

Comment for planning application 23/00750/TEL56

Application Number	23/00750/TEL56
Location	Street Record Station Road Kirtlington
Proposal	Proposed telecommunications installation: Proposed 15.0m Phase 9 slimline Monopole and associated ancillary works
Case Officer	
Organisation Name	elizabeth summons
Address	Hillcrest, Station Road, Kirtlington, Kidlington, OX5 3HE
Type of Comment	Comment
Type	neighbour

Comments	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I am writing to object to the planning application number 23/00750/TEL56</p> <p>My reasons are as laid out below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. "Will the structure be within 3km of an aerodrome or airfield? = answer No" <p>This needs to be checked - this website shows it as about 2km away from weston on the green airport: https://www2.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/sites/default/files/folders/documents/environmentandplanning/countryside/walksandrides/oxfordshireway/OWmap18.pdf</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. a) "The site selection process has also been influenced by the numerous vertical elements of street furniture distributed around the vicinity of the site including street lighting columns." <p>There are NO street lighting columns - there is one telegraph pole! Once again, as with the original application, these are complete outright lies, set to misinform the people deciding on the application.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">b) "To the rear of the mast is existing street furniture (utility pole) which shares a similar vertical column to the mast; and a brick wall with similar height and structure to the cabinets, supporting both mast and cabinets in assimilating into the setting." <p>I can only understand this statement by the fact it must be the person writing it has not been to the site. There is NO brick wall - there is an ancient cotswold stone wall which adds to the beauty of the area. Again this was in the original planning application - it is not true or accurate.</p> <p>These are completely misleading statements used to satisfy the council that all is ok. Can I please implore you to visit the site so you can see for yourself the truths.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">3. "The cabinets are permitted development without Prior Approval and do not form part of the proposal from a planning consideration perspective" <p>In what way are these permitted development - these form part of the overall change of nature of the site. They therefore MUST be considered in relation to this planning application.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">4. "This area of Oxford is rural and residential in nature, with the proposed mast strategically located on the outskirts, towards an area of greenfield." This is not on the outskirts. It is within Kirtlington, very near many houses - as explained in previous objections to a mast. It is also at the southwestern entrance. Please see image attached. <ol style="list-style-type: none">5. "Policy C39 The council will normally grant planning permission for masts and other telecommunications structures where it has been demonstrated that: <ol style="list-style-type: none">iii. in the area of outstanding natural beauty and the area of high landscape value there is no suitable alternative site available in a less sensitive location." <p>I would argue there are more suitable alternative sites. The developers have obviously decided on this as it does not cost them any money in regards to paying landowners, ease of erection of the mast - again meaning less money to them.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">6. "The proposed works on this site would qualify as a visual change to the area, but are necessary to ensure improved delivery of service, would respect and continue to maintain the appearance of the area, with the public benefits outweighing perceived harm, and would be suitably distant from potentially sensitive users, so according with the principles of the Development Plan. The proposal fully accords with the requirements of the NPPF" <p>I completely disagree with:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">a) are necessary to improve delivery of service: where is it proven this service is necessary. As for as improving delivery of service goes, there are numerous complaints across the country that 5g has been undeliverable and does not work.b) would respect and continue to maintain the appearance of the area: well this is quite obviously not true or possible.c) with the public benefits outweighing the perceived harm: where or how <ol style="list-style-type: none">6. "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; but are vitally necessary to ensure improved delivery of service. Capacity and coverage are the key drivers for this new 5G installation. The proposal would respect and continue to maintain the character of the area, would be suitably distant from potentially sensitive users, and so would accord with the principles of the Development Plan policies. It fully accords with the requirements of the NPPF." <p>Again I completely disagree with all of the above, namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">a) proposed works are not to the visual detriment of the surrounding area: this is completely untrue - it will completely change the character of the greenfield and conservation sites - and all housing within that areab) the proposal would not result in demonstrable harm to the character or immediate or wider areas: again this is completely untrue - people will be able to see this mast from many sites in kirtlington, both near and far - inside and outside of properties - all within the conservation area. It will be a constant reminder of a technological age - rather than being in a rural village. It is not appropriate.c) are 'vitally!' necessary to ensure improved delivery of service: prove the vital nature of this improvement and also that it would improve long term. <ol style="list-style-type: none">7. "The cell search areas for 5G are extremely constrained with a typical cell radius of approximately 250m meaning that it would not be feasible to site the column outside of this locale." <p>If that is all it covers, you'll need more in Kirtlington - which I would judge to suggest this is the beginning of the planning applications for masts. These masts just are not suitable for purpose, practical, sightly or workable.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">8. Discounted options
----------	---

If you look at these and the map, they are all listed as : "highly visible from onlooking residential properties" INCLUDING the site they are proposing: "D4 - 449819 , 219374, Grass verge adjacent to Oxford Road discounted due to lack of screening. Site is highly visible from onlooking residential properties."

They have said themselves this site should be discounted! (see attached and photograph on application).

9. In their covering letter, they state:

"This resubmission seeks to address these issues in order to greater protect the distinctiveness of the area and maintain the character of both the Kirtlington Conservation Area, immediate and wider area."

This has not been done in anyway except painting the mast green and making it slightly thinner!

10. Site location plans:

Each photograph is taken to show zero residential properties, and each diagram shows a tall tree. Firstly, the photographs are completely misleading being taken from these angles. Please see attached photographs to see residential properties within meters of site. Secondly, to be reliant on that tree standing forever is irresponsible and unrealistic. These are large old trees which will come to the end of their lives. In addition, there is no photography to show the actual look of the mast, meaning the application does not show the true impact of how invasive this structure will be to the whole village.

I would urge an inspection of the site to see how the proposed mast would dwarf 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. Furthermore such an inspection would prove the location of the nearby residences.

To conclude:

The 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.

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. A site visit would confirm this.

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. Once again the deadline is set during a school holiday (it was half term last time - Easter holidays this time).

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 tree (which is only from one angle), 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 very fact that once again next to no one knows about it or was contacted officially suggests the proposers are trying to get it through under radar again. It was only brought to my attention due to one resident being sent a letter. It is now on Kirtlington village facebook in the hope, that before the holidays start, people object in time.

Overall I fully object to the above planning application on the above grounds.

Regards,

Elizabeth Summons

24/03/2023 17:14:08

Received
Date

Attachments