

Our reference: COM119705799

Application number: 2019/1219

Application address: Bridge Road (southwest of junction with Arnison Road) East Molesey
Surrey KT8 9HY

Name: Mr Sowry

Address: 1 Boleyn Court, Bridge Road, East Molesey, Surrey, KT8 9HY

Comment type: You object to the planning application

Date of comment: 19 May 2019

Comment: We strongly object to the proposed plans for a 15m high monopole and “ancillary development”.

The scope of the voluntary consultation was extraordinarily limited. The council also received plans which the residents did not, the rationale for this was “this was ecologically unsound but copies were available on request” – this was not mentioned on our letter. Strong objections were raised but the planning application has now been submitted with no changes. Therefore I can only conclude that the voluntary consultation was just lip service. Many of the individuals objecting to the proposal did not even get a response.

There is no screening for the residents of Boleyn Court. The pole is considerably higher than the surrounding trees and the additional proposed cabinets are much larger / taller than the 2 already on this piece of land (which are also placed further away from the flats and with greater screening as they are behind established bushes. This infrastructure would dominate this small area of land. The plans show trees in full bloom which of course is not the case year round. This installation is proposed directly on the border of our property and we only have a 7 brick-high wall.

The monopole will directly overlook our garden which is used by the residents. This will lead to a loss of privacy and peaceful enjoyment of our property. This will especially be the case during servicing / repairs of the infrastructure which will be continuous. We have spoken to the current tenants on the land next to the existing infrastructure and they confirmed disruption from maintenance.

The pole itself is also an eyesore and a blight on the landscape. The proposed position is right between 2 conservation zones in the middle of a residential area and opposite a listed building (Kingfisher Court). Why have there not been proposals to camouflage the mast? I have seen masts which look like trees, for example.

The current base station is on commercial property and is not next to residential homes. Due to redevelopment plans the new developers have essentially pushed this unsightly mast from its current location away from newly proposed residential buildings to existing ones which is not acceptable. Any plans on the old site should be able to accommodate this existing infrastructure. There will be alternative sites in the local area where there is limited visual impact to residents and the station will not affect the townscape. There is ample space for example on the Nielson recreation ground, or the land between the river Ember and Mole which would not blight the townscape and this site does not appear to have been considered. A search area is referenced many times but I cannot see what this area is. Please can you confirm?

The planning statement mentions many possible locations but dismissed each. Listing 19 potential sites gives the impression that significant resource has gone into scoping out considerate solutions but if you look at the proposed sites, most are obviously unsuitable (even from having no knowledge of requirements). For example, 8 of the 19 sites were dismissed due to buildings being

too low / roof pitch (not enough space). I am unconvinced how much resource has gone in to finding a suitable site. A lot of possible sites were non-starters. I.e. the pavement is not wide enough.

There are already existing poles and cabinets very close to the current site on the pavement on the A309 (Hampton Court Way). Indeed a 15 foot monopole and cabinets have just been erected within about 25m of the existing site! The planning confirms a trial dig identified the presence of underground services not shown on the utilities map obtained, which prevent the build. I am sure this could be accommodated but perhaps costs more. Additionally the road is long and there is ample space along it on both sides. I find it hard to believe the infrastructure cannot be accommodated here. This is as mentioned "visually appropriate and has sufficient space", and there is already mobile phone infrastructure in place so it must be feasible and would not affect local residents.

Please ensure that other sites are considered fully and the planning is rejected to the significant concerns raised by the local residents.