

APPLICATION NO: 26/00282/TEL **CASE OFFICER:** Andrew Hunt

WARD: Swanside **PARISH:** N/A

LOCATION: Thingwall Hall, Thingwall Lane, Roby, Knowsley, L14 7NZ

PROPOSAL: PRIOR APPROVAL DETERMINATION FOR THE INSTALLATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPEMENT COMPRISING OF 25M HIGH LATTICE TOWER, 6NO. ANTENNAS, 4NO. DISHES AND ASSOCIATED ANCILLARY WORKS WITHIN A 2.4 METRE HIGH FENCED COMPOUND

Site Description

The application site is a small rectangular parcel of land close to a line of trees, set within the grounds of Thingwall Hall. The Thingwall Hall site consists of grassed areas, trees, hardstanding and numerous buildings including a care home at Thingwall Hall (which is a Grade II listed building). There are residential dwellings to the north west and to the south east and north (beyond the Thingwall Hall site).

Proposal

The proposal is a prior approval determination for the installation of telecommunications equipment comprising a 25m high lattice tower, 6no antennas, 4no dishes and associated ancillary works within a 2.4m high fenced compound. The application initially proposed a wider, more substantive tower but this was amended to a more slender tower during the consideration of the application.

Consultations

Liverpool City Council – No response.

Conservation (Growth Lancashire) – The proposal would cause a negligible impact on the setting of Thingwall Hall, a grade II listed building.

Representations

The application has been publicised by a site notice and by letters sent to 27 neighbours. One representation has been received from the Merseyside Residents Association who raised the following matters:

1. Provide an explanation as to why this application which is out for consultation is on the planning portal but does not show all the required documents - Application Form, SSSI and the statutory ICNIRP declaration. Why the delay? Can these be uploaded, please?
2. Say why the address you have put on portal is at odds with the address on the Plan which says Thomas Lane Broadgreen? This is a failure under the planning principles.
3. The real deadline date for the residents' consultation period?

- 4 Explain what the developers notice means, where it is displayed and why they can set a deadline of 14 days from 8 June 2026 (which is tomorrow) when the standard consultation is 56 days in total? That date needs to be extended. (Would The Trustees of Best Lives be the only consultee, by any chance? And did they receive a copy of the ICNIRP declaration?)
5. Also, please explain why the developers notice makes reference to siting and design only.
- 6 Please upload a copy of the Environmental Impact Analysis.
7. Please state the number of antennas that are 3G, 4G and 5G.
- 8 Please explain the nature of the base of this lattice framework and how it is powered.
- 9 Can you also confirm whether this installation is permanent or temporary.
- 10 Notwithstanding 4 above, please provide a list of the addresses who have been consulted and the date of the letter. We would appreciate a copy as it is not on the portal. Also we wish to know whether the Ward Councillors have been consulted.
- 11 Can you explain why this application is listed as being 'delegated'? Does this mean that members will not be involved in the decision? If so why?
- 12 We would also like to know if this base station is to be connected to any other base station in the area, including the temporary installations in Huyton Village which we understand are connected to the Roby Road and Lathom Road Installations.
- 13 Could this be a permanent location for one or both of the temporary installations in Huyton Village? 26/00001/FUL and 24/00426/FUL

The case officer responded to the matters which were raised via an email on 30 June 2026

Planning History

N/A

Relevant Policy

General Permitted Development Order 2015 (As Amended)

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating with the applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Assessment

SCHEDULE 2 PART 16 of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (As Amended) states the following:

“Permitted development

A. Development by or on behalf of an electronic communications code operator for the purpose of the operator’s electronic communications network in, on, over or under land controlled by that operator or in accordance with the electronic communications code, consisting of—

(a) the installation, alteration or replacement of any electronic communications apparatus,

(b) the use of land in an emergency for a period not exceeding 18 months to station and operate moveable electronic communications apparatus required for the replacement of unserviceable electronic communications apparatus, including the provision of moveable structures on the land for the purposes of that use, or

(c) development ancillary to radio equipment housing.

Development not permitted

A.1. Development not permitted: ground-based apparatus

(1) Development consisting of the installation, alteration or replacement of electronic communications apparatus (other than on a building) is not permitted by Class A(a) if—

(c) in the case of the installation of a mast, the mast, excluding any antenna, would exceed a height of—

*(i) **[F230]** metres above ground level on unprotected land; or*

*(ii) **[F325]** metres above ground level on article 2(3) land or land which is on a highway; **F4...**”*

“(4) Before beginning the development described in paragraph A.2(3), the developer must apply to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether the prior approval of the authority will be required as to the siting and appearance of the development”.

The local authority is limited by the prior approval process to considering the effect on the siting and appearance of the development.

Amenity

Policy CS19 in the Core Strategy requires new developments to maintain a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings by avoiding unacceptable impacts on existing residents and future occupiers.

The new mast would be 37 metres away from the garden of the nearest dwellings to the north west on Thingwall Hall Drive and 50 metres away from the nearest building.

It is considered that due to the large distances involved (and tall tree cover at the rear of the dwellings) there would not be material harm to the properties to the north west from loss of light, outlook or privacy. The mast would also be seen against the backdrop of tall trees behind (up to 20 metres) where the mast would be located, which would reduce its visual prominence.

