

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	6 August 2020
Portfolio	Councillor Carol Wardle, Cabinet Member for Planning, Development & Housing
Report Author	Michael Atkinson-Smith
Public/Private Document	Public

Application: 19/00707/FUL	Township: Middleton	Ward: South Middleton
Appeal Reference: APP/P4225/W/20/3245264		Decision level: Delegated
Site Address: Land Fronting 181-217 Kirkway, Middleton M24 1LW		
Proposal: Replacement of existing 12.7m high monopole with 20m monopole, accommodating 12 no. antenna in an open headframe and 2 no. transmission link dishes, together with 8 no. equipment cabinets and ancillary development		
Applicant: EE (UK) Ltd and H3G (UK) Ltd		Agent: Entrust Professional Services
Planning Inspectorate Decision: Appeal Dismissed – 20 th July 2020		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Council refused to grant planning permission for the erection of a 20m monopole on the basis that it would be a significantly incongruous and dominant feature of the street scene in a highly conspicuous location and would contribute to increased street clutter through the retention of redundant equipment. Harm to residential amenity through visual intrusion was also identified. – 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 the length of Kirkway, Mainway and the Kirkway local centre. As such, the Inspector agreed that the mast would be an intrusive feature that would harmfully detract from the character and appearance of the area. – The Inspector also agreed that an unacceptably adverse effect on the outlook of the residential dwellings above the Kirkway shops would occur, despite the separation distance, as a result of the open nature of the area. – Further noted by the Inspector was the lack of a sufficiently robust demonstration of network coverage requirements and an alternative site selection process, which had been referred to by the LPA in the Officer's Report. – Appeal decisions provided by the appellant were considered by the Inspector to be materially different proposals and not comparable with the appeal scheme. – On the basis the proposal would result in significant harm to visual and residential amenity, and in the absence of a comprehensively presented case that clearly demonstrated that there were no alternatives, the Inspector dismissed the appeal. 		