

GLEMSFORD – GROVE FARM, ANGEL LANE

Notification under Part 24 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended) – Erection of 15 metre telecommunications pole incorporating a multi-band antenna and equipment cabinets.

Applicant: O2 (UK Ltd)

Case Officer: Gemma Pannell

---

SITE

1. The application site is located on land within Grove Farm situated toward the end of Angel Lane. The site has a number of farm buildings and silos located within it and some mature trees.

PROPOSAL

2. See report heading. The development consists of a new 15m Flexicell 2 Type E column on a deep root foundation, and is to be painted dark green with multi-band antenna at 14m. Associated cabinets are situated at ground level screened behind three silo buildings that are approximately 7m high.
3. The applicant is seeking, the Council's determination on whether 'prior approval' will be required for the siting and appearance of the proposed development. However, the information and plans submitted with the application are sufficient in order to enable a formal decision to be taken in relation to the siting and appearance of the development at this juncture.

HISTORY

4. 1999 – Notification under Part 24 of the GPDO for the erection of a 15 metre sectored column – refused under B/99/01582/TEL.
5. The application above was recommended for approval but refused by Development Committee for the following reasons: "The Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the proposed 15 metre high column mast would be unduly detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the area. The Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the applicants have not satisfactorily demonstrated that other alternative sites for the mast are not available in the area."

## POLICY

### **PPG 8 (Telecommunications)**

6. PPG 8 offers guidance to local planning authorities in relation to telecommunications development. The Government recognises that in some cases, the nature of telecommunications development may be in conflict with established local and national policies. However, local planning authorities are urged to 'be alive' to the special needs and technical problems of telecommunications development. Each application for telecommunications development (PPG8 advises) should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
7. The Government places a particular emphasis on encouraging mast sharing to cut down on the number of new sites and masts required by the industry.
8. **Suffolk County Structure Plan**
  - Policy ENV1
9. **Babergh Local Plan Alteration No. 2 (2006)**
  - EN26 (Telecommunications)

## OBSERVATIONS

10. PC – Our policy is that any masts in the village should be on a shared site, as we have mentioned before, and the obvious one at present is at New Street. We are all aware that an application on Grove Farm had been suggested in the past but we still feel that the mast would be very obtrusive, and would also be highly visible from the surrounding fields and the recreation ground, thus creating an eyesore as well as for the neighbours. A mast on the site at the bottom of Angel Lane (BT Exchange) was lost at appeal and therefore we stand by our decision that any mast should be erected on a shared site.
11. Letters – none received.

## ASSESSMENT

12. This application has to be assessed against both national and local planning guidance (together with any other material considerations). Government guidance within PPG 8 advises that Local Authorities should encourage operators to utilise existing facilities where possible to negate the demand for a proliferation of new sites. This guidance is reflected within adopted Local Plan policy EN26.
13. The proposed siting of a mast in Glemsford has resulted in a number of sites being considered and rejected both by the Local Planning Authority and the Planning Inspectorate. The site nearest to that proposed is the BT Exchange at the other end of Angel Lane near to Egremont Street: here an appeal was dismissed for a 17 metre monopole (B/01/00269/FUL) given the harmful visual impact on the Conservation Area and some of the listed buildings within the vicinity. Therefore it is not considered to be a suitable site for additional telecommunications equipment. The site was rejected by the applicant given the site offered no natural screening and was the most centrally located site.

14. The proposal for a mast in the vicinity of Grove Farm has the benefit of screening provided by existing agricultural buildings and landscaping which surrounds the immediate area. It is unlikely that the proposed apparatus will be visible from Angel Lane and it is considered that the only public area where the mast will be readily visible is from the playing field. Although the mast will be visible, it is not considered that its visual impact will be so severe so as to justify the details being refused.
15. Prior to the current proposals being submitted, other potential sites in the Glemsford area were explored. The other sites were the BT Exchange, which was discounted for the reasons outlined in paragraph 12 and New Street Farm (which the Parish Council refer to in their consultation response), which is the National Grid Wireless Tower, this was discounted by the application because the required coverage would not be provided at this location.
16. In light of the above, the proposal is considered to comply with Government Guidance (PPG8) and relevant Development Plan policy.

### RECOMMENDATION

The applicants be advised that the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority is required for the siting and design of the development, and that approval is given.

### DECISION

---

---