

PLANNING COMMITTEE

25th April 2012

APPEAL OUTCOME REPORT FOR INFORMATION

APPEAL MADE AGAINST REFUSAL OF PRIOR APPROVAL FOR THE SITING AND DESIGN OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS INSTALLATION

APPLICATION DETAILS: 2011/133/GDO

PROPOSAL	15m MONOPOLE, EQUIPMENT CABINETS AND ANCILLARY APPARATUS
LOCATION	HIGHWAY VERGE AT MILLRACE ROAD, REDDITCH
WARD	ABBEY
DECISION	DECISION MADE BY OFFICERS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS 11TH JULY 2011

The author of this report is Steven Edden, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on extension 3206 (e-mail: steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) for more information.

Discussion

Officers considered that the siting and appearance of this installation was not acceptable and refused to grant prior approval for the following reason:

The proposed mast, by reason of its siting, would be overly dominant in the streetscene such that it would be visually intrusive from nearby residential properties having a negative effect on residential amenity and outlook and as such is considered to be contrary to Policy BBE13 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3 and PPG8.

Officers sought to defend that reason through written representations to the Planning Inspector.

The Inspector noted that the mast would not be positioned in line with and would be taller than the streetlights along Millrace Road, but noted that the height differential would be less when compared to the taller streetlights along the Alvechurch Highway. He considered that the proposed monopole would not project significantly above the taller trees which are in existence adjacent to the site and that the trees would assist in assimilating the mast into the streetscene. He therefore considered that on balance, the proposal would generally respect the context and character of the area. The Inspector commented that whilst the occupiers of the dwellings sited at the junction of Millrace Road and Lydham Close would have views of the upper part of the proposed column, he also considered there to be a significant separation distance between the two. Given the masts siting within a landscaped area, he did not consider that the monopole would be visually dominant and

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

25th April 2012

considered that the outlook of the occupiers of these properties would not be adversely harmed. The Inspector further regarded the sharing of the installation by two operators to be good practice.

Appeal outcome

The appeal was ALLOWED on 22nd March 2012. Costs were neither sought nor awarded.

Further issues

None.

Recommendation

The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that the item of information be noted.