

Application Number	21/01386/PRI16A	Agenda Item	
Date Received	25th March 2021	Officer	Charlotte Peet
Target Date	19th May 2021		
Ward	Queen Ediths		
Site	Wulfstan Way Cambridge		
Proposal	Installation of 15m Phase 8 Monopole C/W wrapround Cabinet at base and associated ancillary works.		
Applicant	Hutchison UK Ltd Star House 20 Grenfell Road Maidenhead SL6 1EH		

SUMMARY	<p>The development does not accord with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The siting and appearance of the proposal would be considered to result in significant visual harm to the character and appearance of the area and would harm the amenity of the Protected Open Space. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information has been provided in regard to the impact upon highway safety and therefore due to the close proximity to the pedestrian crossing the proposal would be unacceptable.
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

1.1 The site comprises a small grassed area adjacent to the public highway that is located close to an existing bus stop and shelter. The site is located adjacent to an area of green, open space with a collection of retail units beyond. The area is characterised by a mix of residential, retail and other uses, with the Queen Edith Medical Practice and Chapel in close proximity.

1.2 The site sits within the designated Wulfstan Way Neighbourhood Centre and is adjacent to an area of Protected Open Space. The proposal site is located outside the Conservation Area and the controlled parking zone.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

2.1 The application seeks prior approval for the installation of a 15m high Phase 8 Monopole combined with a wraparound Cabinet at the base and associated ancillary works.

2.2 The application originally proposed an 18 metre high mast but has been amended during the course of the application to reduce the height of the mast to 15 metres.

2.3 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:

1. Drawings
2. ICNIRP certificate
3. Supplementary information

3.0 SITE HISTORY

None relevant

4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1 Advertisement:	No
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	No

5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2018 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Plan 2018	Local 1 35 55 56 57 59 60 65 67 71 81 82 84

5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework 2021 National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance from 3 March 2014 onwards Circular 11/95 (Annex A)
Supplementary Planning Documents	Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction 2020
Material Considerations	Cambridge City Council Open Space and Recreation Strategy (2011)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Highways Development Management)

As submitted

- 6.1 The Highway Authority requests that the application be refused on the grounds of highway safety for the following reasons:

The nature of the wide based mast means that the visibility of a driver approaching the existing zebra crossing is obscured at a height where a child could be when also approaching the crossing. This has the potential to put very vulnerable highway users at increased risk.

The proposed location is alongside the controlled (zig-zag) area of the crossing. This will lead to an increased potential for maintenance vehicles to stop within this zone and thus reduce visibility towards the zebra crossing, once again increasing the risks for vulnerable highway users when crossing the carriageway.

The above request may be overcome if the proposed installation is moved away from the zebra crossing.

As Amended

- 6.2 Unfortunately the original layout plans have been removed from the Planning Authority's website.

Thus it is not possible to compare the changes made to drawing number CAM16004_M003 Rev A (submitted with the original application) and Rev B dated 14th May 2021, where a visibility splay was added, this does not appear on Rev C dated 18th June 2021 when the tower height was reduced.

Under these circumstances the Highway Authority has no alternative other than to maintain its request that the application be refused.

Environmental Health

- 6.3 The development proposed is acceptable.

Airport Safeguarding

- 6.4 The proposed development has been examined from an aerodrome safeguarding perspective and does not conflict with safeguarding criteria. We, therefore, have no objection to this proposal.

Defence Infrastructure

As Submitted

- 6.5 The application site falls within the Ministry of Defence's Statutory Safeguarding Technical Zone surrounding Cambridge Airport. The MOD has no safeguarding objections to this proposal.

As Amended

- 6.6 The MOD has no safeguarding objections to this proposal.

Marshalls Airport

- 6.7 No comments received.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

As Submitted

- 7.1 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

Objections

- 4 Gunhild Way, Cambridge
- 15 Strangeways Road, Cambridge
- Flat 7 Park House, 40 Queen Edith's Way, Cambridge
- 25 Glebe Road, Cambridge
- 31 Godwin Close, Cambridge
- Flat 6, Editha House, 33 Queen Ediths Way, Cambridge
- 50 Perne Road, Cambridge
- 53 Almoners Avenue, Cambridge
- 57 Almoners Avenue, Cambridge
- 59 Mowbray Road, Cambridge
- 68 Netherhall Way, Cambridge
- 76 Queen Ediths Way, Cambridge
- 91 Netherhall Way, Cambridge
- 107 Perne Road, Cambridge
- Flat 25 Dunstan Court Wulfstan Way, Cambridge
- 39 Wulfstan Way, Cambridge
- 41 Wulfstan Way, Cambridge
- 126 Wulfstan Way, Cambridge
- 174 Wulfstan Way, Cambridge

