

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	Gemma Magnuson
Organisation Name	Stephanie Hilborne
Address	Sunnyside, Troy Lane, Kirtlington, Kidlington, OX5 3HA
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>I am objecting to this planning application for a mast. I objected previously when an almost identical application was made and turned down at appeal. I suggest an officer visits the site to satisfy themselves as to the blatant inaccuracy of many of the statements in the application. I regard this application as cynical as was the original which deliberately split the application from the base from the main mast.</p> <p>Clearly since local residents have full lives, our ability to repeatedly respond and set out the reasons against this application is limited. The number of objections may be small as a result of this deliberate process of wearing us out. I run a charity and am caring for an elderly mother and spare time is precious.</p> <p>The other reason I feel you may not hear many response is that despite my living extremely close to this proposed site, perhaps 50m away, and my having objected previously I was not notified of the new planning notification. It was only brought to my attention through the Kirtlington village Facebook page. Many other villagers have been unaware of this application. Other villagers living in the visual vicinity have not been written to and have not seen written, posted notices relating to the application.</p> <p>The application should be rejected for many reasons, including for making false statements in an effort to justify the application. Very similar false statements were made in the original application which was turned down at appeal:</p> <p>The application states:</p> <p>"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." There are NO street lighting columns.</p> <p>"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." There is NO brick wall.</p> <p>Rather, there is a beautiful stone wall which adds to the scenic quality of this country road junction and the setting would be seriously disfigured by cabinets in front of it as it would a mast. I live in a conservation area.</p> <p>3. "The cabinets are permitted development without Prior Approval and do not form part of the proposal from a planning consideration perspective" I fail to see why the cabinets are not part of the same development.</p> <p>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." In a village the size of Kirtlington there are no "outskirts". The site is towards the edge of the village at the southwestern side, but very near a significant proportion of the houses in the village.</p> <p>5. "Policy C39 The council will normally grant planning permission for masts and other telecommunications</p>

structures where it has been demonstrated that:

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."

The application then lists why other sites were not suitable. Yet many of the reasons given in the reasons why these other sites were not suitable apply equally to this one. The developers appear to be keen on this one as it would not require them to compensate a private landowner.

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"

There are no problems with service currently in the area.

The appearance of the area would be very negatively affected

"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."

Just stating something to be the case which isn't simply can't constitute an application which the planning authority can take seriously.

The mast to proposed to be located in a Cotswold stone village with a conservation area so is clearly to the visual detriment of the surrounding area in terms of character affecting my house and numerous others very close to it. It would be visible from many 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.

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."

If that is how close masts need to be there will need to be several others in the village.

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."

Painting a mast green and making it very slightly thinner does nothing to address the problem.

10. Site location plans:

My neighbour Elizabeth Russell has submitted numerous photographs to show that houses are located at this junction. The photographs submitted with the application are carefully taken to indicate there are none. Each diagram shows a tall tree. To be reliant on that one tree standing forever is irresponsible and unrealistic.

I agree with Elizabeth Russell that there should be a site inspection

This would show 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.

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.

This is a cynical 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.

I object strongly to the above planning application on the above grounds.

Stephanie Hilborne

Received Date

01/04/2023 22:12:35

Attachments