

Comment for planning application 21/03350/TEL

Application Number	21/03350/TEL
Location	Street Record Station Road Kirtlington
Proposal	Proposed 5G Telecommunications Installation
Case Officer	John Cosgrove
Organisation Name	Elizabeth Russell
Address	The Glebe, Troy Lane, Kirtlington, Kidlington, OX5 3HA
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour

Comments

Dear Sir/Madam I am writing to object to the planning application number 21/03350/TEL. My reasons are as laid out below: The 15m (near 50ft) mast and associated apparatus would be "visually intrusive" and "incongruous" in a prominent position on the Oxford Road (A4095)/Bletchington Road. It would fail to conserve the landscape qualities of the conservation area being seen not only from nearby residences of Bletchington Road, Oxford Road and Troy Lane, but also from as far away as the Oxford Arms/Post Office central area of the village together with the residences of Gossway Fields. A Conservation area is an area with special architectural or historic interest, with character or appearance that is desirable to preserve or enhance. The mast will make the area less 'desirable' and certainly not enhance it in any way. The application states: "The equipment is adjacent to tall vertical columns (telegraph pole), with additional tall vertical columns across the further pavements. There are high reaching mature trees dispersed around the surrounding area, where the combined street furniture allows the monopole to more easily blend into the street scene." Any inspection of the site demonstrates that this above statement is misleading. The proposed mast dwarfs the existing street furniture in the vicinity which consists of: a wooden telegraph pole; an attractive signpost dating back to the 1930s; a traditional road nameplate; a give way sign; a low profile wooden traffic calming box now populated with flowers. There is no relevant existing 'street furniture' for the mast and it to integrate with. Furthermore, the mast will not blend in with trees in the vicinity. The artist's impression is misleading in this respect. The fig.2 photograph supplied in the application itself makes this clear. Further the proposed elevation drawing shows a 'brick wall' as backgrounding the apparatus cabinets this is inaccurate and misleading; this is in fact an ancient Cotswold dry stone wall against which these cabinets would sit incongruously. The application further states: "The proposed works are not to the visual detriment of the surrounding area (being suitably distant from sensitive receptors). The proposal would not result in demonstrable harm to the character of the immediate or wider area." This is demonstrably not true in that there are in excess of 30 houses and gardens within the conservation area and elsewhere in direct line of the proposed mast. The siting of this mast is entirely inappropriate, directly in front of attractive houses on entry to the village meaning it would be a constant eyesore, to anyone entering or leaving the village. In addition, it would be seen for miles around in the open countryside meaning it would have an intrusive and negative impact on the nearby residences, village as a whole and open countryside surroundings. Looking at the other rejected locations in the village (many rejected due to proximity to dwellings) it seems this location has been chosen for financial reasons as there is no landowner to pay off and an ease of access; this location has been chosen with no thought to the 30 + residences that will have full view of it. The above objections are not withstanding the questionable health risks associated with these installations for all those living in their shadow and the questionable needs given a top rate fibre-optic broadband network already in Kirtlington, meaning there is certainly no rush to install 5G. In addition, there is no photography to show the actual look of the mast (they have installed these elsewhere so this is possible), meaning the application does not show the true impact of how invasive this structure will be to the whole village. There are no details of the range of radiation it will emit, the health and wildlife welfare considerations, or its range of use (ie who will benefit from it). Nor are there details of the carbon considerations of how much energy this mast will consume. Further many villagers have been unaware of this application. Even villagers living in the visual vicinity have not been written to and have not seen written, posted notices relating to the application, finding out only through Facebook or word of mouth. This is non-standard. It would also be useful to know how many masts have currently been erected. According to the following article of August 2021, the total is only 300. This causes one to question, why has Kirtlington been prioritized: a rural, residential area with low population density and

negligible mobile business, decent 4G/3G coverage and excellent broadband?
<https://www.ispreview.co.uk/index.php/2021/08/three-uk-sees-5g-mobile-broadband-coverage-reach-29-percent.html> Overall I am astounded at the misleading nature of this planning application, in its plan drawings (of existing and proposed) including lack of details both in what the mast will look like bar a misleading drawing against a non-existent tree, and photography that shows very little of the actual area - including NONE of the surrounding houses who will be in direct line of the mast. The half term objection deadline is also very inconvenient to those who want to object. The very fact no one knew about it or was contacted officially suggests the proposers are trying to get it through under radar. Overall I fully object to the above planning application. Yours faithfully Elizabeth Russell

Received Date

18/10/2021 12:50:31

Attachments

The following files have been uploaded:

- IMG_7117.pdf
- IMG_7122.pdf
- IMG_7124.pdf
- IMG_7123.pdf
- conservation area mast proposal.pdf