

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

County Ecologist comments:

Given the scale and nature of the proposals I would not raise any concerns in relation to ecological matters

6 Community Involvement

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications approved at minute 207/6/92 (as amended), as a result of which the following publicity was undertaken:

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 8

Number of site notices: At least one site notice exists - check the number.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Comment	Officer Comment
Health concerns about the operation of the wireless.	Noted. This is not material to the determination of the application.
Viewed the proposal from rear garden and would not be happy looking at large radio mast and support mast at bottom of garden.	Noted and covered at 7.4 and 7.5 below.
Very concerned about the effect of the radio emissions would have on local signals (TV/Radio etc).	Noted. This is not material to the determination of the application. It is a matter for Ofcom, if the radio emission interferes with the TV/Radio.
In 2003/04 appeal Planning Committee and Planning Inspector visited	The application for a dwellinghouse on a neighbouring property was not refused on ecology grounds.
Overall the quality of our life and lifestyle will be severely, negatively impacted - further intrusion unacceptable.	Noted and covered at 7.4 and 7.5 below
Noise from wire, from winds that can be high.	Noted and covered at 7.5 below.
Bats nesting in close vicinity. On flight path for migrating birds - birds eat and rest in garden. Own birds in garden. On Evidence that mast and aerials harm people's health.	Noted. No objection to the proposal has been raised by the County Ecologist
Ground works for the masts have been done - 2 poles to be erected	Noted and as per the application.

7 Planning Considerations

7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the

main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Impact on ecology

(i) Principle of development

- 7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, therefore development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area

- 7.3 The proposal is for 2, 6 metre poles, 1 of which would be attached to the bungalow by 2 brackets. The other pole would be support by 2 guy wires. Between the 2 poles there would be a 27 metre long 6 mm wire aerial. The development is not considered to be out of keeping with the locality and is deemed appropriate in context to the main building and the locality and is therefore considered to be acceptable, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core strategy). It is considered that the scheme would not result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

- 7.4 The impact of the development has been viewed from the garden of 57 Creek Road, which would be partially obscured by vegetation and buildings in this garden. The boundaries treatment between the neighbouring properties comprises of a brick wall (to rear), fencing and existing structures within the application site. There are also trees within the application site. Therefore the proposal would to some degree be screened by this treatment. As to the scale of the development this is considered to be minor in nature, which would not be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring property.

- 7.5 As to the concern raised about possible noise from the wire, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) has no evidence that this would cause significant harm to the occupiers of neighbouring properties. The proposal should not put the health and safety of existing and future users of the site, or nearby occupiers and residents at risk and therefore accords with Policy DM10 of the Core Strategy.

(iv) Impact on ecology

- 7.6 Concerns have been raised regarding the local ecology. In response to this the County Ecologist has been consulted on this proposal, who has stated: "Given the scale and nature of the proposals I would not raise any concerns in relation to ecological matters." Therefore, the proposed, due to its scale and nature should not impact on local ecology.

- 7.7 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would have a limited and acceptable impact on the properties immediately adjacent to the application site and the properties opposite or to the rear, meeting the requirements of Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy). The proposal is also considered to accord with Policies DM8 and DM10 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 The scale and siting of the proposal would have limited and acceptable impact on the neighbours, and would be acceptable in ecology terms. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be appropriate and recommended for approval.
-

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/19/00429 subject to the following conditions

- 1 The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Site location plan
Elevation layout
Elevation plan

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.