The development would not result in unacceptable harm to the amenity of local residents or buildings within the Thingwall Hall site, due to the screening effect of the trees to the south, north and east of the proposed mast.

Overall, the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to amenity.

Character of Area

Policy CS19 (Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development) in the Core Strategy sets out several criteria that developments will be expected to conform to so that they enhance local distinctiveness and the identity and accessibility of new places. The NPPF identifies that the creation of high-quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

The 25 metre high telecoms mast would be of a typical lattice tower design with an ancillary equipment located at the base which is much wider than the rest of the proposal. The proposal has been amended to make the mast narrower and reduce the visual impact.

The proposal would be visible from outside the site but these views would be mitigated by the presence of tall trees (up to 20 metres) to the south, north and east of the mast's location, which would have the effect of partially screening the mast and reducing its prominence. It would also be set back from any main roads within the centre of the site and would not be a prominent feature of the street scene. The mast would cause some harm to local character but this harm would be moderate and would weigh in the planning balance.

Heritage

Policy HE4:2 of the NPPF states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (including from development within its setting) should have a clear and convincing justification.

Policy HE6:4 of the NPPF allows LPAs to consider the level of harm against the public benefits generated by a proposal.

"4. Where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal. Important public benefits can include securing the long-term reuse of a vacant or underused listed building, and enabling energy efficiency and low carbon heating measures to be employed".

The application has been supported by a heritage assessment which demonstrates that there would be less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed building of Thingwall Hall. This has been reviewed by Growth Lancashire who considered that the proposal would cause negligible degree of harm to the significance of the listed building,

The mast would be 90 metres away from Thingwall Hall to the south east (which is a Grade II listed building). Due to the distances involved and the screening provided by the trees, the mast would not significantly affect the setting of Thingwall Hall with only negligible impacts. There is also an existing single storey building between the mast and Thingwall Hall.

The limited and negligible impacts must be weighed against the public benefits of the application in the planning balance.

Highways

NPPF policy TR6 states that a development should only be refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

“Development proposals should be refused if they would have a severe adverse impact on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion, including cumulative impacts), or an unacceptable impact on highway safety; taking into account any mitigation measures proposed as well as any wider network improvements, including measures to support sustainable patterns of movement”.

The telecoms mast would be built well within the site and away from vehicular roads. There is sufficient parking nearby to serve construction vehicles and to service the mast.

Therefore, overall, there would be no impact on highway safety from the proposal.

Health Considerations

Policy C02 of the NPPF requires that applications for electronic communications development should be supported by the necessary evidence to justify the proposed development.

“Development proposals for electronic telecommunications infrastructure (including applications for prior approval under the General Permitted Development Order, as amended) should be supported by the following, where relevant”:

“Evidence demonstrating compliance with policy CO1(1)(c) and (d), including a statement that self-certifies that the cumulative exposure, when operational, will not exceed International Commission guidelines on non-ionising radiation protection”.

NPPF Policy C01 states that local planning authorities should not use different health standards from the International Commission guidelines on non-ionising radiation

protection.

“In assessing proposals for telecommunications infrastructure, local planning authorities should not require minimum distances to be maintained between telecommunications infrastructure and other development, seek to prevent competition between different operators, question the need for the expansion or upgrading of telecommunications networks, or use health safeguarding standards different from the International Commission guidelines on non-ionising radiation protection”.

The application is supported by a Declaration of Conformity with International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) Public Exposure Guidelines to confirm that the proposed equipment would not exceed the guidelines for public exposure. The ICNIRP declaration takes into account the cumulative effect of the emissions from the installation and all radio base stations present at, or near the proposed location. Overall, there is no site specific evidence to indicate the site is particularly sensitive to any health impacts or that the mast would result in harmful health impacts on residents or other persons nearby. The proposed development is acceptable in this respect.

Benefits of the Development

Policy CO1 in the NPPF states that in considering proposals for the expansion or upgrading of electronic telecommunications networks, substantial weight should be given to the benefits of maintaining or improving network coverage, capacity, reliability and resilience, including where significant improvements are required such as along rail corridors. This includes, but is not limited to, providing for next generation wireless technologies (such as standalone 5G), gigabit capable broadband connections and supporting infrastructure such as fibre exchanges.

The application proposes the erection of telecommunications apparatus which would contribute to the EE and H3G telecommunications network and this must be given substantial weight in the planning balance. It is considered that the benefits of delivering mobile coverage outweighs the harm caused to local character and the setting of Thingwall Hall so planning permission should be granted.

Conclusion

The development complies with the relevant criteria set out in Schedule 2, Part 16, of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (As Amended). The submitted details are considered to be acceptable. Therefore, it is considered that prior approval is required and granted in accordance with the provisions of the GPDO.

Recommendation

The applicant be informed that under the terms of Schedule 2 Part 16 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (As Amended) prior approval is required and hereby granted.

Signed Case Officer¹:

Andrew Hunt

**Signed Authorising
Officer²:**

Alan Kilroe

Date:

30 September 2026

1 I confirm that I do not have a personal relationship with the applicant, agent or other interested parties; I also confirm that I do not have a financial interest in the site or the development proposed

2 I confirm that I do not have a personal relationship with the applicant, agent or other interested parties; I also confirm that I do not have a financial interest in the site or the development proposed

Informatives

1) Plans List

The following Plans are approved:

- a. Site Location plan, plans and elevations - received – 28/08/26