

Below are the objections I raised the last time Wireless Infrastructure submitted a retrospective planning application, my views are still the same with the following, very long objection to the current application submitted on their behalf to appeal the granted planning approval for a 9m tree and associated upkeep.

A planning application (APP/15/01029 - 17 Sept 2015) was submitted to Havant Borough Council on behalf of Wireless Infrastructure to install a 15m mast to replace the existing 10m one directly behind my property. The 10m was not visible at all from my property as good tree coverage of two 12m trees.

On a very wet and windy night during October 2016 the 15m mast was installed. In the morning I realised the impact the new mast had on my property. One of the 12m trees which had original shielded (very effectively) the 10m mast had been drastically cut back and the 15m mast was fully visible.

Wireless Infrastructure stated in their original planning application that the mast would not be intrusive or visually detrimental as good tree coverage. The original planning application stated: "repeated claims - should have no major impact on the local community, will not be intrusive. These changes will have a very minor impact for the immediate and wider area. Whilst the increase in height would increase, the visual impact will be partially screened by existing planting and would not be overly prominent".

My objections to this visible mast were raised the morning after it was sited in October 2016, it was not until 20th November 2017 a meeting was arranged with the National Acquisition and Planning Manager, Wireless Infrastructure Group on-site. Wireless Infrastructure acknowledged that the mast had been incorrectly sited by approximately 6-8 feet and that the tree should not have been cut back. They said they were taking the matter seriously and wanted to put their mistake right. If the mast had been sited correctly and the tree left as the original application, then the mast would have been hardly visible, just the top 3m. The application clearly shows tree coverage for the mast from my property.

On the 11th December 2017 they confirmed that a meeting had been held with Southern Water, who own the land the mast is sited on, to discuss the size of the pit required for the proposed tree including lifting mechanisms and other health and safety requirements. They were pushing for a decision from Southern Water before Christmas 2017 "so we can push the button on the ordering process". Southern Water gave their approval on 6th March 2018.

A retrospective planning application (APP/18/01165) was made on the 8th November 2018 for a minimum height 9m tree, I compromised on the height of the tree (originally agreed 12m) and accepted. Planning was granted on 16 January 2019 with constraints, i.e. timeframe for planting of the tree to be 3 months and that the silver sheath which had appeared on the top part of the tree (without planning permission) be removed or hidden as the mast was meant to look like a tree trunk (as the original planning application). They said at the beginning of this year that a tree had been ordered.

Wireless Infrastructure never planted the tree and let the 3 month deadline elapse without any notification that they did not now intend to carry out the work. I have now been advised that they are appealing the planning decision and an inspector representing the Secretary of State may be involved.

I am extremely upset and frustrated that they have gone back on their promise and agreement, in total breach of the approved planning application. This situation has been ongoing for nearly 3 years. They do not care at all that they have caused me extreme upset/worry, affecting my life and property in such a dramatic way. Wireless Infrastructure, as far as I am concerned,

has not been honest in their dealing with this situation and clearly are not intending to take the right and honourable action they promised and agreed to. Mobile masts are now a fact of life and are a very emotive subject for people living close to these installations. Wireless Infrastructure is not helping with the PR exercise mobile providers, the government or local councils need with the general public.

I have read the letter from Harlequin included in the appeal, I really don't like the 2nd paragraph on page 5 - "Reliance therefore on these trees and could be removed at any point in time". And the 4th paragraph on page 5 - "In terms of necessityRF signal" Clearly these paragraphs indicate that WIG at some point will cut down both trees, which I think was always their intention and expose the mast totally, this is the real reason they do not want to replace the tree. This move by them is contrary to the original planning application where they stated that the mast would have not visible impact on the local area because the trees gave protection. Would the council have given planning permission if WIG had stated original that they planned to cut both trees down, I would hope not. They have been totally dishonest with the council. Can the council place TPO's on these trees.

Companies like this have to be stopped from riding roughshod over residents and installing their masts wherever they wish whatever the impact on the environment and locality to the detriment to people and their properties.

Attached are photographs before (taken a year or so before nothing to do with the mast) and 3 taken after, one showing the recent addition of the silver cover which was not given planning consent.

Objection to previous planning application

I object to this retrospective planning application on the grounds that the issue of the incorrect siting of the mast, by approximately 6-8 feet and the cutting back of the original tree by Wireless Infrastructure Group has been ongoing now for 2 years. No where in this application can I see mention that this application is not only for retrospective planning for a tree but also for the incorrect siting of the mast. I also note that under "pre application advice" that the applicant has stated that advice was asked of the Director of Planning on numerous occasions - "details of pre application of advice received - no response".

If the mast had been sited and the tree left as the original application then the mast would have been hardly visible, just the top 3m (original tree was 12m). The previous 10m mast was not visible from my property as good tree coverage. The original planning application stated: "repeated claims - should have no major impact on the local community, will not be intrusive. These changes will have a very minor impact for the immediate and wider area. Whilst the increase in height would increase, the visual impact will be partially screened by existing planting and would not be overly prominent". There was no statement in the application to say some properties would have major impact with full view. The drawings in the original application clearly shows tree coverage for the mast from my property. Perhaps they should be reminded about a statement in their Corporate Social responsibility statement - "mindful of the impact on local communities and the environment".

The installation of this mast and cutting back of the tree, by approximately two thirds, was undertaken during the hours of darkness on a very windy night, hence the cutting down of the tree. It must have been obviously to the company that the mast was being incorrectly sited. The scale of the incorrect siting can be seen in the west elevation diagrams for both applications. I have photographs showing the view from my home taken the year before installation and the day after, clearly showing the impact on my property and surrounding area. One showing, if enlarged, the original 10m mast screened by the tree which was cut down.

My objections to this visible mast was raised the morning after it was sited in October 2016, it was not until 20th November 2017 a meeting was arranged with the National Acquisition and Planning Manager, Wireless Infrastructure Group onsite. On 3rd October 2017 he had already proposed a 7-9m tree. At this meeting he agreed that a 9m tree would be planted and that Wireless Infrastructure Group were taking the matter seriously and wanted to put their mistake right.

On the 11th December he confirmed that a meeting had been held with Southern Water to discuss the size of the pit required for the proposed tree including lifting mechanisms and other health and safety requirements. He was pushing for a decision from Southern Water before Christmas 2017 "so we can push the button on the ordering process". Southern Water gave their approval on 6th March 2018.

Now this application had been submitted 7 months later and they have completely reneged on their promise and agreement with no explanation. They are now proposing a 4m tree which is totally unacceptable to me. There is a 3m fence behind my property so a 4m tree is not going to do anything to screen the mast.

They need to be asked why it has taken nearly a year to drop this bombshell when after our meeting all seemed settled. I think they have waited until they can put a retrospective application in and therefore not commit themselves to the promise made nearly a year ago.

I would ask the council to respect their own planning statement "compliance with the plans and other documents submitted with regard to your application, any failure to adhere to the details of submitted plans and other documents may lead to enforcement action being taken by the council".







