

I want to seriously object to the planning application number 2023/90395 for a 17m high slim-line monopole, supporting 6 antennas, 1 wraparound equipment cabinet at the base of the monopole, 2 equipment cabinets, 1 electric meter cabinet and ancillary development thereto (within a Conservation Area).

Some of my reasons for objecting are below and based on this being a very poor proposal both with regard to its siting but also type.

1. The siting and appearance of the mast would cause unacceptable harm to the visual amenity of the locality. (This is an established precedent to refuse permission)
 - a. This regardless of any need or claims of 'coverage holes.
2. A number of other masts have been applied for and rejected in other local conservation areas and the same comments would be applicable and consistent with the Hinchcliffe Mill site i.e.
 - a. Marsden 'would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Marsden Conservation Area',
 - b. Shepley 'visually intrusive and incongruous feature in the streetscape', 'fail to conserve or respect the character of the Shepley Conservation Area'
 - c. Wooldale 'wholly out of scale with the surrounding residential properties and failing to respect the character of the area'
 - d. Thongsbridge
3. The mast is not slim. It is absolutely vast. It is overbearing and ugly. Its 17m tall. The diameter at the base is 1m plus numerous large associated cabinets.
 - a. Hinchcliffe mill and surrounding locality is a small village with very low residential housing density
 - b. The masts size and design makes it visually incompatible and insensitive in design with the visual appeal of the surrounding conservation area
 - c. Its size, design and location does not meet the planning requirements and legal objectives of the Hinchcliffe Mill conservation area and the Holme Valley NDP whose purpose is to prevent inappropriate development and to protect the look and feel of a Small low population village.
 - d. It is in the middle of a prime and unique conservation area with heritage and listed buildings
 - e. It is totally out of keeping and proportion with the historic street scene of the conservation area and will dominate the surrounding views for residents and tourists on both sides of the valley
 - f. it is will dominate Woodhead road, stubbin lane, stubbin fold, old road and the local landscape being visible for miles. It would be an eyesore visible from all aspects of the top of Holme valley.
 - g. it's located in a well-known tourist area which is popular because of its rural beauty, conservation status and heritage buildings. It will damage local business by destroying these aspects.
 - h. The proposed location is in a beautiful long established conservation area and is also covered by the HV plan. Both of these have been implemented at significant cost and with significant local peoples input and council support to protect the look, feel and heritage buildings and aspect within it.
4. Its size will completely overwhelm nearby houses and heritage and listed buildings
 - a. It is dangerously close to nearby houses and no more than 6 metres from a number of houses, causing undue harm and being unsafe.

- b. It would be incongruous to the locality and totally overbearing to nearby properties being sited less than 10m from some listed and heritage buildings.
 - c. It will tower above the current terraced houses and cottages on Stubbin Fold, Stubbin Lane, old lane and houses on Woodhead Road. Some of these buildings are listed and of significant cultural heritage.
 - d. Stubbin Fold is on a steep bank above the road. The mast would be 5m above the roof line of Number One Stubbin Fold and the transmitters at eye level with all the properties on Stubbin Lane and Stubbin Fold and the mast visible from every aspect of these properties.
 - e. It ruins the views of nearby houses on both of sides of the valley making a mockery of being proposed as an asset for the local community and tourists come away to get away from feeling they are in a city.
 - f. The structure is not hidden in any way by trees as has been falsely claimed by the applicant.
- 5. The planning officer notes the pavement by the Pickled Pheasant which is much wider than the proposed site would be more appropriate than the site proposed and he has disagreed with the applicants assessment for ruling this location out.
 - a. It is also outside the conservation area and further away from nearby houses. The applicant has failed to note that the tables outside the pub are not on the pub's land so claiming it is unsuitable due to the pavement width is false.
- 6. This is an inappropriate choice of the design used by the applicant.
- 7. This is one of 3 telecoms largest possible masts capable of being up to 20m tall. Masts of this type were specifically designed for cities with higher user demand and are usually sited well away from residential properties on the borders of parks or industrial estates. (There is not a single one of this type of this mast in the Holme Valley or Huddersfield to the best of my knowledge).
 - a. The applicant has other more suitable mast designs which for unknown reasons have not been consulted on, considered, discounted or proposed in the application. The proposal is not based on technical need but on wanting to provide coverage as cheaply as possible by building fewer larger masts as opposed to more sensitivity available options. This is utterly disrespectful to local residents and does not balance the desire to offer 5g coverage in the most sensitive way
 - b. Technically they do not need a 16m high mast to provide coverage. This is driven by cost. Any other reason is false.
 - c. They do not need 6 antennae to achieve coverage objectives.
 - d. 3 and other network providers have smaller design masts designed specifically for visually sensitive sites which are similar in size and height to telegraph poles. They are 5g compliant.
 - e. No attempt has been made to propose a smaller and lower mast, no attempt to either soften impact, or propose a mast of an appropriate smaller size at the same height as street lighting
- 8. Other viable sites have not been properly explored for its location. The list of sites considered are all on public land.
 - a. No consideration has been given to use existing mobile telecom structures located on the other side of the valley which are far more modest in size and appearance
 - b. No serious consideration has been given to what may be more appropriate sites on private land. E.g., Yew Tree Either by the side of it or on its land or on its chimney

