

Comment for planning application 21/03452/TEL56

Application Number	21/03452/TEL56
Location	Street Record Station Road Kirtlington
Proposal	Proposed 15.0m Phase 8 Monopole C/W wrapround Cabinet at base and associated ancillary works.
Case Officer	John Cosgrove
Organisation Name	Andrew Russell
Address	The Glebe, Troy Lane, Kirtlington, Kidlington, OX5 3HA
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>It is disappointing to see that two separate planning applications have been made, one for the tower and one for the base unit. The community was not made aware of EITHER application and, of course, having discovered the tower application, most remain unaware of this, the base unit application. Residents who have made one objection are therefore, by and large, unaware of the possible need to comment twice. I therefore urge you to ensure that objections made to the tower are applied equally to this application and vice versa as, clearly, the planning applications amount to different elements of the same technological construction. Otherwise, the number of objections to either plan will have effectively been diluted. Please see my objection to the tower, provided on the principle grounds that it is entirely unsuitable to position this dominant structure within the Kirtlington conservation area. I should add that this bulky apparatus will be positioned in front of an attractive, traditionally constructed and recently repaired dry stone wall. NOT a brick wall as indicated in the proposal. The apparatus is entirely unsympathetic to the surroundings and should not be built. The applicant claims to have considered alternative locations for the tower and equipment. Their preferred site just happens to be a location where construction costs will be minimised: a roadside location with straightforward access for construction vehicles and existing power infrastructure. No doubt these were key factors in selecting this particular location. If a 5G tower is deemed to be needed - which is highly questionable in a village with excellent, fibre-optic broadband / wi-fi - then alternative, potentially more costly locations must be considered. The enjoyment of our surroundings must be prioritised. I do find it astounding that the planners have not provided photographs such that residents can see what it all would all actually look like. This is not like a plan for a house where only an artist's impressions is available. The applicants must have a full specification for the apparatus including photographs. One can only assume - viewing other Three mobile 5G apparatus constructed elsewhere - that they realise that upon seeing such photographs residents would be horrified. Furthermore, a full technical specification for the equipment surely exists and yet the energy consumption of the apparatus has not been shared. Searches on the internet do not reveal the energy consumption for Three mobile 5G installations. However, there is information about other, comparable 5G masts, such as one by an alternative supplier, which is quoted as consuming: 11,577 W = 11.6KW (Note: this feels about right: something like 4 x 3 bar electric heaters). Running 24/7 365 that equates to: $24 \times 365 \times 11.6 = 101,616$ kWh The average UK house consumes 3,760 kWh per year (generally electricity plus gas). So, the example 5G base station and mast consumes the equivalent of: $101,616 / 3,760 = 27.03$ average UK homes. Or, put another way, if villagers take measures in line with government initiatives to reduce their household carbon footprint by 10% (not an easy task) the mast will offset the efforts of about 270 Kirtlington dwellings. Now these figures could be way off because we have not been informed of the energy consumption of the proposed equipment. Can you please ensure that any proposals for 5G equipment include manufacturer's data on energy consumption? Thank you.</p>
Received Date	22/10/2021 10:56:20
Attachments	