
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2016

by Elizabeth Pleasant DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 7 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/3156294

Highways Land, Wood Street (opposite junction with Galley Lane), Barnet, London EN5 4DB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by CTIL and Telefonica UK Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/1985/FUL, dated 23 March 2016, was refused by a notice dated 24 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a 12.5m high telecommunications column with 1no. equipment cabinets and development ancillary thereto.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of a 12.5m high telecommunications column with 1no. equipment cabinets and development ancillary thereto at Highways Land, Wood Street (opposite junction with Galley Lane), Barnet, London EN5 4DB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/1985/FUL, dated 23 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and information: Site Location Plan, 100 C; Proposed Site Plan, 200 E; Proposed Site Elevation, 300 E and the Supplementary Information submitted with the application, dated 23 March 2016.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed and finished in the materials specified in the approved Supplementary Information submitted with the application, dated 23 March 2016 and shall therefore be so maintained.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development above is altered slightly from that on the application form through the removal of narrative text not related to the development itself.
-

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of Wood Street Conservation Area and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Wood Street Conservation Area has a linear structure which spans the busy A411 and extends from Barnet's town centre in a westerly direction. Its significance is derived from the interspersed historic buildings with areas of open space which include Ravenscroft Park and Whalebones Park.
5. The appeal site is located at the edge of the Wood Street Conservation Area within the pavement area adjoining Whalebones Park. The Park is well screened from Wood Street by a mature hedge and trees, and consequently the site of the proposed column and equipment cabinet has a much greater visual connection with its surrounding highway environment than with Whalebones Park.
6. The proposed column and cabinet would be located at the back edge of the pavement and close to the junction of Galley Lane and Wood Street. The right turning harbourage and central reservation in this location create a wide open junction where there is an array of street furniture including a bus shelter, highway signs, bollards and street lights. To the East of the appeal site there is an existing EE street furniture radio base station which comprises a monopole with shrouded antennae and 4 radio base cabinets. Immediately to the west of the site the adjoining land is being redeveloped for housing.
7. The proposed equipment cabinet would be abut an existing hedgerow and it would be painted dark green. Consequently it would not be visually conspicuous within the street scene and nor would it be visible from within Whalebone Park.
8. I recognise that the proposed column and shrouded antennae would be higher than both the existing street lights and the existing monopole located to the East of it. However, it would not be significantly higher, and from street level this additional height would be less visually discernible. The column would have an appearance akin to a telegraph pole and would not therefore appear incongruous positioned within the highway. Furthermore, although there is already telecommunication furniture nearby, the column and cabinet would be sited adjacent to a spacious junction and a sufficient distance away from the neighbouring monopole so as not to result in a hub of unduly dominant telecommunications paraphernalia.
9. From within Whalebone Park the proposed slimline column would not be visually dominant and would appear as part of the highway environment that presently provides a backdrop to the Park. For the reasons given above, I am satisfied that the appeal proposal would not harm the visual qualities of the street scene and moreover the character and appearance of Wood Street Conservation Area would be preserved.
10. I conclude that the appeal proposal would preserve the character and appearance of Wood Street Conservation Area and the surrounding area. I therefore find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) policies which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment, or Section 5 which seeks to support high quality communications

infrastructure. The proposal accords with the development plan and in particular Policies DM01, DM06 and DM18 of the Barnet's Local Plan, Development Management Policies, Development Plan Document, 2012 which seek to ensure, amongst other criteria, that new development, including telecommunications equipment respect local character and preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of all heritage assets.

Other Matters

11. The proposed column would be located some distance away from the nearest existing residential properties which are situated on the opposite side of Wood Street and in a location where the carriageway is particularly wide. I have found that the proposals would not be visually conspicuous within the street scene and accordingly I do not consider that they would have a significant impact on the outlook of residents.
12. Paragraph 46 of the Framework advises that proposals should not be prevented where they meet International Commission guidelines for public exposure. The proposal has been designed to be in full accordance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation and the proposal has been provided with the appropriate self-certification.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and subject to conditions that are necessary to provide certainty and safeguard the character and appearance of the area, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Elizabeth Pleasant

INSPECTOR