



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2021

by **Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 15 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3261507

**Verge on Breakspear Road, adjacent to junction with Fine Bush Lane,
Ruislip HA4 7SS**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under a development order.
- The appeal is made by MBNL (EE Ltd and H3G (UK) Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 65930/APP/2020/1831, dated 12 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 31 July 2020.
- The development proposed is the installation of a 20m monopole, 12 No antenna apertures, equipment cabinets and development ancillary thereto.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is whether the siting and appearance of the development would have an acceptable effect on the surroundings and neighbouring residents.

Reasons

3. The proposal would place the development on a section of verge, adjacent to Breakspear Road. There is an existing bus stop and shelter immediately adjacent to the proposed site. There are residential properties on Stowe Crescent immediately to the east and land on the opposite side of the road is within the Green Belt.
4. The adjacent buildings, mainly houses and a public house, are of 2 storeys in height. Due to the presence of the open land and the low level buildings, the area has a semi-rural feel. I noted the presence of another monopole a short distance from the appeal site also on Breakspear Road. There is some reference to this within the submissions and it is clear that there is no direct intention to remove that monopole and equipment as a consequence of the approval of this appeal scheme (although the appellant indicates that there is a requirement to remove it if it becomes redundant).
5. The proposal would have a wide base and main body and its upper sections would accommodate the antenna apertures. The proposal would represent a tall feature within the area. It would be taller than the adjacent buildings by some significant margin, and taller than the street-lights and the existing

telecommunications monopole. Combined with its position, where clear views would be available, and taking account of its width, I consider that the monopole would have a significant and negative visual effect when seen within the area. Its position adjacent to the open land within the Green Belt would accentuate this effect.

6. There is planting along parts of the adjacent garden boundaries which, along with the fences, would screen the lower sections of the proposal. However, it is clear that the upper parts of the proposal would be visible from a number of the residential properties to the east. I consider that where these views are from the nearest properties, including their rear gardens, that the proposal would be particularly dominating and unacceptable.
7. I have had regard to the appellant's statement relating to the need for the proposal and to their search for alternatives. I also acknowledge the considerable encouragement given to the provision of an efficient communications network within the National Planning Policy Framework and elsewhere. I also note that the Framework states that sympathetic design is a requirement. I confirm that I have taken it into account and so give weight to these matters in favour of the appeal. I have also taken account of the other appeal decisions submitted by the appellant but each case will have its own individual circumstances and locational characteristics and so the balance of differing factors may also be different. When weighed against the significant and unacceptable visual effects of the proposal in this case, I consider that those other matters are insufficient to outweigh the harm that would arise from this proposal. Therefore, I find that the proposal is contrary to Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHB 21 of the Council's Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies and there are no matters sufficient to outweigh that conflict.
8. As a result of my findings, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR