

## Application reference: 21/3178/TEL MORTLAKE, BARNES COMMON WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
09.09.2021	09.09.2021	03.11.2021	03.11.2021

### Site:

Telecommunications Mast Outside Bus Station, North Worple Way, Mortlake, London

### Proposal:

Installation of a 10m monopole with tri-antenna and 2 no. equipment cabinets and associated ancillary works.

Status: Pending Decision (If status = HOLD please check that all is OK before you proceed any further with this application)

### APPLICANT NAME

EE (UK) Ltd  
Hatfield Business Park  
Hatfield  
AL10 9BW

### AGENT NAME

Mr George Oliver  
131  
Trinity Street  
Huddersfield  
HD1 4DZ

**DC Site Notice:** printed on 10.09.2021 and posted on 17.09.2021 and due to expire on 08.10.2021

### Consultations:

#### Internal/External:

#### Consultee

14D Urban D  
LBRUT Transport

#### Expiry Date

24.09.2021  
24.09.2021

### Neighbours:

24 Dovecote Gardens, Mortlake, SW14 8PN -  
7 Westfields Avenue, Barnes, London, SW13 0AT -  
77 Beverley Way, West Wimbledon, London, SW20 0AW -  
6 Rock Avenue, Sheen, SW14 8PG -  
480 Upper Richmond Road, Barnes, London, SW15 5JG -  
11 Trehern Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 8PD -  
15 Cowley Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8QD -  
95 Cowley Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8QD, - 10.09.2021  
58 Ashleigh Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PX, - 10.09.2021  
100 Ashleigh Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PX, -  
97 Avondale Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PU, - 10.09.2021  
21 Ripley Gardens, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HF, - 10.09.2021  
8 Queens Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 8PJ, -  
,, - 10.09.2021  
7 Ripley Gardens, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HF, - 10.09.2021  
40 South Worple Way, East Sheen, London, SW14 8PB, -  
9 Lodge Avenue, East Sheen, London, SW14 8PQ, - 10.09.2021  
24 Queens Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 8PJ, - 10.09.2021  
44 Ripley Gardens, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HF, -  
21 Ashleigh Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PY, - 10.09.2021  
91 Ashleigh Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PY, - 10.09.2021  
210 Huntingfield Road, London, Sw155es - 10.09.2021  
12 Avondale Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PT, -  
38 Beards Hill, Hampton, TW12 2AQ, - 10.09.2021  
2 Rock Avenue, East Sheen, London, SW14 8PG, - 10.09.2021  
19 Parkfield Avenue, East Sheen, London, SW14 8DY, - 10.09.2021

109 St Leonards Court, St Leonards Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 7LS, - 10.09.2021  
29 Avondale Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PU, - 10.09.2021  
18 First Avenue, Mortlake, London, SW14 8SR, - 10.09.2021  
Flat 2, 76 White Hart Lane, Barnes, London, SW13 0PZ, - 10.09.2021  
8 North Worple Way, Mortlake, London, SW14 8QG, - 10.09.2021  
25 Avondale Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PU, - 10.09.2021  
18 Fitzgerald Avenue, East Sheen, London, SW14 8SZ, - 10.09.2021  
48 Ripley Gardens, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HF, - 10.09.2021  
56 Gilpin Avenue, East Sheen, London, SW14 8QY, -  
16 Fitzgerald Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HA, - 10.09.2021  
9 Westfields Avenue, Barnes, London, SW13 0AT, - 10.09.2021  
8 Lodge Avenue, East Sheen, London, SW14 8PQ, - 10.09.2021  
1 Queens Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 8PH, - 10.09.2021  
25 North Worple Way, Mortlake, London, SW14 8QA, - 10.09.2021  
11 Oaklands Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 8NJ, - 10.09.2021  
5 James Terrace, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HB, - 10.09.2021  
32 Dovecote Gardens, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
43 Ripley Gardens, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HF, - 10.09.2021  
41B North Worple Way, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PZ, - 10.09.2021  
50 South Worple Way, East Sheen, London, SW14 8PB, - 10.09.2021  
30 Worple Street, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HE, - 10.09.2021  
10 Lodge Avenue, London, SW14 8PQ, - 10.09.2021  
4 Ripley Gardens, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HF, - 10.09.2021  
6 Ripley Gardens, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HF, - 10.09.2021  
9 Trehern Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 8PD, - 10.09.2021  
8 Ripley Gardens, Mortlake, Sw14 8hf - 10.09.2021  
41 South Worple Way, East Sheen, London, SW14 8PB, - 10.09.2021  
94 Ashleigh Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PX, - 10.09.2021  
58 North Worple Way, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PS, - 10.09.2021  
67 First Avenue, Mortlake, London, SW14 8SP, - 10.09.2021  
82, Ashleigh Road, Ashleigh Road, Mortlake, Sw14 8px - 10.09.2021  
41 Rosemary Gardens, Mortlake, London, SW14 7HD, - 10.09.2021  
3 Fitzgerald Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HA, - 10.09.2021  
45 Elm Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 7JL, -  
88 Westfields Avenue, Barnes, London, SW13 0AZ, - 10.09.2021  
26 Queens Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 8PJ, - 10.09.2021  
64 First Avenue, Mortlake, London, SW14 8SR, - 10.09.2021  
31 Queens Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 8PH, -  
53 North Worple Way, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PS, -  
7 Avondale Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PU, - 10.09.2021  
52 Ashleigh Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PX, - 10.09.2021  
11 Rosemary Lane, Mortlake, London, SW14 7HG, - 10.09.2021  
15 Avondale Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PU, - 10.09.2021  
29 Ashleigh Road, Mortlake, SW14 8PY - 10.09.2021  
115 Cowley Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8QD, -  
36 Ashleigh Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PX, - 10.09.2021  
9 First Avenue, Mortlake, London, SW14 8SP, -  
29 Glendower Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 8NY, - 10.09.2021  
29 Ripley Gardens, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HF, - 10.09.2021  
20 Cowley Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8QB, -  
13 Avondale House, Mortlake High Street, Mortlake, London, SW14 8SQ, - 10.09.2021  
5 Kings Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 8PF, - 10.09.2021  
16 BEL LANE, FELTHAM, TW13 6BY - 10.09.2021  
13 Cowley Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8QD, - 10.09.2021  
56 Cowley Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8QB, - 10.09.2021  
22 Ashleigh Rd, Mortlake, SW14 8PX - 10.09.2021  
Church Hall (St Mary Magdalene Church), North Worple Way, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PR, - 10.09.2021  
6 Avondale Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PT, - 10.09.2021  
4 Worple Street, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HE, - 10.09.2021  
253 VARSITY DRIVE, TWICKENHAM, TW1 1AP - 10.09.2021  
8 Richmond Park Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 8JT, - 10.09.2021  
11 Rock Avenue, East Sheen, London, SW14 8PG, - 10.09.2021  
26 Ripley Gardens, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HF, - 10.09.2021  
22 Ashleigh Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PX, - 10.09.2021  
40 Alder Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8ER, -  
128 Ashleigh Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PX, - 10.09.2021  
73 North Worple Way, Mortlake, Sw14 8pr - 10.09.2021

145 Kingsway,Mortlake,London,SW14 7HN, - 10.09.2021  
42 Cowley Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8QB, - 10.09.2021  
62 White Hart Lane,Barnes,London,SW13 0PZ, - 10.09.2021  
120 Ashleigh Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PX, - 10.09.2021  
73 North Worple Way,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PR, - 10.09.2021  
1 Fitzgerald Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HA, - 10.09.2021  
27 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
2 WOODLANDS AVENUE,WEST BYFLEET,KT14 6AT - 10.09.2021  
28 Ripley Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HF, - 10.09.2021  
The Studio,7A Queens Road,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PH, - 10.09.2021  
59 Cowley Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8QD, - 10.09.2021  
65 Ashleigh Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PY, - 10.09.2021  
56 Ashleigh Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PX, -  
66A,66 White Hart Lane,London,SW13 0PZ - 10.09.2021  
66 White Hart Lane,Barnes,London,SW13 0PZ, - 10.09.2021  
312 Cowley Mansions,Mortlake High Street,Mortlake,London,SW14 8SL, - 10.09.2021  
22 Ripley Gardens,London,SW14 8HF - 10.09.2021  
45 First Avenue,Mortlake,London,SW14 8SP, - 10.09.2021  
102 Cowley Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8QB, - 10.09.2021  
37 North Worple Way,Mortlake,London,SW14 8QA, -  
19 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
52 South Worple Way,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PB, - 10.09.2021  
51 Essex Court,Station Road,Barnes,London,SW13 0ER, - 10.09.2021  
82 WEST HILL,LONDON,SW15 2UJ - 10.09.2021  
72 North Worple Way,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PR, - 10.09.2021  
10 Ripley Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HF, - 10.09.2021  
27 27 Ripley Gardens,London,SW148HF - 10.09.2021  
22 Fitzgerald Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HA, - 10.09.2021  
20 Ripley Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HF, - 10.09.2021  
38 First Avenue,Mortlake,London,SW14 8SR, - 10.09.2021  
29 North Worple Way,Mortlake,London,SW14 8QA, - 10.09.2021  
53 Ashleigh Road,London,Sw148py - 10.09.2021  
106 Ashleigh Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PX, - 10.09.2021  
5 Second Avenue,Mortlake,London,SW14 8QF, - 10.09.2021  
15 Ripley Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HF, - 10.09.2021  
31 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
81 South Worple Way,East Sheen,London,SW14 8NG, - 10.09.2021  
2 Ripley Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HF, - 10.09.2021  
5 Kings Ride House,289 Sheen Road,Richmond,TW10 5AW, - 10.09.2021  
18 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
21 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
6 Lodge Avenue,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PQ, - 10.09.2021  
24 Ripley Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HF, -  
95 Avondale Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PU, - 10.09.2021  
124 Ashleigh Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PX, - 10.09.2021  
11 Lodge Avenue,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PQ, -  
54 North Worple Way,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PS, - 10.09.2021  
23 Ripley Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HF, - 10.09.2021  
6 Shelley House,34 South Worple Way,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PB, - 10.09.2021  
1 Shelley House,34 South Worple Way,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PB, - 10.09.2021  
4 Shelley House,34 South Worple Way,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PB, - 10.09.2021  
3 Shelley House,34 South Worple Way,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PB, - 10.09.2021  
2 Shelley House,34 South Worple Way,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PB, - 10.09.2021  
5 Shelley House,34 South Worple Way,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PB, - 10.09.2021  
33 South Worple Way,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PB, - 10.09.2021  
39 South Worple Way,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PB, - 10.09.2021  
38 South Worple Way,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PB, - 10.09.2021  
37 South Worple Way,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PB, - 10.09.2021  
1 Lodge Avenue,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PQ, - 10.09.2021  
47 North Worple Way,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PZ, - 10.09.2021  
52 North Worple Way,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PS, - 10.09.2021  
50A North Worple Way,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PZ, - 10.09.2021  
48 North Worple Way,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PZ, - 10.09.2021  
16 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
14 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
12 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
10 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021

8 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
5 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, -  
3 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
1 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
123 Avondale Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PU, - 10.09.2021  
119 Avondale Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PU, - 10.09.2021  
115 Avondale Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PU, - 10.09.2021  
111 Avondale Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PU, - 10.09.2021  
51 North Worple Way,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PS, - 10.09.2021  
50 North Worple Way,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PZ, - 10.09.2021  
49 North Worple Way,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PZ, - 10.09.2021  
17 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
15 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
13 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, -  
11 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
9 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
7 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
6 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
4 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
2 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN, - 10.09.2021  
Omnibus Garage,Avondale Road,Mortlake,London,Surrey,SW14 8PT - 10.09.2021  
125 Avondale Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PU, - 10.09.2021  
121 Avondale Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PU, - 10.09.2021  
117 Avondale Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PU, - 10.09.2021  
113 Avondale Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PU, - 10.09.2021  
109 Avondale Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PU, - 10.09.2021  
17 First Avenue,Mortlake,London,SW14 8SP, - 10.09.2021  
1 North Worple Way,Mortlake,London,Surrey,SW14 8QG, - 10.09.2021  
16 Trehern Road,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PD, -  
65 First Avenue,Mortlake,London,SW14 8SP, - 10.09.2021  
47 First Avenue,Mortlake,London,SW14 8SP, - 10.09.2021  
21 Cowley Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8QD, - 10.09.2021  
11 Glendower Road,East Sheen,London,SW14 8NY, - 10.09.2021  
15 Rock Avenue,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PG, - 10.09.2021  
33 Ripley Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HF, - 10.09.2021  
53 Vernon Road,East Sheen,London,SW14 8NU, - 10.09.2021  
22 Ripley Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HF, - 10.09.2021  
92 Ashleigh Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PX, - 10.09.2021  
10 Queens Road,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PJ, - 10.09.2021  
61 Avondale Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PU, - 10.09.2021  
13 Ripley Gardens,London,SW14 8HF - 10.09.2021  
39 Queens Road,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PH -  
20 Avondale Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PT -  
18 Princes Road,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PE -  
6 Rock Avenue,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PG -  
56 Cowley Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8QB -  
COLLINGWOOD GRANGE COTTAGE,COLLINGWOOD GRANGE CLOSE,CAMBERLEY,GU15 1LD -  
23 Trehern Road,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PD -  
46 Ripley Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HF -  
25 Ripley Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HF -  
FLAT 13,LONGVIEW COURT 61,SOUTHVILLE ROAD,FELTHAM,TW14 8FN -  
24 Princes Road,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PE -  
29 Ashleigh Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PY -  
4 Rock Avenue,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PG -  
56 South Worple Way,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PB -  
18 Queens Road,London,SW14 8PJ -  
5 The Byeway,East Sheen,London,SW14 7NL -  
51 North Worple Way,Mortlake,London,SW148PS -  
4 Queens Road,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PJ -  
3 Rose Cottages,Rock Avenue,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PG -  
8 Ripley Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HF -  
97 Cowley Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8QD -  
12 Lodge Avenue,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PQ -  
37 Vernon Road,East Sheen,London,SW14 8NH -  
25 Enmore Gardens,East Sheen,London,SW14 8RF -  
49 Cowley Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8QD -  
34 Ripley Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HF -

65 White Hart Lane,Barnes,London,SW13 0PP -  
77 Archway Street,Barnes,SW13 0AN -  
20 Dovecote Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PN -  
17A Sheen Lane,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HY -  
9 Queens Road,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PH -  
36 Cowley Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8QB -  
93 Cowley Road,Mortlake,London,SW14 8QD -  
17 Queens Road,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PH -  
23 Princes Road,East Sheen,London,SW14 8PE -  
121 White Hart Lane,Barnes,London,SW13 0JW -  
133 Sheen Lane,East Sheen,London,SW14 8AE -  
13 Ripley gardens,Mortlake,London,Sw14 8hf -

**History: Development Management, Appeals, Building Control, Enforcements:**

Development Management

Status: REF Application:11/0062/TEL  
Date:28/02/2011 Proposed installation of telecommunication mast outside Bus Depot.

---

Development Management

Status: REF Application:20/1206/TEL  
Date:23/06/2020 Installation of 1 x 15m high monopole and 3 x equipment cabinets on new concrete base (address correction location previously stated as South Worple Way)

---

Development Management

Status: PDE Application:21/3178/TEL  
Date: Installation of a 10m monopole with tri-antenna and 2 no. equipment cabinets and associated ancillary works.

---

**Proposal:**

The application has been made under Class A, Part 16, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) ('the GPDO'). The application is to determine whether the Prior Approval of the Local Planning Authority is required as to the siting and appearance of the following:

This application is seeking prior approval for installation of a 10m monopole with tri-antenna and 2 no. equipment cabinets and associated ancillary works.

**Site:**

The application site is located close to an intersection between Avondale Road and North Worple Way on the Southern side of Mortlake Bus Station. Although the site is not within a Conservation Area, the site is located adjacent to the Queens Road Mortlake Conservation Area the boundary of which lies to the south side of the railway on South Worple Way. Further Conservation Areas encompass North Worple Way some 100m to the West (CA33 Mortlake) and 150m to the East (A79 Cowley Road), indicated by the hatched areas on the map below.



The site is also located within Floodzones 2, 3 and 3a as well as being designated within an archaeological priority area.

**Planning history:**

This is the fourth prior approval application for a telecommunication mast in this general location and follows two relatively recent refusals, with the main difference from the preceding applications being a gradual reduction in the height of the monopole by 2.5 metres in height to 10 metres from previous proposals for a monopole of 12.5 m and 15 m respectively. In other respects this proposal essentially reflects these earlier schemes.

**20/2044/TEL** - Installation of a telecommunications base station and 1 x 12.5m high monopole. **Refused 23.08.2020** (the resultant appeal under ref: APP/L5810/W/20/3264935 was dismissed on the 17.06.21.) This application was refused on the following basis:

*Under schedule 2, Part 16 of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended), the Local Planning authority has determined that prior approval is required and hereby REFUSED as to the siting and appearance of the proposed development for the following reason:*

*The proposal, by reason of its prominent siting and height would result in an unduly dominant, incongruous and visually intrusive form of development that would adversely affect the character, appearance and the visual amenity of the streetscene in general and the setting of the Queens Road Conservation Area. The application fails to sufficiently demonstrate the need for an additional telecommunications pole and associated equipment in this location. The scheme results in harm that would not be outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme. As such, the proposal is considered contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (in particular paras 113 and 115) and the Local Plan (2018) in particular LP1, LP3 and LP33 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Telecommunications Equipment' (2006) and Mortlake Village Planning Guidance (2015) and the Queens Road Conservation Area Study and Statement.*

This current application almost identical to the current application, notwithstanding the 2.5 m reduction in height. Earlier applications for the erection of a proposed monopole in this location have also been refused:

**20/1206/TEL** - Installation of 1 x 15m high monopole and 3 x equipment cabinets on new concrete base (address correction location previously stated as South Worple Way). **Refused 23.06.21**

*Reasons:*

*The application fails to sufficiently demonstrate the need for an additional telecommunications pole and associated equipment in this location and does not demonstrate that adequate consultation has been undertaken. As such the application fails to comply with outcomes sought in Paras. 113 and 115 in Chapter 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and Policy LP33 of the Local Plan.*

*The proposal, by reason of its prominent siting, height and design would result in an unduly dominant, incongruous and visually intrusive form of development that would adversely affect the character, appearance and the visual amenity of the streetscene in general and the setting of the Queens Road Conservation Area resulting in harm that would not be outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme. As such, the proposal is considered contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and the Local Plan (2018) in particular LP1, LP3 and LP33 and Supplementary Planning Document 'Telecommunications Equipment' (2006) and Mortlake Village Planning Guidance (2015) and the Queens Road Conservation Area Study and Statement.*

**11/0062/TEL** - Proposed installation of telecommunication mast outside Bus Depot. **Refused 28.02.2011**

**Reasons:**

*The proposed column, by reason of its size, siting and design, would appear visually intrusive and result in a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area, including the nearby Queens Road Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies BLT 2, 11, 13 and 24 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan - First Review Adopted March 2005, policies DC1 and HD1 of the emerging Development management Plan and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: Telecommunications Equipment' adopted June 2006.*

*The proposed column, by reason of its size and location would give rise to a perception of health risk to neighbouring residents. It would thereby be contrary to policy BLT 16 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan - First Review Adopted March 2005, policy DC5 of the emerging Development management Plan and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: Telecommunications Equipment' adopted June 2006.*

*The proposed column and ancillary equipment, by reason of its size and location would adversely impact on the free passage of pedestrians along this footpath without obstruction and would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety in the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy TRN 2 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan - First Review Adopted March 2005 and policy TP2 of the emerging Development management Plan*

**Amendments:**

None received.

**Material representations:**

**Neighbour consultation**

The application has been subject to number objections from third parties, the full details of which are available to view on the Council's website.

Approximately 84 objections have been received, predominantly from local residents and local amenity and society groups, Local Councilors and MP Sarah Olney. The objections are wide ranging and full details of all the comments received are available to view online, but the main points could be summarized as:

- Extremely unsightly
- Visually intrusive
- Out of character
- Additional street clutter
- Health risks due to radiation
- Unknown health implications
- Dangerous
- Harmful to wildlife
- More suitable locations elsewhere where masts are already in use
- Inappropriately located near a school
- Concerns of children and vulnerable populations
- Highway safety due to the obstruction of free passage to the bus stop
- Harmful to surrounding conservation area
- Harmful to nearby heritage assets
- Out of scale with surrounding residential buildings
- Overly dominant
- Incongruous

- Insufficient and inaccurate information
- Has not addressed previous reasons for refusal
- Harm outweighs benefit

The application was also subject to more general observations and letters generally supporting the benefits of improved communication. The observations echo the objections and considered that soft landscaping may improve the appearance, with the four letters generally supporting the benefits of improved telecommunications and noting no particular impact on nearby premises.

All representations have been taken into consideration throughout this assessment.

### **Planning policies:**

The application has been made under Class A, Part 16, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) ('the GPDO'). The following NPPF and Local Development Plans are also relevant:

### **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021)**

- Chapter 10 Supporting High Quality Communications

### **London Plan (2021)**

- Policy SI6

### **Local Plan (2018)**

- LP 1 - Local Character and Design Quality
- LP3 – Designated Heritage assets
- LP5 – Views and Vistas
- LP 8 - Amenity and Living Conditions
- LP 33 – Telecommunications
- LP 44 – Sustainable travel choices
- LP45 – Parking standards and servicing

### **Supplementary Planning Documents / Guidance**

'Telecommunications Equipment' (2006)

Queens Road Mortlake Conservation Area Statement & Study (CA35)

Mortlake Village Planning guidance (2015)

### **Professional comments:**

The installation of the telecoms mast and equipment constitutes permitted development provided that the operators comply with the relevant conditions set out within the GPDO, including giving the Local Planning Authority the opportunity to consider the siting and appearance of the apparatus, a procedure commonly referred to as Prior Approval. The Prior Approval procedure means that the principle of development is not an issue for consideration and it is noted as Class A.1(1) (C (i) allows provision of a mast of up to 25 metres in height above ground level on unprotected land, subject to prior approval for siting and appearance.

### **Prior Approval Required**

Under A.3 (prior approval) in Class A Part 16, the developer is required to give notice of the proposed development to any person who is an owner of the land to which the development relates. The application for prior approval is accompanied by a copy of the email with the Developers Notice sent to TfL as owner of the land in question on 26.08.21 and a series of email exchanges between EE and TFL.

The applicant has submitted a developers notice with their application to evidence that they have given the requisite notice. However, the notice submitted to the LPA the application has been made to Richmondshire District Council in DL10 4JX which is in North Yorkshire, which is clearly erroneous as this authority is the London Borough of Richmond. There is a separate authority to Richmond so is incorrect and fails to meet the requirements at A.3.(1) and (2). Email exchanges between EE and TFL, who operate the bus station are also submitted.

This evidence is required to be submitted to the LPA by virtue of A.3.(5)(c).

### **Policy Background**

Guidance within Chapter 10 Paras. 114 to 118 in the NPPF (2021) is relevant.



Para. 114 states that advanced, high quality and reliable communications infrastructure is essential for economic growth and social well-being. Planning policies and decisions should support the expansion of electronic communications networks, including next generation mobile technology (such as 5G) and full fibre broadband connections. Policies should set out how high-quality digital infrastructure, providing access to services from a range of providers, is expected to be delivered and upgraded over time; and should prioritise full fibre connections to existing and new developments (as these connections will, in almost all cases, provide the optimum solution).

Para. 115 advises that the number of radio and electronic communications masts, and the sites for such installations, should be kept to a minimum consistent with the needs of consumers, the efficient operation of the network and providing reasonable capacity for future expansion. Use of existing masts, buildings and other structures for new electronic communications capability (including wireless) should be encouraged. Where new sites are required (such as for new 5G networks, or for connected transport and smart city applications), equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate.

Para 116 states that Local Planning Authorities should not impose a ban on new electronic communications development in certain areas, impose blanket Article 4 directions over a wide area or a wide range of electronic communications development, or insist on minimum distances between new electronic communications development and existing development.

The guidance goes on to state that Councils should ensure that applicants:

- a) have evidence to demonstrate that electronic communications infrastructure is not expected to cause significant and irremediable interference with other electrical equipment, air traffic services or instrumentation operated in the national interest;
- b) have considered the possibility of the construction of new buildings or other structures interfering with broadcast and electronic communications services.

Para 117 states that applications for electronic communications development (including applications for Prior Approval under the GPDO) should be supported by the necessary evidence to justify the proposed development. This should include:

- a) the outcome of consultations with organisations with an interest in the proposed development, in particular with the relevant body where a mast is to be installed near a school or college, or within a statutory safeguarding zone surrounding an aerodrome, technical site or military explosives storage area; and
- b) for an addition to an existing mast or base station, a statement that self-certifies that the cumulative exposure, when operational, will not exceed International Commission guidelines on non-ionising radiation protection; or
- c) for a new mast or base station, evidence that the applicant has explored the possibility of erecting antennas on an existing building, mast or other structure and a statement that self-certifies that, when operational, International Commission guidelines will be met.

Para 118 states that Local Planning Authorities must determine applications on planning grounds only. They should not seek to prevent competition between different operators, question the need for an electronic communications system, or set health safeguards different from the International Commission guidelines for public exposure.

Local Plan Policy LP33 'Telecommunications' states that the Council will promote the enhanced connectivity of the borough through supporting infrastructure for high speed broadband and telecommunications. Applications for telecommunications development will be considered in accordance with national policy and guidance and the following:

1. The applicant will need to submit evidence to demonstrate that all options for sharing of existing equipment, including with other operators, and erecting masts on existing tall buildings or structures, have been fully explored before considering the erection of new structures or facilities;
2. Visual impacts of telecommunications proposal should be minimised, in line with Local Plan Policy LP1 'Local Character and Design Quality', particularly on rooftops;
3. The applicant has demonstrated that the development will operate within the ICNIRP guidelines for public exposure.

Further guidance is provided in the Council's Telecommunications Equipment SPD.

What follows is an assessment of the application against the relevant policies and guidance above.

Para. 115 NPPF – Number of electronic communications equipment

This application is submitted by Everything Everywhere, which it is explained is a joint venture between Deutsche and France telecom and others. The applicants statement describes the coordinates for 14 alternative sites considered and discounted, including seven existing sites. It is noted that many of the options are discounted on technical grounds, including distance to the optimal call centre, density of surrounding buildings sited in close proximity to residential housing, too dense and too narrow to house the equipment. Other factors include sites such as Barnes hospital discounted because of anticipated comprehensive redevelopment, no suitable rooftops, Network rail safeguarding requirements given the proximity of the railway, insufficient space and interference with pedestrian mobility.

The submission explains how the applicant adopted a sequential approach to site selection which is encouraged in the Code of Best Practice for Mobile Operators and the NPPF and advised that efforts have been made to utilise existing telecommunications sites wherever possible to prevent the proliferation of base stations. It is advised in this instance there was no existing sites situated within the search area. As a result, there was a requirement to identify alternative options for a new base station. The information provided explains the level of coverage on this part of the train line is extremely poor (optimum levels would be green - > = -55 as per the key). The aim of the installation is essentially to eliminate any red/black areas which show very weak/poor coverage areas on the train routes and that this installation will improve the levels of coverage to aim towards achieving the green level of optimum coverage.

In the selection process of this application site, the applicant has taken into account the site's effectiveness within the overall network on balance with design considerations for its siting and appearance. A number of alternative options were identified which are also listed in the supporting statement. Each option has been discounted in favour of the application site for a variety of reasons which are detailed in this accompanying document.

It is noted that in this regard to the dismissed appeal decision in connection with 20/2044/TEL, referred to in the planning history (APP/L5810/W/20/3264935) in relation to a previous proposal for a 12.5 m monopole made by the same applicant the Inspector specifically noted at Paragraph 9:

*"My attention is drawn to an assessment of four alternative locations which were assessed by the applicant. In each of the cases, a short explanation of why the site is inappropriate is given, however in my opinion, clear and detailed evidence has not been provided. Such an example is the 'Vodafone site' which is located near trees at the Mortlake Old Burial Ground which could be a potential site to share equipment with another operator. Whilst it is stated by the applicant that the sharing of equipment may lead to a large mast and more equipment boxes being needed which is a logical expectation, this is not actually qualified or demonstrated so that a reasonable assessment can be made of the resultant impacts as to the character and appearance so that this site can be discounted. There also appears to be contradictory information presented given that an alternative site at sites labelled 1 and 2 are discounted by the presence of trees, whereas the Vodafone site is partly surrounded by trees."*

As previously several objections were received arguing that the chosen location is not suitable due to the potential impacts it would have on the adjacent conservation area and residential character of the locality. Criticisms have also been made of the lack of transparent information to fully justify why sites have been discounted. A very detailed representation received from Knights PLC on behalf of the Dovecote Garden residents association is notable in this regard. This representation highlights a number of concerns over the consideration of alternatives identified which they do not consider been addressed within this resubmission and that the application has again failed to justify the need for a new development and has not provided any evidence as to why they would not be able to use the 'Vodafone site' at Old Mortlake burial ground, it is noted that the report submitted with the application does state that this particular site was discounted because there is not enough land to extend the compound to accommodate the monopole and associated equipment, which it is advised is due to the existing footpath. Therefore the site is discounted as it would not be able to be upgraded to a site share.

The Inspectors view (as noted above) was that, clear and detailed evidence within the short explanations had not been provided. It is again noted that very short explanations are provided and in particular, within the earlier refusal, the LPA found that it was insufficiently clear why the appealed site alongside the Burial Ground could not be a shareable structure. In the absence of such information, the applicant has failed to demonstrate to the LPAs satisfaction that there is a not a sequentially more preferable existing site to the proposed new site as required by the Local Plan which notes at para 8.6.2 that:

*"It is important to keep the number of masts and sites to a minimum as an over-concentration of equipment and installations can have harmful impacts on the borough's unique and distinctive character. Therefore, there is an expectation that existing masts, buildings and other structures are used wherever possible, which includes sharing facilities with other operators, unless the need for a new site has been justified and accepted by the Council. Where new sites or structures are required, equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where possible."*

The Council is not satisfied that the applicant has met the terms of Policy LP33 in demonstrating that all options for sharing of existing equipment, including with other operators, and erecting masts on existing tall buildings or structures, have been fully explored before considering the erection of new structures or facilities. The policy requirement is explicit that the applicant will need to “submit evidence to demonstrate that all options for sharing of existing equipment, including with other operators, and erecting masts on existing tall buildings or structures, have been fully explored before considering the erection of new structures or facilities” (Council’s emphasis).

The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) recognises that high quality and reliable communications infrastructure is essential for economic growth and social well-being. However, while planning decisions should support the expansion of communications networks, paragraph 115 of the Framework advises that the number of masts and the sites for such installations should be kept to a minimum. Use of existing masts, buildings and other structures is encouraged. The LPA is not satisfied from the information provided that no alternative sites would be available to provide the required coverage. This is a material consideration which affects the planning balance.

Para. 116 NPPF – Interference with other equipment and services

The proposal site is not within close proximity with air traffic services or instrumentation operated in the national interest.

Para 117 (c) NPPF – International Commissions guidelines compliance

With regards to part (c), consideration of alternative sites and a ICNIRP declaration report has been submitted as part of the application. It is advised that ICNIRP (International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection) aims to protect people and the environment against adverse effects of non-ionizing radiation (NIR). Public compliance is determined by mathematical calculation and implemented by careful location of antennas, access restrictions and/or barriers and signage as necessary. Members of the public cannot unknowingly enter areas close to the antennas where exposure may exceed the relevant guidelines. When determining compliance, the emissions from all mobile phone network operators on the site are taken into account.

As with the previous proposal 20/2044/TEL the proposed installation would comply with the ICNIRP guidance and, where such compliance is certified by the operator (as it is in this case), the NPPF indicates that a Local Planning Authority should not seek to set additional health standards. The NPPF states that Local Planning Authority must determine applications on planning grounds. They should not seek to prevent competition between different operators, question the need for the telecommunications system, or determine health safeguards if the proposal meets International Commission guidelines.

As with previous application the applicant has provided the Council with the requisite ICNIRP (International Commission for Non-Ionising Radiation) declaration for public exposure and consequently an objection on public health grounds is not considered to be tenable. This position is established in planning law and in this respect the proposal is in accordance with this part of policy LP33 of the Local Plan (2018) and SPD ‘Telecommunications Equipment’ (2008).

Siting and Appearance

*Policy LP1 states that development must be of a high architectural and urban design quality. Development must be inclusive, respect local character including the nature of a particular road, and connect with, and contribute positively, to its surroundings based on a thorough understanding of the site and its context. Particular regard should be had to the compatibility with local character, detailing and materials.*

The ‘Telecommunications Equipment’ SPD states that masts are generally not acceptable unless it can be demonstrated they:

- Will not be prominent in the streetscene or from dwellings;
- Will not be detrimental to the character or appearance of important buildings including listed buildings or BTMs
- Will not adversely affect the character of a Conservation Area;
- Will not affect an important viewpoint or be prominent on the skyline;

Will not be sited so close to other telecommunications equipment or other street furniture, where it would create a cluttered visual appearance

*Policy LP 3 seeks to protect, and where possible enhance, the character and appearance of conservation areas. Policy LP4 sets out the council will seek to preserve, and where possible enhance, the significance, character and setting of non-designated heritage asset, including Buildings of townscape Merit (BTM)*

*Policy LP 33 deals with telecommunications and states that the Council will promote the enhanced connectivity of the borough through supporting infrastructure for high speed broadband and telecommunications. The policy confirms that applications will be determined in accordance with national policy and guidance, that the sharing and utilization of existing structures will be encouraged but also that the visual impacts of telecommunications proposals should be minimised in accordance with policy LP 1.. The policy also requires confirmation that proposals will comply with the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection Guidelines (ICNIRP) for public exposure.*

As with previous prior approval proposals a large number of objections have been received commenting that the chosen location is not suitable due to the potential impacts it would have on the adjacent conservation area and residential character of the locality.

As noted in the earlier refusal, subsequently dismissed on appeal the site is within Character Area 2 within the Mortlake Village Planning Guidance (SPD). This document notes that the area is characterised by small to medium sized terraced housing although "There is some recent infill on Avondale Road where the former Mortlake bus depot was located. The bus depot had opened in the early twentieth century originally for horse buses and was closed in 1983. A small area at the southern end of the site has been retained as a turning point for buses. The spur footbridge on North Worple Way, an unusual semi-circular iron structure of 1902, provides an important link from Mortlake to East Sheen." The SPD identifies the 'improvement of public realm setting and treatment, particularly around the bus depot' as an opportunity. At section 2.3 the SPD notes the planning policy aim to relocated the Avondale Road bus terminus.

The dismissed appeal in relation to 20/2044/TEL for a 12.5m monopole was not supported due to the impact it would have on the immediate locality and the Queens Road Conservation Area that is adjacent to the site. Previous officers report explained that the height of the previously proposed monopole, within its context of a predominately low set residential area, would create an overly exposed mast which would adversely impact on the character and appearance of the area. Likewise, the refused scheme (20/1026/TEL), which proposed a 15m monopole with ancillary equipment was refused on similar grounds.

The NPPF is clear that where new telecommunication sites are required, equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate. To this extent, it is noted that some mobile coverage would be compromised to reduce the height of the monopole in comparison to the previously refused applications for higher masts than that proposed. Whereas the intention of blending the monopole in with the existing street furniture such is noted, no specific details of how it is proposed to blend the mast in has been provided as with the previous application where it was suggested this be painted beige to blend in and it is observed that the streetlights are significant lower in height and given the predominantly two storey residential nature of the area, and the siting of the monopole within a relatively open area, it is considered that there is little within the immediate context to soften the impact of the considerably higher monopole proposed. This will make the monopole conspicuous in both close- and longer-range views, including from the opposite side of the railway line. Given the conspicuous size of the proposal it is clear that the scheme, in this location, would appear as a dominant and incongruous form of development in the area.

There has been no concerted attempt to address policy in this revised proposal and of the drawings provided only show limited detail of the equipment. As pointed out in the objection of Knights PLC none of the drawings provided enable an appropriate assessment of the impact of telecoms equipment in terms of its appearance, including any details of the proposed shroud, dishes, colour etc in comparison to the surrounding area. The photographs provided within the supplementary information, do not provide a clear or accurate depiction based on the elevations.

The Planning Inspector in the previous scheme 20/2044/TEL considered the impact of the mast on various heritage assets as para 7 and 8, noting:

*"Whilst there are some telegraph poles and street lights in the vicinity of the appeal site, there is not a strong vertical emphasis of street furniture with the openness of the area being experienced as a greater characteristic. I acknowledge the design attempts that seek to use a slimline pole that is coloured brown/grey to attempt to mimic a telegraph pole, however the differences in height and thickness of the pole, together with the additional clutter provided by the satellite dishes would be very apparent. The proposed mast would be a discordant feature unlike anything around it which would be detrimental to the experience of the character and appearance of the area, particularly from within and outside the Queens Road CA. The photomontages of the proposed mast do illustrate the detrimental appearance, particularly against the backdrop of the Spur Railway Bridge which is where many pedestrians experience the CA. Whilst I consider that in this instance the proposal would cause 'less than substantial' harm to the significance of the Queens Road CA from development within its setting, having considered the significance of both Cowley Road CA and Mortlake CA, in these cases I do not consider that their significance has been harmed."*

Even with the height reduced to 10 metres it is still the case that proposal would remain visible from the

nearby Queens Road Conservation Area and although separated by the railway line, the site is visible from within CA and therefore forms part of its setting. At 10 m the monopole is still considerably higher than the lower level residential building and street furniture including lampposts. The Queens Road CA Statement (35) notes that the “adjoining terraces of small Victorian cottages, some of which face onto narrow alleyways and have unusual embellishments, possess a charming sense of space.” The area is characterised by two storey development in a fine urban grain and the wider setting on North Worple Way continues the relatively low-level predominantly two-storey built form. The CA Study notes in particular that “as a local landmark at the end of Queens Road the spur railway footbridge of 1902 is an exceptional semi-circular iron structure providing a vital pedestrian connection between the Queens Road area and Mortlake. It is heavily used, particularly at school times, and an undoubted feature of interest in the local scene.” As set out above, even at 10 metres the mast would appear overly exposed and have a high degree of prominence given the absence of other structures or vegetation to provide some mitigating context. The height of the mast although reduced would therefore remain a notably discordant element in this wider setting that would result in less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Queens Road Conservation Area.

As previously held there are a number of BTMs within the Queens Road Conservation Area (CA36) although as individually designated locally listed buildings, the mast would not be so apparent within their closer setting.

As previously held and also noted by the inspector in relation to the dismissed appeal the site is sufficiently separated from Conservation Area CA33 Mortlake and CA79 Cowley Road so as not to affect their setting.

The Inspectors' summations in this regard are noted:

*“Taken as a whole, I therefore disagree with the applicant’s Statement of Case that the installation would not cause demonstrable harm to the significance of the CA. Although serious, the harm to the CA in this case would be ‘less than substantial,’ within the meaning of the term in paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Paragraph 194 states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 196 requires that, where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. 12. I note the benefits of providing telecommunications equipment as encouraged by paragraphs 112-116 of the Framework. However, taking the above into account with regards to alternative options and the harm caused to the character and appearance of the locality including the significance of the CA, I find that the public benefits in this case would not outweigh the harm to the CA. The scheme therefore conflicts with the Framework, which directs, at paragraph 193, ‘that great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation...irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to their significance’. 13. Consequently, the proposal would also be contrary to LP Policies LP1 (which seeks that proposals are compatible with local character, siting and existing townscape); Policy LP3 (which seeks that proposals give weight to the conservation of heritage assets, including their setting); and Policy LP33 (which seeks the compliance of a number of criteria to ensure the appropriateness of telecommunications equipment). The development plan policies are also supported by the Telecommunications Equipment Supplementary Planning Document, the Mortlake Village Planning Guidance and the Queens Road CA Appraisal. 14. In conclusion on this matter, I consider the installation causes less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA. It has not been shown that public benefits would outweigh this harm and so the proposal would conflict with the Framework and the development plan.”*

It is appreciated that this proposal due to the further reduction in overall height would have a marginally lesser impact than the previously refused scheme 20/2044/TEL, which was 12.5 metres, however is still considered to be harmful. The area around the site is devoid of trees and at 10m high the mast would be significantly higher than the adjacent building, street furniture e.g. lamp posts and starkly visible over a wide area and visible with the Queens Road Conservation Area 35 (Mortlake) on the other side of the railway line. The proposed monopole would result in a prominent feature in the short and long views in the immediate surrounds as it would be far higher than existing lampposts and there is no surrounding vegetation sufficient to obscure the prominence of the mast. The mast would dominate the view in the particular spot and the absence of vegetation and other street furniture would do little to soften the impact when viewed at some distance or close up. There would be an intrusive visual impact on the setting of the Queens Road Conservation area and the siting and appearance of the proposed development would still result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy LP, LP3 and LP33 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan Adopted July 2018 which requires, among other things, that development should improve the quality and character of spaces and the local area.

