

**Our reference:** COM119886517

**Application number:** 2019/1219

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

**Name:** Mr Dand

**Address:** 7 Boleyn Court, Bridge Road, East Molesey, Surrey, KT8 9HY

**Comment type:** You object to the planning application

**Date of comment:** 20 May 2019

**Comment:** I wish to formally register my objection to the proposed communications base station and mast in the strongest possible terms. I believe the site to be inappropriate for the following reasons:

1. Alternative sites have not been investigated fully. I note a number of sites have been listed, but they appear to be 'column fodder' to me. For example, Hampton Court Way was identified as being suitable being both visually appropriate and where sufficient space to accommodate the equipment was found, a combination not observed elsewhere! However, a trial dig found utilities not shown on the utilities map. Hampton Court Way is a long stretch of road, and I fail to believe that a single trial dig should discount the whole of the road. Can another trial dig not take place further along the road – given that it is such a suitable location? With the error in the utility map does that also mean there may be other sites not considered through desktop research as the utility map shows there to be utilities, but we know that utility map to be erroneous?
2. Building on this, I cannot see many (if any) commercial properties that have been considered for the proposed base station and base. The current base station is on commercial property and is not next to residential homes. There must be commercial properties within the required area that could be considered.
3. The pole itself is also an eyesore and stands out. The mocked-up photos of what it may look like are massively trying to paint a rosier picture than reality would be. For example, the photos show the neighbouring trees in full bloom and covered with leaves. Clearly in the winter months this would not be the case and it would stand out like the eyesore it is. There was also not a proposed photo of how it would look from Boleyn Court – which is the nearest property to it. My lounge is on the first floor and my bedroom is on the second floor – and would be staring right at the mast. The photos in the applications try to paint the proposed mast in much more favourable light than it would be in reality.
4. Breach of Elmbridge Development Plan. The “Elmbridge Development Plan 2015 DM16 Telecommunications ” states that: “Installations should avoid sensitive local areas including conservation areas and listed buildings, Green Belt, sites of nature conservation importance, sites of special scientific interest, Local Green Space, strategic views and landmarks and the Thames Policy Area unless there is evidence that this is technically impractical.” The area for the proposed mast is allocated as an area of high archaeological potential ([http://emaps.elmbridge.gov.uk/ebc\\_simple.aspx?requesttype=parseTemplate&template=PlanningPolicy.templt](http://emaps.elmbridge.gov.uk/ebc_simple.aspx?requesttype=parseTemplate&template=PlanningPolicy.templt)) - which is clearly in breach of the Elmbridge Development plan.

I trust that you will reject the application for the reasons I've given above, and that the applicant should seek alternative sites.