



Mr Ryan Marshall
WHP Telecoms Ltd
Helena House
Troy Mills
Troy Road
Horsforth
LS18 5GN

Date: 16 June 2020

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) (England) 2015
(as amended) Schedule 2, Part 16**

Application No: 126785/TEL/2020

Prior approval application for telecommunications installation of monopole with antennae and wraparound equipment cabinet base (maximum height 20m) including associated equipment cabinets and ancillary works at Store Street, Manchester, M1 2WD,

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:

Reason 1 - The proposed telecommunications monopole, by reason of its height, siting, design and appearance, would form an unacceptable, incongruous and dominant feature within the streetscene that would be particularly prominent from a range of short and long range views 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 the character and appearance of the area, and regeneration efforts and improvements to the environment taking place within the area, and as a consequence would have a detrimental impact on the overall quality of the City Centre. Opportunities to minimise these identified impacts have not been robustly evidenced to a satisfactory degree. For these reasons, the proposed installation would be contrary to guidance within the revised 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.

Reason 2 - The proposed telecommunications monopole, by reason of its height, siting, design and appearance, would adversely affect the setting of nearby heritage asset, specifically the Grade II* Store Street Aqueduct. 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 revised 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) and DC19.1 (Listed Buildings) of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester.

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 Store 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 street bench, bin and street trees in the immediate area. 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.

Reason 4 - The proposed telecommunications monopole, by reason of its siting, could adversely impact amenity within the area due to the potential of 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. As such the siting of the proposal could lead to disamenity to those occupying and working within nearby existing buildings, and also at land directly south of the proposal site which is currently being considered for a significant residential development. 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.

Should you wish to discuss this matter any further please contact Christopher Smith.

Yours faithfully,



Julie Roscoe
Director of Planning, Building Control & Licensing