

From: kirtlingtonclerk@gmail.com
Sent: 17 April 2023 18:42
To: Gemma Magnuson
Cc: Planning
Subject: 23/00750/TEL56 - Station Road Kirtlington, Proposed 15.0m Phase 9 slimline Monopole and associated ancillary works - comments from Kirtlington Parish Council
Attachments: 21-03452-TEL56 PINS 3290284 Appeal Decision 15Feb2023.pdf; 23-00750-TEL56 Junction approach Conservation Area.heic; 23-00750-TEL56 Verge and stone wall.heic; 23-00750-TEL56 View southwards.heic; 23-00750-TEL56 Kirtlington Parish Council response.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Council. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ms Magnuson

**23/00750/TEL56 - Street Record Station Road Kirtlington
Proposed telecommunications installation: Proposed 15.0m Phase 9 slimline Monopole and associated ancillary works**

The applicant acknowledges in their Covering Letter dated 16th March 2023 that this site had been refused permission on 03/12/2021 by CDC, although it fails to acknowledge that it was also dismissed by appeal on 15th February 2023 (Appeal Decision attached). It further states that " *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.*" However, the only distinction between this submission and the previous one is that the mast and cabinets are now to be painted green, and that the 15m mast would now be a reportedly slimmer phase 9 pole, instead of the earlier phase 8 pole. We do not consider that this addresses any of the objections raised by Kirtlington Parish Council to the original application, or by the many local residents who have again written their objections to this application. We therefore attach again our objection to the siting of a mast at this location.

The SSSI for the current application contains incorrect, misleading, and obvious cut and paste comments from applications elsewhere casting great doubt on the efforts made by the applicant to find the most suitable, less harmful, rather than just convenient location to site the mast around Kirtlington. Examples of this are:

"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 is no street lighting in this part of Kirtlington. *"The mast will be mounted on a wide grass verge adjacent to Station Road to avoid impeding on pedestrian flow and to allow pedestrians to maintain unrestricted access to the footpath."* There is no pedestrian footpath here, just an uninterrupted view across open countryside.

"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 a single 7m high BT pole which would be dwarfed by the 15m monopole. The wall behind is not brick but a low-level dry-stone wall which has a positive impact on the heritage asset and is itself considered to be a non designated heritage asset. This would be obscured by the cabinets.

"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." And yet in the next sentence. *"The proposed works are not to the visual detriment of the surrounding area (being suitably distant from sensitive receptors."* Attached are three photographs showing the proposed site and give a truer indication of the impact this installation would have than those included in the SSSI which have been taken at angles away from the village. Under Reasons for Choice of Design. *"In keeping with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF July 2021). guidelines of using high quality communications infrastructure the proposed design has been selected to minimise*

visual impact upon the street scene by integrating with the existing street furniture, having similar vertical lines and overall appearance to the numerous street lighting columns in this area". Again, please refer to photographs and confirm that there is no street lighting in this part of the village.

Finally, this new application does not address **items 9, 10 & 11 of the recent Appeal Decision**, copied below. We believe that these comments still remain relevant, and that the application should therefore be refused, as should any right to further appeal.

9. The Framework states that where new sites serving the telecommunication industry are required, equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate. Whilst some effort has been made to design the proposed mast as a standard, uncluttered monopole, it would nevertheless exceed the height of the existing BT pole by a significant margin. The width of the proposed mast would stand out as an incongruous and dominant feature within the surrounding streetscape and would harmfully detract from the character and appearance of the area.

10. As the site lies within the KCA, I have a duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA Act) to ensure that new developments either preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the designated KCA. I find that the proposed mast would be over dominant and incongruous at this edge of village location. It would undermine the significance of the KCA that I have identified and in turn would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of this heritage asset.

11. Whilst the harm identified to the character and appearance of the KCA may be considered less than substantial in the context of paragraph 202 of the Framework, this test requires that such harm be considered against any public benefit the development might offer. The provision of facilities to provide up[1]to-date telecommunications may in the broadest sense be deemed to be a public benefit. However, paragraph 199 of the Framework, states that great weight should be afforded to the conservation of heritage assets, which must also by definition, include their setting. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.

Yours sincerely

Ruth Powles

Mrs Ruth Powles
Clerk, Kirtlington Parish Council
01869 350995

Office hours: Monday to Wednesday