



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 February 2026

by **M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 April 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/25/3372647

Footpath outside 89 Harrogate Road, Undercliffe, Bradford BD2 3AX

- 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 Limited against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application reference is 25/00993/PNT.
 - The development proposed is a radio base station comprising a 17.5m high Hutchinson monopole, along with 6no antennas, 1no dishes, 3no cabinets and ancillary development thereto.
-

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 radio base station comprising a 17.5m high Hutchinson monopole, along with 6no antennas, 1no dishes, 3no cabinets and ancillary development thereto at Footpath outside 89 Harrogate Road, Undercliffe, Bradford BD2 3AX in accordance with the application reference 25/00993/PNT and the plans and other details submitted with it.

Preliminary Matters

2. 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 (hereafter “the GPDO”) permit certain categories of development, including the installation of electronic communications apparatus and ancillary equipment. This is subject to the restrictions, limitations, conditions and “prior approval” requirements set out in Paragraphs A.1., A.2. and A.3. of the GPDO.
3. The GPDO does not require regard be had to the development plan in this case. I have had regard to its policies which have been brought to my attention only in so far as they are material considerations relevant to matters of siting and appearance. The National Planning Policy Framework (“the Framework”) is also a material consideration.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the siting and appearance of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area and, if any harm would be caused, whether this would be outweighed by the need to site the installation in the proposed location.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site is a part of the footway on the north side of Harrogate Road, between its junctions with Wellington Road and Leeds Road, in north-eastern suburban Bradford. It is in front of a short row of properties comprising ground-floor shop units with flats above, and there are some other commercial premises including a petrol filling station nearby, but the surrounding area is predominantly residential. The proposed development is the installation of a 17.5m high monopole, with ancillary works including the installation of three equipment cabinets.
6. Buildings in the area typically have two storeys; those nearest the appeal site have a ridge height of around 8.8m. Street lighting columns nearby are around 10.3m tall. At 17.5m, the proposed monopole would be considerably taller than most of the other features in its immediate surroundings. There are some street trees along Harrogate Road, but their siting means that they would provide limited, if any, screening of the mast, which would therefore be visible in views for some way along Harrogate Road in both directions and, from the south, from Leeds Road. The equipment cabinets would introduce a degree of visual clutter to the footway. While an installation such as that proposed would not be wholly unexpected or alien in a suburban part of a large city, the height and prominence of the monopole would give it a somewhat stark, intrusive and dominant appearance.
7. I find that the proposed installation would cause a moderate degree of harm to the character and appearance of the area. The development would therefore conflict with Policies DS1, DS3 and SC9 of the 2017 Bradford Core Strategy, which are material considerations insofar as they seek to ensure that all new development achieves good design and contributes to a high-quality environment with a strong sense of place.

Alternatives and other considerations

8. The Framework supports the provision of high quality and reliable communications, which it states are essential for economic growth and social well-being. Paragraph 119 states that planning policies and decisions should support the expansion of the electronic communications network, including next generation mobile technology such as 5G.
9. The proposed development would increase coverage and capacity in the surrounding area for one mobile network operator, and would assist in the roll out of 5G technology in accordance with aspirations in the Framework. I am satisfied that the appellant has demonstrated that there is an identified need for the proposed development to be located somewhere within the search area.
10. The appellant's evidence is that planning permission was granted for the upgrade of an existing base station serving the same operator (and one other) at Quarry House Garage around 300m south-west of the appeal site¹, but that it was not subsequently possible to carry out that development because of the difficulty of providing adequate foundations. Two other existing on-street base stations used by another operator were considered for upgrading and sharing but discounted; in

¹ LPA Ref: 21/04261/FUL

one case this was due to the visual impact on a residential street, in the other because of technical network reasons.

11. Ten further possible locations for new installations were assessed. Some were discounted on account of having greater visual impact than the appeal proposal, some because they would obstruct narrow footways, and others because the presence of underground services would prevent foundations being installed. One of the ten was excluded purely on network coverage grounds, which somewhat limits its value as a genuine alternative. However, the Council did not propose any further alternative sites beyond those already considered and ruled out by the appellant. Based on all the evidence before me, including my observations on my site visit, I am satisfied that there is not a more suitable site for the required facility.
12. The installation would provide improved 4G, and new 5G, mobile communications, infilling what is currently something of a gap in network coverage. It would benefit motorists and bus passengers travelling along what seemed to me to be a busy arterial route, as well as residents in the local area.
13. Taking all of these points together, while the development proposed would cause some harm to the character and appearance of the area, it has been demonstrated that there is an identified need for the proposed equipment within this area and that there are not more suitable alternatives available. These factors outweigh the limited harm I have identified, and in that context I find the siting and appearance of the proposed development would be acceptable.

Other Matter

14. The Council did not raise any objections to the scheme in relation to its effects on public safety, including highway safety, and nothing which has been put before me leads me to a different view on this matter.

Conditions

15. 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

16. While I have found that the siting and appearance of the proposed mast would cause some limited harm to the character and appearance of the area, I consider that this would be outweighed by the need for the installation to be sited as proposed, taking into account alternative locations investigated. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and prior approval should be granted.

M Cryan

Inspector