
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 October 2020

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/20/3252323

Land at Winchester Road, Twickenham TW1 1LA

- 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 Cornerstone & Telefonica UK Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 19/2884/FUL, dated 18 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is the proposed installation of a slimline monopole for a temporary period of 18 months; the proposed installation is a 15m high dual stack monopole supporting 6 no antenna within a shroud, together with 3 no ground based equipment cabinets and ancillary development thereto.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, which is then weighed against the need and benefits of the proposal.

Reasons

3. The proposal would be sited at the rear edge of the pavement, close to an area of landscaping which bounds a small area of car parking. The proposal sits within a residential area which is formed predominantly by terraces of houses, set behind modest front garden areas.
4. Within the adjacent Godstone Road and Winchester Road the lighting columns are of a modest height and the tallest item of street furniture is perhaps the telegraph poles. A lighting column to the south, adjacent to the railway line is taller and I also noted the footbridge. These items are screened to a large degree when in Winchester Road and Godstone Road.
5. The proposal would be 15m high and the top of the mast would be considerably wider than its lower parts, due to the antenna shroud. The 3 nearby trees are shown on the submitted drawings to be around 9m and the tallest at 11.5m. Due to its height, form and width at the top, I consider that the proposed mast would appear as a significantly dominant feature within the street-scene here. It would be taller than the trees and other items of street-furniture and taller than the houses. Within this intimate street-scene where the close and modest

- scale of the houses and other structures gives rise to this character, the proposal would appear significantly out of place.
6. The footbridge over the railway line is not particularly tall and does not have a vertical emphasis and the adjacent lighting column is slender and not as tall as the proposal. Neither of these features have an effect that would be similar to the proposal, in my judgement. The adjacent trees would offer some degree of screening from some parts of the public realm and at certain times of the years when the trees are in leaf. However, this would be insufficient to soften the visual effects of the proposal to an acceptable level and I judge that its effects would remain significantly unacceptable.
 7. There is clearly a balance to be struck between the need for such a proposal, the benefits arising from it, and any visual effects that may arise. I have given very careful attention to the appellant's statement relating to the Notice To Quit at their current site and to their search for alternatives. I also acknowledge the considerable encouragement given to the provision of an efficient communications network within the National Planning Policy Framework. I also note that it states that sympathetic design is a requirement. The Council do not seek to criticise the appellant's evidence in this respect and I confirm that I have taken it into account and so give weight to these matters in favour of the appeal. I have also taken account of the other appeal decisions submitted by the appellant but what is important to keep in mind is that the individual circumstances of each case will be different and so the balance of differing factors may also be different. When balanced against the significant and unacceptable visual effects of the proposal in this case, I consider that those other matters, including the temporary nature of the proposal, are insufficient to outweigh the harm that would arise from this proposal. Therefore, I find that the proposal is contrary to Policies LP1, LP8 and LP33 of the Council's Local Plan and there are no matters sufficient to outweigh that conflict.
 8. As a consequence of the above, the appeal is dismissed.

ST Wood

INSPECTOR