The NPPF is clear that where new telecommunication sites are required, equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate. The proposal would appear as a visually intrusive, prominent and incongruous form of development which would fail to preserve or enhance the setting, character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposed monopole would stand out in terms of height and appearance over a wide surrounding area, which is part of the setting of a CA and it is considered that the degree of harm to these Queens Road would be more than substantial, as previously considered and sustained

by the Inspector who dismissed the appeal.

### **Residential Amenity**

*Policy LP8 of the Local Plan (2018) requires that developments do not cause harm to neighbouring amenities in terms of daylight/sunlight, outlook, privacy, noise and disturbance. Policy LP10 of the Local Plan (2018) specifically sets out that local environmental impacts of all development proposals should not lead to detrimental effects on the health, safety and the amenity of existing and new users or occupiers of the development site, or the surrounding land.*

Recent appeal decisions have stated that there is a balancing exercise to be undertaken between the significant benefits of having high quality communications infrastructure with good mobile connectivity and the availability of mobile broadband, against the harm to visual amenity. The sensitivity of the location must also be afforded appropriate weight.

The previous proposal for a taller 12.5 metres monopole considered residential amenity and assessed the impact accordingly

*“The equipment and monopole will be visible from residential buildings along North Worple Way, South Worple Way and Avondale Road. However, the monopole is sited approximately 18m away from the closest residential window, and whilst harm is identified to the character and appearance of the area which by definition will be noticeable to local residents and some visual amenity would be compromised, it is not considered that the scheme is in close enough proximity to warrant a refusal on the grounds of harm to residential amenity in particular. Whilst is conspicuously tall structure in its surrounds, it is of the slimmer variety and is sited far enough from residential developments so as not to be overbearing or result in a loss of sunlight. Given such the scheme is considered to satisfy Local Plan Policy LP 8. “*

On the basis that this application is for a lower level monopole in the same general location, it is considered that there would be no reasonable basis to resist this proposal on the basis that it is contrary to Policy LP8.

### **Pedestrian/Highway Safety**

As with previous proposal for a monopole in this location it is noted that several objections were received from members of the public voicing concern over pedestrian and highways safety.

The Council's Transport Officer has reviewed the scheme and has no objection to the location of the monopole and ancillary equipment.

TfL who on the basis of email exchanges submitted have been in communication with EE have not commented, but on previously refused proposals for a monopole in this location have stated that had the scheme been considered acceptable they would have no objection to the proposal to build on TfL property subject to the TfL project team being involved with all aspects of installation.

Given the recent status of previously refused application and the fact that there is no material difference between applications that would further compromise highway/pedestrian safety, there remains no objection to the scheme in terms of highway and pedestrian safety.

### **Conclusion**

As previously, it is acknowledged that the proposal would bring benefits in enhancing the telecommunications infrastructure and enhancing the network provision. The applicant has certified that the installation would comply with ICNIRP.

It is also acknowledged that the scheme in reducing the overall height is improved from the earlier refusal and the degree of harm is lessened by the incremental 2.5 reduction in height to the monopole to 10 m from a previous proposals for 12.5 m and 15 m respectively. However it remains that the introduction of the proposed telecommunications equipment, by reason of its size and siting, would result in an incongruous form of development which would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area, including less than substantial harm to the setting of the nearby Queens Road Conservation Area, with consequent conflict with the development plan. The evidence does not make a convincing case that no suitable alternative sites exist, and this weighs against the proposal.

The benefits of providing improved infrastructure for the telecommunications network have been taken into account and acknowledged. The lesser degree of harm as compared with the refused schemes 202044/TEL and 20/1206/TEL is acknowledged but it remains that in the absence of satisfactory information to demonstrate that there are no more sequentially preferable sites, the LPA is not able to conclude that the benefits outweigh the harm.

Overall, the application fails to sufficiently demonstrate the need for an additional telecommunications pole

and associated equipment in this location and the benefits are not considered to outweigh the visual harm that of this proposal would cause to the local area and nearby Queens Road Conservation Area. As such, it is contrary policies and guidance from the Local Plan (2018) in particular LP1, LP3, LP 33, outcomes sought in Para. 115 in Chapter 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), and Supplementary Planning Document 'Telecommunications Equipment' (2006) and Mortlake Village Planning Guidance (2015) and the Queens Road Conservation Area Study and Statement.

**Recommendation: Prior Approval is REQUIRED and REFUSED**

**Recommendation:**

The determination of this application falls within the scope of Officer delegated powers - YES

**I therefore recommend the following:**

- 1. REFUSAL
- 2. PERMISSION
- 3. FORWARD TO COMMITTEE

This application is CIL liable  YES\*  NO  
(\*If yes, complete CIL tab in Uniform)

This application requires a Legal Agreement  YES\*  NO  
(\*If yes, complete Development Condition Monitoring in Uniform)

This application has representations online (which are not on the file)  YES  NO

Case Officer (Initials): VAA Dated: 02.11.21

**I agree the recommendation:**

Principal Planner:.....WWC.....

Dated: 02.11.21.....