introduce a new constraint beyond those already present and, in fact, retains widths greater than some existing features. The presence of an existing telecommunications installation nearby further indicates that similar infrastructure has been accommodated without unacceptable harm to pedestrian or cycle safety.
 7. Although the Highway Authority refers to Local Transport Note 1/20 (DfT, 2020) guidance for shared use routes, this relates to new infrastructure design rather than incremental changes within constrained urban environments. A 3-metre width cannot be achieved within existing constraints. In this context, the retained widths exceed national standards and the SPD's specific utilities guidance, ensuring safe passage for pedestrians, wheelchair users and cyclists.
 8. For all these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not cause harm to highway safety. It therefore complies with Policies T2 and P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy (Selective Review 2019), which seek safe and secure access for all users and avoidance of highway safety problems. It also complies with Saved Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006), which requires proposals to address detailed planning considerations and avoid danger to health or life.

Other Matters

9. Paragraph 119 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) recognises that advanced, high-quality and reliable communications infrastructure is essential for economic growth and social well-being. In this case, the previously approved location for a new monopole cannot be implemented due to technical constraints, and no alternative sites have been identified. The appeal scheme therefore provides the only viable solution to maintain continuity of service and delivering 5G capability in this area. While these considerations are not determinative in light of my findings on highway safety and policy compliance, they lend further support to the conclusion that planning permission should be granted.

Conditions

10. Although the Council did not suggest any conditions, I shall impose the standard time limit and approved plans conditions to provide certainty. A separate condition for colour treatment is unnecessary because the approved plans specify the colour treatment.
11. The appellant has offered to relocate an existing traffic sign and cut back the overgrown hedge to maximise usable footway width. While these measures would be beneficial, they are not necessary to make the proposal acceptable. The retained widths already exceed the appropriate standards without requiring the sign's relocation. Furthermore, the hedge lies outside the appellant's control, so any condition requiring its cutting and future maintenance would fail the tests of necessity, reasonableness and enforceability set out in the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. For these reasons, no such conditions are imposed. It would, however, remain open to the appellant to discuss these matters with the relevant landowners.
12. Finally, a condition preventing implementation of the earlier prior approval is unnecessary as there is no realistic prospect of both schemes being carried out.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would not cause harm to highway safety and complies with the relevant policies of the development plan. The appeal is therefore allowed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR