

Burnett, James

From: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: FW: Comment Received from Public Access

-----Original Message-----

From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk [<mailto:planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk>]

Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2017 12:30 PM

To: Planning Comments (HPBC)

Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : DET/2017/0005

Site Address: Westbourne Footpath Platt Street Padfield Glossop Derbyshire

Comments by: Andrew Price1958

From:

8

Gawsworth Close

Hadfield

Glossop

Derbyshire

SK131QT

Submission: Objection

Comments:

8 Gawsworth Close

Hadfield

Glossop

SK13 1QT

Dear Sirs

HPBC Planning Application DET/2017/0005 & 15 metre high tower at Platt Street

We wish to register in the strongest possible terms our objection to the above proposed mast.

TIMING

It has been established that you have known about this for some considerable time but have chosen to inform only a select group of residents at the last moment and impose a time limit on objections. This is both unfair and calculating on your part.

NECESSITY

Other service providers have an equal coverage in the area but use up to 3 masts. The erection of this mast would take EE into double figures in this respect. This is totally unnecessary when the technology to avoid multiple masts exists and is proven.

LOCATION

This is a highly undesirable choice on many levels. It would ruin what is at the present time a gateway to a popular trail. It is used and appreciated as a location of natural beauty by local families and a great many visitors. A little investigating on your behalf would reveal that this location has seen accidents in the past where there has been a collision with a lamppost. Imagine the devastation if this mast was hit in the same way. A much better use of your time and efforts would be to erect a mandatory speed limit sign.

HEALTH

It is well documented that the close proximity of such a mast could impact on long term health and that a number of residents would fall well short of established safe boundaries for such a device.

LONG TERM

Firstly, please don't insult our intelligence to suggest that this would 'blend in'. It would be a forever present 'eye sore' that we would be forced to live with. No amount of trees, bushes or hedges would cover or disguise its presence. There is also the aspect of interference to our already crippled relay transmitter for Tv and Radio services. Here is a quote from a published paper written by an industry expert: 'Digital TV interference problems (often referred to as "TVI"), can be difficult to diagnose. 4G masts can interfere with digital TV channels, or (in extreme cases) overload a

Sky Digital distribution amplifier, Freeview box'

The other aspect to consider is of course the value of our homes and their desirability if this went ahead. No one wants to live next to a towering mast that permanently hums.

IN CONCLUSION

Despite EE stating to the contrary it is glaringly apparent that there are a wealth of possible alternative sites in the area where consideration for residents, their lives, health and investment would not have to be compromised. I would therefore respectfully ask that this application is denied and further investigation into finding an alternative location is embarked upon with immediate effect.

Yours faithfully

Andrew and Jane Price

4th May 2017