

**Consultation Response from KC,
Conservation & Design**

2023/90052 land at, Wood Lane, Newsome, Huddersfield, HD4 6PH

Prior notification for proposed 5G telecoms installation: H3G 15m street pole and additional equipment cabinets.

Date Responded: 23.01.2023

Responding Officer: Sebastian Pickles

Responding Ref:

The application relates to the erection of a 15m high telecoms monopole. The proposals are for the monopole to be erected in on a intersection of Wood Lane, Fanny Moor Lane and Longley Lane.

The application site is not within a Conservation Area, however it is within the immediate setting of several Listed Buildings which include, Grade II* Longley Old Hall, Grade II 197-201 Longley, Grade II 191 Longley, Grade II 175, 177 and 179 Longley and Grade II 161 and 165 Longley. The building form part of the historic core of Longley, which are all clustered around a key turnpike. The Grade II* Hall can be seen through glimpse views from the site.

The proposed site is form of a large, grassed area, which include some immature trees, with a front projecting pavement. To the rear of the pavement and the front of the grassed area there is an existing late 20th century lamppost and a more recent bus shelter. The lamppost while being tall does not have a significant impact on the character of the area, however the bus shelter being painted red does have a high visual impact and is of no quality.

The proposed monopole as noted will be 15m high and will not only include the pole, but also the necessary ancillary equipment, which includes a large cabinet and further two separate cabinets. This will create a large alien feature in the street scene and also create addition clutter with the associated cabinets.

Pre-application advise was given in 2022 setting out the sensitive nature of the site, being the immediate setting of the noted Listed Buildings, advising that alternative location should be considered.

Looking at the submitted statement there does not appear to be any regard for the chosen placement of the monopole in relation to the setting of the Listed Buildings. Again, looking at the submitted planning statement, the reasons presented for the locations which have been discounted appear unsubstantiated and unjustified. One of the reasons presented for 2 of the locations are 'being in a residential area, very residential area'. Given the chosen location, this reason appears entirely unbalanced. There are also comments provided setting there are insufficient pavements, issues of visibility splays and issues around adoption.

In regard to one of the locations D6, is sets out that the option has been discounted due to unsuitable pavements and the location is also in a residential area. This is a curious assessment as the pavement design appears to match the proposed location and there is already an existing pole in this location, which has been present since 2012.

As presented Conservation would raise an objection to the proposed monopole which would have a negative impact on the setting of the Listed Buildings and there does not appear to be a sound and convincing justification for the proposed location. We consider that the alternative locations needed to be reconsidered and alternative location as well, as was set out at pre-application stage. We consider the proposed placement of the monopole would be contrary to policy 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act and policy LP35 of the Local Plan. We appreciate that the aim is

to improve connectivity, we however, as set out consider this can be achieved in a less sensitive location.