- 40 Wulfstan Court, Cambridge
- 179 Walpole Road, Cambridge
- 301 Hills Road Cambridge 21 Bowers Croft, Cambridge
- Queen Edith Primary School

Support

- 16 Long Road, Cambridge

7.2 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Objections

- Detriment to the vitality and amenity of the Neighbourhood Centre
- Out of place due to height, scale, size, form and design
- Harm to open character due to the addition of cluttered equipment
- Harm to the function of the open green space
- Health risks due to radiation and pollution
- Health risks due to proximity to community facilities such as school and doctors' surgery
- Proximity to existing telecommunication equipment
- Sufficient coverage for telecommunications in area
- Loss of light to surrounding residential properties
- Loss of amenity to surrounding residential properties
- Harm to pedestrian traffic route
- Harm to highway safety is regard to visibility at the crossing
- Harm to the planet through additional mobile phone use

Support

- Support due to poor telecommunication infrastructure

7.3 Cllr Page-Croft called the item into Planning Committee for the following reasons:

- The proposal would be installed in the centre of the shopping area
- It would be located next to the bus shelter and zebra crossing which is regularly used by elderly residents and children who will struggle to see traffic.
- The area is a lovely green space that is used by families especially in the summer, sitting under the trees enjoying food bought locally.

- The site is surrounded by residential properties including flats above the shops, as well as a pub, a church and a chapel a few metres from the site.
- To ruin a lovely area like the shopping area at Wulfstan Way is not an idea I can support, I would appreciate if this was to go to committee, and I do realise that I will not be able to vote if I am to be a member of the planning committee.

As Amended

7.4 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

- 2b Cavendish Avenue, Cambridge
- 40 Dunstan Court, Wulfstan Way
- 107 Perne Road, Cambridge
- Flat 7, Park House, 40 Queen Ediths Way, Cambridge
- 174 Wulfstan Way, Cambridge

7.5 The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Harm to open character and amenity of the area
- Out of place due to siting and height
- Health risks due to radiation and pollution
- Adverse impact upon highway safety due to cabinetry and equipment
- Proximity to existing telecommunication equipment
- Sufficient coverage for telecommunications in area

7.6 Cllr Page-Croft has the following comments:

- I really appreciate that the size of the mast has been lowered. I am still not convinced that the boxes need to go on the piece of grass in between the bus stop and the zebra crossing. I understand that these poles need to be built, but please come and have a look at how close it is to the primary school and sheltered accommodation, the crossing in use quite a lot of the time, by older people and young.
- Buses stop every 20-30 minutes and if maintenance vans have to park it will make visibility poor for buses and people.

7.7 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received the main issues are as follows:

- Considerations of Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)
- Principle of Development
- Context of Site, Design and External Spaces
- Residential Amenity
- Highway Safety

Considerations of Class A, Part 16

8.2 Under this section of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 masts of this type under 25 metres are permitted on unprotected land subject to consideration by the Local Authority as to whether prior approval would be required in regard to the siting and appearance of the proposed development. In this case, the proposal is under 25 metres and so would meet the criteria listed. It is therefore necessary to consider whether prior approval is required for the siting and appearance of the development.

Principle of Development

8.3 The information accompanying the application explains why UK H3G (Three) network require a new site. The new site is required as the frequencies used for 5G do not travel as far as those frequencies currently in use. For this reason and given the different requirements of the equipment and antennas not all existing sites can be upgraded.

8.4 The National Planning Policy Framework supports high quality communication infrastructure. Policy 84, Telecommunications, of the 2018 Local Plan also states that telecommunications development will be permitted providing:

- Visual impact is minimised through design and location
- Evidence is submitted of compliance with national guidance.
- Evidence is provided regarding the purpose and need for the proposed development
- Evidence is provided to demonstrate alternative sites have been considered, including the use of existing buildings and masts.

8.5 The development meets the criteria of Part 16 and it is therefore necessary to consider whether prior approval is required for the siting and appearance of the development.

Context of Site, Design and External Spaces, Impact upon the Protected Open Space and Neighbourhood Centre

8.6 The proposed monopole, cabinetry and equipment would be situated on a grass verge between the footpath and the highway. Beyond the footpath is an area of grassed open space which contains several mature trees, this area is designated as an area of Protected Open Space due to its amenity function and several representations have been received reiterating the importance of this space in terms of amenity and character of the area. In addition, this area and the retail units to the west of the site comprise an integral part of the designated Neighborhood Centre. Similarly, several representations have been received with concerns about the impact upon the vitality and amenity of this area

8.7 As existing, this section of Wulfstan Way makes a significant contribution in terms of character of the area by virtue of its green and open nature. There is a minimal amount of street furniture at the front of the site to serve the bus stop and zebra crossing, however attractive views remain into and across the site. The existing lampposts are slim and do not dominate the site. A significant number of representations have been received about the impact to the character of the area due to the height, scale, size, form and design of the proposed monopole and cabinetry.

