

Resident objection - ref 135908/TEL/2023. Mast proposal: to be located at corner of Fog Lane and Cranmer Road

Caroline Gee <carolinegeeathome@hotmail.com>

Tue 2023-02-07 12:28 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 carolinegeeathome@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Adam

I am writing to object to the above referenced planning application.

I am a resident of Cranmer Road.

The proposal to place a mast at Cranmer Road/Fog Lane, is **inappropriate** and is **fundamentally flawed** as:

- The Cranmer Road/Fog Lane location is not in the developers ideal/desired location
- Cranmer Road is not "close by" to the ideal location
- Cranmer Road is half a mile from the desired location
- Cranmer Road is at the extreme norther edge of the coverage hole
- The incremental coverage that a mast at Cranmer Road will generate is absolutely minimal
- The mast is therefore sub-optimally located
- Cranmer Road is a residential area.
- The mast will not be in a commercial area, despite there being available commercial locations in the zone
- Alternative locations are available (in commercial zones) that will provide better coverage
- Far more appropriate locations exist, closer to the ideal location and with a more commercial focus (e.g. multiple options closer to Didsbury Village)
- A mast placement on top of a taller building has not been considered
- The developers' proposals do not document the appearance and confirm the mast is under 15 meters
- MCC will be deleterious in allowing the mast to be placed in Cranmer Road/Fog Lane
- MCC will be negligent in allowing a mast in a residential area when there are better and more suitable commercial locations

I object to the proposal to place the mast on Cranmer Road as:

- The location is **FUNDAMENTALLY FLAWED** for the reasons stated above.
- In this location the mast is **INAPPROPRIATE** as it does improve the coverage across the entire hole.
- The review process has **FAILED** to consider alternative better locations

At any one of the other available commercial locations in the zone, the mast would meet its objectives.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email.

Kind regards

Caroline Gee