

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	8 August 2019
Portfolio	Councillor Carol Wardle, Cabinet Member for Planning, Development & Housing
Report Author	Michael Atkinson-Smith
Public/Private Document	Public

Application: 18/01257/TELE	Township: Middleton	Ward: East Middleton
Appeal Reference: APP/P4225/W/19/3321504		Decision level: Delegated
Site Address: Verge adjacent to Oldham Road, M24 1QZ		
Proposal: Prior approval for the installation of a 20 metre high phase 5 Monopole and associated works		
Applicant: EE Ltd and Hutchinson 3G UK Ltd		Agent: WHP Wilkinson Helsby
Planning Inspectorate Decision: Appeal Dismissed – 26 th June 2019		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Council refused to give prior approval for the siting and appearance of a 20m monopole on the grass verge to the south of the Middleton Way (A576) / Manchester New Road (A664) / Oldham Road (A669) roundabout in Middleton Town Centre that would otherwise be permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the GPDO (telecommunications). – The Inspector agreed that the mast would be significantly taller than any other structure or street furniture in the immediate vicinity and noted that the mast would be clearly visible from key vantage points, including Oldham Road (travelling westward), Middleton Shopping Centre and Middleton Bus Station. – Whilst acknowledging that the site is urban and neither an identified key gateway in the Development Plan or within a Conservation Area, the Inspector noted that the mast would nonetheless be sited on a busy primary approach to the town centre that is well used. On this basis, the Inspector concluded that the mast would represent an incongruous and dominant addition to the street scene. – The Inspector did acknowledge that certain factors weighed in the scheme's favour, including the economic and social importance of advanced telecommunications infrastructure, network coverage requirements and sharing between two operators and the Emergency Services Network. However, the Inspector agreed with the Council that inadequate demonstration had been made that no alternative sites were available that would keep the number of sites for street based installations to the minimum. – On the basis that the possibility remains that an alternative site could yet be found, the Inspector did not consider that the operational and locational needs of the operators outweighed the significant harm identified from the mast's appearance and siting in this particular location and dismissed the appeal. 		