About the application

Application number: 2026/92702	
What is the application for?:	Prior notification for installation of 22.5m monopole, supporting 9 antennas, 2
Address of the site or building:	Land at Lindley Bowling Club, Daisy Lea Lane, Huddersfield, Lindley, HD3 3LP
Postcode:	RG7 4SA

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes

I object to prior approval for the siting and appearance of the proposed 22.5-metre telecommunications monopole at Lindley Bowling Club.

1. Heritage setting

The applicant's statement identifies Edgerton Conservation Area about 40 metres east of the site, the Grade II* Lindley Clock Tower about 200 metres west, and nearby listed buildings including Briar Court, Ridgemount and the Church of St Stephen. The Council should assess the effect of the mast on the settings and appreciation of these assets, including the character of the conservation area. The distance from the Clock Tower does not, by itself, establish whether its setting would be affected.

2. The heritage assessment is unclear and not sufficiently site-specific

On pages 40–41 of document 1158951, the assessment refers to "Headingly Conservation Area" and concludes that the proposal would not harm that area or nearby heritage assets. It then says there will be "a degree of harm" to the setting of a conservation area due to visibility. Elsewhere, the same document correctly identifies Edgerton Conservation Area as being about 40 metres east of the site.

The wrong place-name appears to be copied or template text. The concern is not the error by itself: the report does not explain which conservation area its conclusions refer to, reconcile its "no harm" conclusion with its acknowledgement of harm, or identify the views on which those conclusions are based. Correcting "Headingly" to "Edgerton" would not resolve those substantive questions.

I ask the Council to assess the actual effect on Edgerton Conservation Area, the Clock Tower and the other nearby listed buildings, including their settings and relevant public views. The NPPF calls for an assessment of heritage significance, including setting, and the effects of the proposal; decision-makers should be satisfied that the assessment accurately reflects those effects.

3. Appearance and views from surrounding streets

The proposed structure includes nine antennas, two transmission dishes and an open headframe. The applicant says the antennas need to be at 22.5 metres to clear trees and buildings, while also relying on surrounding trees to screen longer views. The Council should assess the full installation and how much of it would remain visible above the tree cover.

I ask the Council to assess views from publicly accessible points along Cressfield Road, Burwood Road, Victoria Road, Daisy Lea Lane and Lidget Street, and from other surrounding residential streets, wherever the mast would be visible. Accurate visualisations from those viewpoints would help establish its effect on the street scene, local skyline and views towards the Clock Tower and conservation area. The 1.8-metre fence may screen some ground-level equipment, but it would not screen the mast and its upper equipment.

4. Alternative locations

The applicant’s site-selection statement considers a number of local alternatives and says that locations outside its search area would not provide the required coverage. I ask the Council to consider whether suitable locations within the necessary service area, but outside conservation areas and the settings of listed buildings, have been adequately explored.

In particular, the applicant should explain whether locations in an established commercial, utility or telecommunications setting could accommodate a mast of this form more appropriately, and provide the technical reasons for rejecting any feasible options. My objection is to the proposed siting in this heritage-sensitive setting; the assessment should establish whether a less harmful location is practicable.

5. Height clarification

The pre-application letter describes a 22.5-metre monopole but says a height of 20 metres is essential. The final site-specific statement says 22.5 metres is essential. I ask the applicant to clarify the difference and confirm the full installed height.

The NPPF gives substantial weight to telecommunications benefits while also requiring proposals to minimise visual impact and assess effects on heritage significance. I ask the Council to refuse prior approval as the proposed siting and appearance would harm the local street scene, landscape, conservation area and heritage setting.

Please treat this letter as a formal objection and take it fully into account when determining the application.