8.8 As amended, the proposal would contain a 15 metre monopole with a width of 0.4 metres, and the addition of 3no. cabinets. The proposed monopole would be 7 metres taller than the existing lampposts, and have a significantly greater girth, and

would be similar to the height of the mature trees in the protected green space. The monopole would result in significant detriment to the character of Wulfstan Way through the creation of a bulky, visually intrusive built form. It would be substantially taller than the surrounding street furniture and buildings and appear completely incongruous. The proposal would be viewed against the existing green space and would result in concealment of this good quality open space, especially at street level with the wrap around cabinet and associated equipment. Given the siting of the proposal set forward from the existing trees and building line and in the centre of the Wulfstan Way Neighbourhood Centre, in front of the existing open space it would appear especially prominent from multiple views as to result in detriment to the character of the area.

- 8.9 The monopole and associated cabinetry would result in significant visual pollution and a cluttered appearance due to the addition of unattractive street furniture in an area which is reasonably clear and open at present. The form and design of the cabinets compounds this. The agent has suggested that the pole could be painted green or brown to appear closer to the appearance of the trees, however this would do little to disguise the excessive height and bulk of the proposed monopole and equipment. Therefore, the proposal is considered to result in a detrimental impact to the character and appearance of the locality and the Protected Open Space.
- 8.10 Officers note that the proposal is intended to improve the telecommunications services in this area, however the adverse impacts that would result to the amenity of this area would be significant and is not outweighed by the need for this infrastructure. The proposal would result in adverse impacts to the character and appearance of the area and its visual amenity.
- 8.11 The proposal would fail to comply with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 55, 56, 57, 65, 67, and 84.

Residential Amenity

Impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 8.12 Health concerns can be a material consideration and several representations have been received raising concerns about this

matter given the close proximity to facilities and services such as the school, doctors, church and residential properties close by. In this case, the application includes an ICNIRP declaration confirming that the development, when operational, would not exceed the International Commission on non-ionising radiation protection guidelines. The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 118 advises that in these circumstances it should not be necessary to consider further the health aspects and concerns about them.

- 8.13 The representations received have raised additional concerns about the impact upon the residential occupiers in the dwellings and other accommodation close to the site in terms of loss of light, however the proposal would be sited approximately 20 metres from the closest residential unit and therefore in terms of loss of light would not result in a significant adverse impact.
- 8.14 The proposal adequately respects the residential amenity of its neighbours and the constraints of the site and is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2018) policies 58 and 35.

Highway Safety

- 8.15 As submitted, the Highways Authority raised significant concerns and recommend the application be refused due to the adverse impact to highway safety. A number of concerns have also been raised within the representations received due to the close proximity to the zebra crossing. In response, the plan showing vehicular visibility splays was submitted, however the equipment was not moved away from the crossing as requested in the comments of the initial comments of the Highways Authority.
- 8.16 The Highways Authority viewed the visibility splays submitted, however did not change their position as the visibility splay drawing corresponded with the monopole as submitted rather than amended. The proposed equipment and cabinetry have the potential to result in reduced visibility to the pedestrian crossing for vehicle users and could therefore endanger pedestrian and cycle users who are the most vulnerable highways users. Given that the area is set within a Neighbourhood Centre with many services intended to meet the day-to-day needs of local users, this risk could be substantial. Given the remaining objection from the Highways Authority

and the close proximity to the pedestrian crossing, it is considered that insufficient information has been given to justify that harm would not be caused to highway safety.

8.17 Therefore, the proposal would fail to comply with Cambridge Local Plan policy 81.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 In conclusion the proposal would be considered to result in significant visual harm to the character and appearance of the area by virtue of its siting, height, scale and appearance and would harm the amenity of the Protected Open Space. Insufficient information has been provided in regard to the impact upon highway safety and therefore due to the close proximity to the pedestrian crossing the proposal would be unacceptable.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The proposal, by virtue of its excessive height and bulk and its siting, form and design would result in a dominant and incongruous built form which would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, including to the Protected Open Space. The proposal would appear extremely dominant and obscure the green and open character which is integral to this section of Wulfstan Way. The proposal has therefore failed to respond positively to its context in terms of its siting, scale and design and the visual impact and harm to the character of the area has not been justified or minimised through careful siting, scale and design. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies 55, 56, 57, 65, 67 and 84 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.
2. The proposed monopole and cabinetry would be sited adjacent to the highway and extremely close to a zebra crossing for pedestrian users. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in harm to the vulnerable users of this crossing, which located within the Neighbourhood Centre. As such, the development is contrary to policy 81 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.