

**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: 2011/222/GDO

PROPOSAL	15m MONOPOLE, EQUIPMENT CABINETS AND ANCILLARY APPARATUS
LOCATION	HIGHWAY VERGE AT BIRCHFIELD ROAD, REDDITCH
WARD	WEST
DECISION	DECISION MADE BY OFFICERS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS 29TH SEPTEMBER 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 installation, by reason of its height and siting in close proximity to other installations and street furniture, would result in visual clutter which would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene and on the residential amenities of those properties from which it would be visible. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy B(BE)13 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, whilst noting that existing monopoles, streetlights and telegraph poles along the road are at a lower height than the proposed mast, the development was not considered to appear so conspicuous in appearance as to cause harm to the streetscene. He considered that the proposal would not result in undue visual clutter, stating that the vertical emphasis of the existing street furniture along the road would be respected. The Inspector considered that the separation distance from the dwellings to the south and the mast would be such that the development would not be overbearing, nor would it adversely harm the outlook of the occupiers of those properties.

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

25th April 2012

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.