

22.01,2023

Peter Simon
48 Post Street
Padfield
SK13 1EF

James Stannard
High Peak Borough Council

OBJECTION TO: DET/2022/0021

PROPOSED TELECOMMUNICATIONS INSTALLATION, Old Hall Square, Hadfield, Glossop, Derbyshire,

1. This is a concerning “application”.
2. Firstly it is appropriate to question if the application has been appropriately publicised to interested parties beyond very immediate neighbours as no site notice has been posted as is customary?
3. Next irrespective of suggested tree screening, the proposed 18m phone overall (pole) structure would obviously be obtrusive and detrimental in the historic area identified, where there are important listed buildings. Moreover this heritage square enjoys panoramic moorland views, within a conservation area and contributes critically to the sense of “place” that Hadfield enjoys. (**NPPF Para 190 d**). Further updates to NPPF now under consultation regarding “place” and “beauty” are likely to add even further significant planning weight to this consideration.
4. However the applicant in their statement (Developer’s Notice) implies the matter is a “fait accompli” prompting the question why the “application” unless perhaps the LPA retains discretion as to siting and appearance? *“CK Hutchison Networks (UK) Ltd benefits from permitted development rights for this development as set out under the above order.”* The Applicant are possibly correct as such masts if below 30m (as this is – 18m) are apparently considered “permitted development” in conservation areas.
5. The applicant also cite a telephony network section in National Planning Guidance for their proposal which looks supportive of their case in principle though I have not had time to check this. (**NPPF2021 Chapter 10. Supporting high quality communications**). They also contend that there is no specific position expressed by the LPA in the adopted local plan which might influence or guide a decision in this area, and again this may also be the case. (They do not mention any relevant Plan Guidance for Derbyshire which might possibly contain relevant policy in the absence of such in the local adopted plan?)

However the separate NPPF text regarding conservation as regards “place” is a relevant consideration, so clearly there are outstanding matters for the authority to determine here. *“CK Hutchison Networks (UK) Ltd are required to apply to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether the prior approval of the authority will be required to the siting and appearance of the development set out below”*. It seems the Applicant are not less sure of their ground than they imply, and this might be a speculative application at least in part.

6. In response to this situation as described and its probable speculative nature, it is appropriate to point out this is public land with where development is within the jurisdiction of the LPA High Peak Borough, and highway matters the responsibility of Derbyshire County Council. With this in mind it should be noted:
- As stated the proposal is detrimental to a “place” defining area for the village of Hadfield and therefore against the NPPF guidance also I suspect reinforced by general guidance regarding heritage protection within the adopted High Peak local plan of 2016.
 - Further there are magnetic field health concerns associated with 5G mobile phone masts, and therefore with such an exposed public site position the Council would be justified to take a second expert opinion on assessment methodology, so as to confirm if the clean health audit claimed by the Applicant is correct.
 - Similarly though the Application may conform with a national aspiration to support 5G networks the Council would be justified in deferring the application to test the claim that there are no other more suitable sites for this mast elsewhere; the proposed site being manifestly inappropriate.

Finally returning to the initial point “2” made in this representation I only heard of the Application through “word of mouth “ and it appears that immediate neighbours apart other potentially interested parties nearby and further afield would have not necessarily been made aware through a site notice as is I think the normal procedure. I therefore suggest if this is an oversight that for all the reasons I have stated this controversial application could and should be rightfully deferred for a further consultation period prior to decision. This seems procedurally correct to indemnify any application decision and offer fair time for all once properly notified to research the such a radical proposal further, as seems necessary.

Thank you for considering my comments in objection to this application.

Yours sincerely

Peter Simon