

18 DCNC2005/1817/F - T-MOBILE SHARE ON 5M EXTENSION OF THE EXISTING 25M TELECOMMS TOWER. TO INCLUDE 3 NEW OPCS ANTENNAE AND 3 NEW OPCS DISHES, 2 NEW T-MOBILE ANTENNAE, 1 NEW T-MOBILE DISH AND A NEW T-MOBILE CABINET AT UPPER EDGLEY FARM, STOKES LANE, STOKE LACY, BROMYARD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR7 4HD

For: Orange Pcs Ltd per FPD Savills, Wessex House, Wimborne, BH21 1PB

Date Received: 31st May, 2005 Ward: Bromyard Grid Ref: 63091, 50294

Expiry Date: 26th July, 2005

Local Members: Councillors P.J. Dauncey and B. Hunt

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 Site is located on rising land on the south side of Stoke Lane, C1132, and to the southeast of Sunny Lea. It is located in open countryside. There is screening to the side.
- 1.2 This application proposes to increase the height of an existing 25-metre high telecommunications mast by 5 metres to accommodate 3 new antennae, 3 new dishes, 2 new T-Mobile antennae and 1 new T-Mobile dish, as well as a new equipment cabin.

2. Policies

2.1 Malvern Hills District Local Plan

Landscape Policy 1 – Development Outside Settlements
Conservation Policy 18 – Telecommunications Equipment

2.2 Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan

CTC9 – Development Criteria

2.3 Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)

CF3 – Telecommunications

- 2.4 PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development
PPG8 – Telecommunications

3. Planning History

NC2000/2644/F – 20-metre high monopole mast and ancillary equipment refused 12th February, 2001.

NC2002/3549/F – 25-metre high slim-line lattice tower refused 19th March, 2003. Appeal allowed 25th September 2003.

NC2004/1683/F – 25-metre lattice tower refused 4th August, 2004

4. Consultation Summary

Statutory Consultations

4.1 None required.

Internal Council Advice

4.2 Traffic Manager – no objection

4.3 Environmental Health and Trading Standards – “no comment”

5. Representations

5.1 Stoke Lacy Parish Council – The existing mast is enough of an eyesore and would further be detrimental to the visual amenity of the locality. Not recommended.

5.2 Nine letters of objection have been received:

- a) It is a blot on the landscape.
- b) The existing mast has already had a detrimental impact on the local environment.
- c) The increase in height would further impact on the quiet rural nature of the area.
- d) The mast should be sited on an industrial estate.
- e) Harm to health.
- f) Alternative sites have not been investigated.
- g) There are more suitable sites available at Symmonds Cider and Woodend Business Park.

5.3 The applicant has said:

- a) The site is designed to provide specific coverage along the route of the A465.
- b) The proposed site is an existing 25-metre orange lattice tower located at Upper Edgeley Farm.
- c) There are numerous coverage holes and the inclusion of the site is critical.
- d) T-Mobile has conducted extensive search of the area in order to find a site that will meet the coverage requirements by using an existing telecommunications mast, T-Mobile is endeavouring to minimise the environmental and visual impacts of the installation in line with The Code of Best Practice. Alternative sites have been investigated and have been discounted for technical reasons.

5.4 The full text of these letters can be inspected at Northern Planning Services, Blueschool House, Blueschool Street, Hereford, and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

6. Officers Appraisal

- 6.1 Conservation Policy 8 deals specifically with telecommunications, setting a criteria for consideration as follows:
- a) It can be demonstrated that there is no opportunity of a mast sharing or use of existing buildings or structures.
 - b) It is designed to minimise the impact on the surrounding countryside or urban area.
 - c) Where appropriate and technically possible a scheme for landscape screening is provided.
 - d) The District Council will use planning conditions or seek legal agreement to remove any existing equipment rendered obsolete or redundant by the proposal.
- 6.2 This application is to increase the height of the existing 25-metre high mast by 5 metres.
- 6.3 The existing mast was allowed on appeal, NC2002/3549/F refers, when the inspector concluded there is no environmentally preferable and operationally acceptable alternative site that would acceptably upgrade performance of service along the A465, and that the appeal proposal would satisfy the considerations in local and national policy and that operational need outweighs the limited harm to the landscape that would arise from this proposal. Given the planning history of the site, and the need to upgrade performance along the A465 it is not considered that the increase in height of this mast will cause significant harm to the local environment.
- 6.4 This application has been submitted following the refusal of NC2004/1683/F, which was for a second mast on this site. The application was refused as it would lead to a proliferation of masts. It is considered this proposal fulfils the requirements of mast sharing as advocated by PPG 8, and Conservation Policy 8.

RECOMMENDATION:

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1 - A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission))

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 - Before development commences the colour and finish of the lattice tower equipment cabinets and fencing shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with those details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

Informative:

1 - N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of PP/LBC/CAC

Decision:

Notes:

.....

Background Papers

Internal departmental consultation replies.