

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	18 March 2021
Portfolio	Councillor John Blundell, Cabinet Member for a Thriving Economy
Report Author	Emily Sykes
Public/Private Document	Public

<b>Application:</b> 20/00389/TELE	<b>Township:</b> Pennines	<b>Ward:</b> Smallbridge Firgrove
<b>Appeal Reference:</b> APP/P4225/D/20/3259908		<b>Decision level:</b> Delegated
<b>Site Address:</b> Land Off Elizabethan Way, Milnrow, Greater Manchester, OL16 4DG		
<b>Proposal:</b> Installation of a 20m high slim-line column supporting 6 no. antennas, 2 no transmission dishes, 2 no equipment cabinets and ancillary development thereto including a GPS module and 3 no. Remote Radio Units (RRUs).		
<b>Applicant:</b> Clarke Telecom Ltd		<b>Agent:</b> Mr Richard Morison
<b>Planning Inspectorate Decision:</b> Appeal Dismissed – 15 February 2021		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Prior approval was refused on the basis that the proposed installation would represent an incongruous and dominant feature of the street scene in a prominent open location adjacent to a highway in close proximity of a busy junction used as a through route into and out of the town centre of Rochdale. Furthermore, no justified information in relation to alternative ground or rooftop based sites had been provided.</li> <li>– The Inspector agreed with the Council that the 20m monopole would be a dominant, overbearing and discordant feature that would not be assimilated into its surroundings. The proposal is located in a prominent open location with a height twice the size of the nearby existing light columns, buildings and trees. As a result, the height and bulk would be readily visible in both close and long-range views.</li> <li>– Although the proposal is at lower ground level than the existing nearby 15m monopole, the Inspector found that the existing slimline mast is not overly prominent in the context of nearby lighting columns and tree canopies that fringe that part of Elizabethan Way, unlike the prominently sited proposal.</li> <li>– In other considerations, the Inspector agreed with the Council that there was very little detail about the site selection process or the specific alternative options that were identified, considered and discounted – a material consideration to which the Inspector attached significant weight.</li> <li>– On this basis, despite the social and economic benefits of the proposed development, the Inspector found that there would be significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, with consequent conflict with the development plan and also found that there was a lack of evidence for the specified location.</li> <li>– For these reasons, the appeal was dismissed.</li> </ul>		