MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Carolyn Parry
Telephone: 0161 234 4022
c.parry@manchester.gov.uk

P O Box 532 Town Hall
Manchester M60 2LA

Damian Hosker
WHP Telecoms Limited
Helena House
Troy Mills
Troy Road
Leeds
LS18 5GN

Date: 21 May 2020

Dear Sir/Madam,

Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) (England) 2015 (as amended) Schedule 2, Part 16
Application No: 126643/TEL/2020
Application for prior approval for proposed telecommunications installation within pavement consisting of monopole with associated antennae at top and wrap around cabinet at base (to a maximum height of 20m), 3 no. other equipment cabinets on pavement and associated works at 53 Portland Street, Manchester, M1 3LD

I write with reference to the above application and advise you that prior approval will be required for the siting and appearance of the proposed apparatus.

In this case, prior approval is **refused** for the following reason(s):

1) The City Council is not satisfied that the proposed development has been sited and designed to minimise its impact upon amenity within the area for the following reasons:

2) Reason 1 - The proposed telecommunications monopole, by reason of its height, siting, design and appearance, would form an unacceptable, visually intrusive, incongruous and dominant feature within the streetscene that would be visible from a range of short and long range views within Portland Street and from surrounding roads. The monopole, and its associated ground based cabinets, would lead to visual clutter which would be to the detriment of visual amenity within the area. The proposal would have a negative effect upon regeneration efforts and improvements to the environment taking place within the area, and as a consequence would have a detrimental impact on the overall image of the City Centre. For these reasons, the proposed installation would be contrary to guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework, policies DM1 (Development Management) and SP1 (Spatial Principles) of the Adopted Core Strategy for the City of Manchester and saved policies E3.3 (Environmental Improvement and Protection) and DC17.1 (Telecommunications) of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester.

3) Reason 2 - The proposed telecommunications monopole, by reason of its height, siting, design and appearance, would adversely affect the setting of nearby heritage assets including the George Street Conservation Area and a number of Grade II listed buildings that are located directly opposite the application site, as well as the Grade II* listed buiding

at 35 Portland Street . The monopole would be of an overtly industrial design and inelegant in its appearance. For these reasons, the proposed installation would be contrary to guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework, policies DM1 (Development Management), EN3 (Heritage), CC9 (Design and Heritage) and SP1 (Spatial Principles) of the Adopted Core Strategy for the City of Manchester and saved policies E3.3 (Environmental Improvement and Protection), DC17.1 (Telecommunications), DC18.1 (Conservation Areas) and DC19.1 (Listed Buildings) of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester.

4) Reason 3 - The proposed telecommunications monopole, by reason of its siting, together with the associated ground based equipment cabinets, would clutter the adopted highway and impede the free movement of pedestrians along the pavement at this location on Portland Street, including those pedestrians who may be physically disabled and/or visually impaired. This would be compounded due to the location of the proposed monopole and cabinets relative to existing ground based installations in the immediate area, including cycle stands, a bin, a streetlight and a bollard. For these reasons, the proposed installation would be contrary to guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework, policies DM1 (Development Management) and SP1 (Spatial Principles) of the Adopted Core Strategy for the City of Manchester and saved policy DC17.1 (Telecommunications) of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester.

5) Reason 4 - The proposed telecommunications monopole, by reason of its siting, would be detrimental to amenity within the area due to the potential noise that would be emitted from the equipment. The applicant has not provided an acoustic assessment that assesses the noise from the installation and associated equipment cabinets (which can make noise in the form of humming type sounds). The noise from such installations can be perceived as a brief low-level noise, often described as a "click" or "buzzing" (ICNIRP, 2020) and some people will be more perceptible to these noises than others. As such the proposal could lead to disamenity to those living and working in close proximity to the monopole. For these reasons, the proposed installation would be contrary to guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework, policies DM1 (Development Management) and SP1 (Spatial Principles) of the Adopted Core Strategy for the City of Manchester and saved policies DC17.1 (Telecommunications) and DC26 (Development and Noise) of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester.

6) Reason 5 - The applicant did not allow for sufficient time for pre-application discussions with the Local Planning Authority before submitting the prior approval application.

Should you wish to discuss this matter any further please contact Carolyn Parry.

Yours faithfully,



Julie Roscoe
Director of Planning, Building Control & Licensing