- c. The applicant assessment of other sites seems half hearted at best with minimal detail given as to the reason for being excluded as has been noted by the planning officer. They should be challenged to give more details.
- 9. The rationale for siting the mast on Woodhead Road in the proposed location seems to be solely to do with the width of the pavement. This ignores how the path is currently used for parking on by residents vehicles who have no other option as the road is narrow and cars park on both sides of the road already.
 - a. The footpath is not wide enough to locate the mast and accompanying cabinets and car parking and pedestrian usage. This is best demonstrated by the picture the applicant has submitted showing a car parked where they want to site the cabinet.
 - b. No cars park on the pavement by the pickled pheasant as the road is wider here with a car park opposite.
- 10. Cars exiting Stubbin Lane and Stubbin Fold will not be able to see past the cabinets creating a dangerous road safety issue. Pedestrians, cyclists and drivers could be killed. **A road traffic safety assessment has not been included in the application.**
- 11. The commercial and technical information supporting the application is weak. WE ARE NOT IN LEEDS. No case is made for any public benefit for 5G in the area. The residents are ignored, as are the impacts on the conservation area and the HV plan.
- 12. All the networks, including 3, are able to provide currently excellent 4G coverage without significant physical intrusion. Its not needed. We are also due to have superfast fibre within the next 12 months further negating any need. Most people would be quite happy to maintain the status quo and forgo 5G as proposed to protect the conservation area.
- 13. The application is not compliant with the ICNIRP guidelines for limiting exposure to electromagnetic radio fields as it does not take into account its proximity to the raised nature of houses on Stubbin Lane and Stubbin Fold.
- 14. The ICNIRP application is also quoting the wrong location i.e. Booth House which is a mile away and a postcode that is not on Woodside Road and not where it is being proposed to be sited. THE APPLICATION IS THEREFORE INVALID and should be ruled so as it is creating confusion about true location reducing the number of objections.
- 15. The residents of Hinchcliffe Mill are sensitive and supportive of the conservation area. This results in significant extra building costs and time being incurred as a result of submitting plans for building work. We see this as a worthwhile price to pay to protect the look and feel of the conservation area. Householders wishing to obtain planning permission for alterations/improvements have to use traditional materials and construction techniques where these would be visible. The mast is clearly not of traditional materials.
- 16. The mast will seriously damage the value of nearby houses making them unsellable and resulting in financial ruin for the residents as they are frequently vandalised. No compensation has been proposed.
- 17. The government priorities supporting 5g are defined as for the benefit of consumers and businesses. There are very few consumers and few businesses in Hinchcliffe Mill so the application does not meet government guidelines. There are no major businesses needing 5G to be commercially viable. This is a very rural village on the edge of the National Park so does not require the same levels of coverage as a densely populated urban area. Neither can there be, as building offices and business units would not be permitted under planning restrictions due to the conservation status.

Summary

A 17m structure with six antennas and a collection of boxes at its base is totally out of keeping with the Hinchliffe Mill Conservation area comprising a selection of buildings deemed to make a particular contribution to the character of the area as noted in the Holme Valley NDP and with views into the National Park.

Smaller more modest masts are available to be used.

Approving the site in a conservation area would undermine completely the conservation areas goals and objectives. It is the opposite of what the conservation area tries to achieve.

Allowing the application would create a very damaging and dangerous precedent for other operators to be also able to erect similar masts in the same location as they cannot be rejected if they are seen to stymie competition between the operators

Other applications in Kirklees conservation areas have all been refused.

Alternative sites may be more appropriate and technically superior.

There is no clear established need for 5G in the area. Current 4G signal is excellent from all providers.