

## Comms Mast 135908/TEL/2023

Ray Routledge <ringorrrj@outlook.com>

Wed 2023-02-08 9:07 PM

To: Adam Mitchell <Adam.Mitchell@manchester.gov.uk>; 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 ringorrrj@outlook.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

I object most strongly to the siting of this 50 feet tall mast at the junction of Cranmer Rd and Fog Lane, for the following reasons:

**1. The intrusion into a wholly residential area.** Of the many masts in the surrounding area, this would be the only one (as far as I can see) which is wholly in a residential area. The existing masts are mainly on wide verges along major through roads/ dual carriageways, at junctions on such roads or on the edges of sports fields or other recreational areas, and commercial sites e.g. garages. They are often 'disguised' among trees and all well away from individual homes.

**2. The significant loss of residential amenity.** The local street scene would be severely compromised. The mast as proposed will be twice the height of, and will tower over, neighbouring homes. It would be the dominant feature at the road junction, seen against the sky from all directions. There are no trees or other structures tall enough to soften the background.

The impact on No.15 Fog Lane would be appalling. But for the thickness of a boundary wall the mast would be in the garden of this house and is positioned little more than a few feet from the backdoor. It is hard to believe that any one would seriously suggest putting such a mast so close to anyone's home.

The **three cabinets associated with the mast** are much taller (virtually hedge height) and deeper than the existing cabinets to which we have all become inured. The whole site will look cluttered and take on an industrial look which will attract the usual graffiti.

The mast and cabinets will **further impair the resident and visitor use of the pavement**. The pavement is not really any wider than most others in the area and has already been 'pinched' by 'cabinet creep' over the years. The narrowing is much worse at times because of visiting engineers, their parked vans and shelters over inspection chambers. Pedestrians are already displaced into the road at times. This will only get worse. More cabinets, more engineers, more vans etc. The new cabinets by virtue of being deeper and angled round the boundary wall will encroach further into the pedestrian area. **This junction has already become unsafe** because of parking issues and the poorly designed right turn pocket on Fog Lane.

**3. The case for an additional mast at this site has not been adequately explained.** It has not been possible to see the Council's map of existing masts in the area. A personal survey revealed 28 masts in the 2-3 square miles bounded by Wilbraham Rd/Mosley Rd, the Princess Parkway, Kingsway and Barlow Moor Rd/Wilmslow Rd to Parrswood. Outside this area there is a distinct paucity of masts by comparison. Why so many masts in the area? Many masts are in clusters suggesting competition between service providers rather than mast sharing which is the first choice according the guidance. Why do other service providers not have similar holes in their coverage area.

**4. Alternative sites for the mast seem to have been dismissed too readily or not considered at all.** Some sites have been considered too residential with pavements which are too narrow. They are no more residential than Cranmer Rd/Fog Lane junction. There are already **five** masts on Fog Lane/Lapwing Lane (junctions with Kingsway & Palatine Rd) and **one** on School Lane at the entrance to Didsbury Tram Station. The latter seems ideally placed to be shared whilst meeting CK Hutchison's target area for improved coverage. Commercial sites around Aldi and the wider District Centre have seemingly not been considered, nor has the fringes of Fog Lane Park.

**4. This prior approval application refers repeatedly to ministerial guidance and contains numerous reminders to the Planning Authority of their responsibilities in this regard.** CK Hutchison seem to be trying to force through the Cranmer Rd/Fog Lane site as their preferred option, ignoring issues of

mast sharing and local amenity. Presumably the proposed site is more straightforward for CK Hutchison because of existing infrastructure in the area and therefore cheaper.

**I urge the Council Planners to reject this application as it stands and work with CK Hutchison to find a more suitable non-residential location for pre-application approval which addresses the provider's service requirements whilst minimising damage to the local amenity.**

Ray Routledge 12 Cranmer Road M20 6AW