

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2024

by T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3341723

Hunters Moon, 34 Potter Street, Northwood, Middlesex HA6 1QE

- 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 Mr John McIntyre against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 50102/APP/2023/3574.
 - The development proposed is the addition of a galvanised steel mast, nominal height 10 metres, adjacent to garage wall in rear garden; this mast will support an amateur radio antenna array with a profile very similar to a rotary style washing line.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a prominent corner position between Potter Street and Alandale Drive, in a residential area where the prevailing characteristic is of two storey properties with small domestic tv aerials fixed to the chimneys.
4. The proposed galvanised steel mast would be positioned at the front of a single storey garage, in line with the neighbouring property. Given the 10 metre height of the mast, it would be significantly taller than the garage that it would be viewed against when at full height and taller than the ridgelines of the neighbouring properties.
5. Although set back from the highway, the positioning and height of the mast with the antenna array, would make it an unduly prominent and highly conspicuous feature in views from both the public and private realm, particularly when approaching Potter Street from the southwest. While I note it would not exceed the total overall height of surrounding ridgelines in combination with any antennas on those properties, the proposal visually has a different appearance. It would be noticeably at odds with and fail to

assimilate with the domestic character and appearance of the surrounding residential area.

6. An exception to the prevailing character is a pair of bungalows at 72-74 Alandale Drive, close to the appeal site. They have a tall, fixed height mast on their chimney that appears higher than the ridgeline of the neighbouring properties. While the profile of the mast bears some resemblance to the proposed scheme, I have limited information about the proposed antenna array and therefore cannot be certain of any further similarities. In any case, as the mast on the bungalows is fixed to the chimney, it is not directly comparable to the appeal scheme. I also have limited information about the planning history of the mast and cannot therefore be certain that it benefits from planning permission.
7. I note that the antenna would be telescopic and would be 5 metres tall when retracted. However, limited information has been submitted as to how frequently it would be retracted. From the submitted information, it appears that this would only be in inclement weather. In any case, I am not satisfied that there would be any enforceable mechanism to ensure its retraction when not in use. Therefore, based on the information before me, I attached limited weight to the telescopic nature of the mast.
8. Whilst there are telegraph poles and street lights near to the appeal site, these are sited on the highway. Such structures are not uncommon in urban areas, whereas the mast and antenna would be located in a garden, and is of a different design. As such, the structures are not comparable. Consequently, the existence of these does not lend support to the proposal.
9. For the reasons above, the proposal would be a visually intrusive addition that would detract from the residential character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012) and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020) (LP2). Collectively, these seek, amongst other matters, development which makes a positive contribution to and harmonises with the local context. It would also conflict with Policy DMHD 1 of LP2 which, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure development does not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

T Bennett

INSPECTOR