

Mobile Mast Application 135908/TEL/2023

J FERNS <jon.fern@btinternet.com>

Wed 2023-02-08 4:24 PM

To: Adam Mitchell <Adam.Mitchell@manchester.gov.uk>

Cc: bcoombe@mcrlibdems.uk <bcoombe@mcrlibdems.uk>; John Leech <cllr.john.leech@manchester.gov.uk>

Some people who received this message don't often get email from jon.fern@btinternet.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Calibri;mso-bidi-theme-font:minor-latin;mso-fareast-language:EN-GB">

Dear Mr Mitchell,

I wish to record my objection to the siting of a proposed 15 metre Mobile Mast at the junction of Fog Lane and Cranmer Road.

The grounds are that this is a wholly inappropriate location for such a mast, being in an exclusively residential place. I would like to know what the grounds are for choosing this location and discounting other places which are non-residential.

Please inform me of the following:

- The area in which you have considered siting this mast.
- Why locations such as the various car parks in the vicinity were rejected - car parks in Didsbury Village and the Christie Car park on Wilmslow Road are all close by and are in different directions from the proposed location (offering choice).
- Other possible locations that spring to mind are:

the new Christie Building - already an eyesore.

the old telecoms building between Mayville Drive and the Circuit, another comparative eyesore.

within Fog Lane Park, where there is a depot area already.

- The above are all "off the top of my head" alternatives and I find it extremely difficult to accept that the proposed location is "optimal". I wonder whether in some way it is just convenient. There was no real attempt to consult locally and set out the case for the location.

- If only a wholly residential area had to be chosen why was the proposed location chosen? There must be some objective measure for signal strength, range or coverage. Did the proposed location deliver maximum values for these?

I am not a NIMBY and would accept (for the greater good) a location decision backed by a fully transparent process with the case made for the decision set out clearly, including the reason why more obvious locations have been rejected. I would like to think that your decision was made on objectively justifiable grounds, in which case why is this not fully shared in a timely way ahead of any final decision being made.

Regards

Jon Ferns