

7 Boleyn Court
Bridge Road
East Molesey
Surrey
KT8 9HY

28th February 2020

Dear Sir or Madam,

Appeal Reference: APP/K3605/W/19/3243927
(Planning Reference: 2019/1219) Appeal for installation of a 15m high monopole incorporating shrouded antenna and supporting 2no. external dishes and ancillary development at Bridge Road KT8 9HY (southwest of junction with Arnison Road)

This letter is written on behalf of the 12 flats that form Boleyn Court. The proposed mast and telecom boxes would be located on land right outside our block of flats and the mast would be directly in the line of sight of the 12 flats who have their lounges facing Arnison Road and Bridge Road.

We were hoping that when the decision was taken to reject the application for the mast and boxes in late June 2019 that would be the end of this, but we are disappointed and frustrated with the appeal that Waldon Telecom have made. It would appear that their appeal is based on three main drivers:

1. Due process was not followed by the Local Authority.
2. The mast and boxes would not result in any unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the street scene.
3. The benefits of this communications infrastructure and the digital connectivity it provided outweighed the impact on the street scene.

We would like to take each of these points in turn:

1. ***Due process was not followed by the Local Authority:*** We do not claim to be experts in the process that should be followed and cannot comment on whether the correct process was followed – but a process was certainly followed by the Local Authority that clearly involved us, those most impacted by the proposed mast and boxes, and in so doing it became blatantly clear that the proposed installation would adversely impact the character and appearance of the street scene, that it is overwhelmingly opposed by local residents and alternative sites (including the current site) have not been sufficiently investigated. We will expand on those points in the following paragraphs:
2. ***The mast and boxes would not result in an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the street scene.*** We strongly dispute this, and we do not believe that Waldon demonstrated that in their initial planning application. The proposed pole is considerably higher than the surrounding trees and the additional proposed cabinets are much larger / taller than the two 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 original Waldon plans show trees in full bloom which of course is not the case all year-round. This installation is proposed directly on the border of our property and we only have a 7 brick-high wall. It is clear that the residents of the area (who would be the ones living with this new infrastructure literally on their doorstep and in clear view out of their lounge windows) do not believe that mast and boxes would result in an acceptable impact on the character & appearance of the street scene – there were 58 objections to the proposal and only 2 in favour. Not only do the local residents think this would be a monstrosity (with a ratio of 24 against for every one for). It is also clear, from the original decision, that the Elmbridge Borough Council also think it would be massively detrimental to the landscape.
3. ***The benefits of this communications infrastructure & digital connectivity it provides outweigh the impact on the street scene.*** We do not dispute that digital connectivity is a

good thing but in the objections we raised we suggested alternatives, that we do not believe have fully investigated and we would suggest Waldon would have been better pursuing those than proposing (and then appealing) putting the infrastructure right in the middle of a densely populated residential area. The current infrastructure that is being used is on a commercial site on Summer Road (base station 98405.) The current site is proposed for a luxury flat development as detailed here: <https://www.hamptoncourtestatedevelopment.co.uk/>. This proposed development has been recently rejected by Elmbridge Borough Council, <http://edocs.elmbridge.gov.uk/IAM/IAMCache/3551365/3551365.pdf>. We would therefore suggest that the existing infrastructure could not stay within its current site and the retaining of it made a condition of any appeal or new proposed redevelopment of Unit 1 and 2 Hampton Court Estate. It would appear that the new developers have been proposing to push this unsightly mast from its current location away from their newly proposed residential buildings to existing ones which is not acceptable, and it is pleasing to see that Elmbridge have rejected their planning application. In addition, the original proposal from Waldon mentioned many possible locations but dismissed each. Listing 19 potential sites gives the impression that significant resource has gone into scoping out considerate solutions but looking at the proposed sites, most are obviously unsuitable. For example, 8 of the 19 sites were dismissed due to buildings being too low / roof pitch (not enough space). We are 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. However, it should be noted 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 prevented the build. We are sure this could be accommodated but perhaps costs more. Additionally, the road is long and there is ample space along it on both sides. We 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 residents.

As you can see, we strongly object to the appeal that Waldon have made and stand by all our original objections to it. We urge you to reject their appeal for the reasons given above.

Kind regards

James Dand on behalf of Boleyn Court Residents Association.