

## Appeal/objection to telephone mast Fog Lane/Cranmer Road

Caroline Steiner <csteiner1808@gmail.com>

Thu 2023-02-02 9:07 PM

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

Cc: Andrew Simcock <cllr.andrew.simcock@manchester.gov.uk>; Linda Foley <cllr.linda.foley@manchester.gov.uk>; James Wilson <cllr.james.wilson@manchester.gov.uk>

Some people who received this message don't often get email from csteiner1808@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mr Mitchell,

I am writing to lodge my strong objection to the proposal to erect a telephone mast on Fog Lane/Cranmer Road.

I live at number 18 Fog Lane, so am only too aware of the impact this may have on what is an entirely residential area. I understand that Manchester City Council is under an obligation to give first consideration to commercial sites for such a development and that there have to be compelling grounds for these to be rejected in favour of a fully residential location. In this connection, I am unclear why locations near the tram stops or Aldi have not been chosen. I am led to believe that these have not even been considered? Is this the case?

I understand that the mast is needed to improve mobile phone coverage in the area - which I fully support. However, I have seen a map of the area for which coverage is needed and I remain puzzled as to why Fog Lane/Cranmer Road is even being considered. It is half a mile away from what I understand to be the surveyor's ideal location and right at the edge of the coverage gap. Accordingly, its efficacy in improving coverage would seem to be pretty limited - and certainly not sufficient to justify the negative environmental impact on our hitherto very attractive and desirable residential community. There must be a host of more centrally placed locations which are more fit for purpose. Why have they been ruled out? It cannot be because they are residential - since so is this! What, then, can possibly be the justification for the proposed location on Fog Lane?

In the light of the above, I would like my strong objection to this development to be taken into account in the next stage of the planning process.

Yours,  
Caroline Steiner