



## **Appendix 3 – Post Application Correspondence**

### **Correspondence received from the Wrexham County Borough Council**

#### **WRX24987 – Stockwell Grove Street Work Appeal**

- Copy of Officers Report refusing application

| Application No. | Application Type       | Date Valid | Expiry Date | Extension of Time Date |
|-----------------|------------------------|------------|-------------|------------------------|
| P/2023/0002     | Telecom Prior Approval | 06/01/2023 | 03/03/2023  |                        |

| Applicant                                                                                                                              | Agent Name and Address                                                              |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| GALLIVAN CK HUTCHINSON NETWORKS (UK) LTD<br>450 LONGWATER AVENUE<br>RG2 6GF                                                            | DOT SURVEYING LTD<br>MR TOM GALLIVAN<br>14 INVERLEITH PLACE<br>EDINBURGH<br>EH3 5PZ |
| Description of Development                                                                                                             | Location of Development                                                             |
| GOSOD POLYN TELEGYFATHREBU 17 METR O UCHDER A CHABINET OFFER / INSTALLATION OF 17M HIGH TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLE AND EQUIPMENT CABINETS | LAND AT THE CORNER OF PERCY ROAD AND STOCKWELL GROVE WREXHAM<br>LL13 7HJ            |

| Relevant History |  |
|------------------|--|
|------------------|--|

| Constraints                          | Applicable | Acceptable | Not Acceptable |
|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| Outside settlement                   |            |            |                |
| Inside settlement                    | x          |            | x              |
| Conservation Area                    |            |            |                |
| Listed Building/ setting             |            |            |                |
| Green Barrier                        |            |            |                |
| Special Landscape Area               |            |            |                |
| Flood Risk                           |            |            |                |
| Within Buffer Zone or affecting SAC* |            |            |                |
| World Heritage Site                  |            |            |                |
| AONB                                 |            |            |                |
| Phosphates                           |            |            |                |
| Other                                |            |            |                |

| Key Issues          | Acceptable | Not acceptable | Observations Below | N/A |
|---------------------|------------|----------------|--------------------|-----|
| Residential Amenity |            |                |                    |     |

|                 |  |   |  |  |
|-----------------|--|---|--|--|
| Design          |  | x |  |  |
| Highway safety  |  |   |  |  |
| Parking         |  |   |  |  |
| Conservation/LB |  |   |  |  |
| Ecology         |  |   |  |  |
| Trees           |  |   |  |  |
| Other           |  |   |  |  |

### KEY PLANS AND PHOTOGRAPHS (All plans and photos on Civica file)

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| None – see Civica for details |  |
| Yes – see below               |  |

### APPLICANTS SUPPORTING STATEMENT

| CONSULTATION RESPONSES  | Consulted | Supports | Comments | Objects | No objection/<br>no comments | No response |
|-------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|---------|------------------------------|-------------|
| Community Council       | x         |          |          |         | x                            |             |
| Local member(s)         | x         | x        |          | x       |                              |             |
| Highways                | x         |          |          |         | x                            |             |
| Public Protection       | x         |          |          |         | x                            |             |
| Natural Resources Wales |           |          |          |         |                              |             |
| Welsh Water             |           |          |          |         |                              |             |
| Other                   |           |          |          |         |                              |             |
| Neighbours              | x         | x        |          | x       |                              |             |

### KEY COMMENTS MADE IF APPLICABLE

**Community Council:** No Objections

**Local Member:** Cllr Graham Rogers objects to the proposal and notes that he advised the applicant of his preferred option being Howards Fields.

Cllr Paul Roberts is supportive of the application.

**Neighbours:** 24 letter of objection have been received from neighbouring properties in relation to a range of concerns including; impacts on health, visual amenity, highway safety and concerns about the level of neighbour notification.

10 letters of support have been received from neighbouring properties in relation to a range of concerns including; improved signal and improved house value due to improved signal.

## **OFFICERS ASSESSMENT**

**Policy:** National guidance on telecommunication development in Wales is contained in Planning Policy Wales 11 (and Technical Guidance Advice Note (TAN) 19: Telecommunications).

PPW11 (paragraphs 3.61 and 5.2.1) confirms that adequate and efficient infrastructure, including telecommunications is crucial for economic, social and environmental stability. Fast and reliable telecommunications are essential to meet the needs of businesses and to allow people to access digital services or to work. This is particularly so given a general increase in home working. Delivering fast and reliable telecommunications requires appropriate infrastructure, including masts and antennae to be provided. Whilst the planning system is encouraged to support telecommunications infrastructure where it is required, PPW11 (para 5.2.5-5.2.6) and TAN19 (para 56) recognises the impact visually sensitive locations must also be considered.

Wrexham UDP Policy CLF8 allows for the development of telecommunications facilities subject to an appraisal has been carried out that:

- a) Firstly, of the potential for sharing other masts and sites; if there is no potential;
- b) Secondly, of the potential to use existing buildings and structures; if there is no potential;
- c) Thirdly, of the potential to use other sites.

The policy requires the siting of telecommunications development to minimise the impact on the townscape/landscape.

Policy GDP1 is also applicable to the proposals.

**Site selection:** The mast is required to provide 5G coverage in the areas surrounding Stockwell Grove and Percy Road.

The submitted details confirm that four alternative sites have been considered and discounted on the grounds there would be an impact upon highway safety, unsuitable pavements, proximity to education establishments and residential character of the area. The details submitted confirm that sufficient consideration to alternative sites has been given and that there are no acceptable alternatives to the proposed site currently exists.

**Health effects:** It is a statutory requirement that applications for prior approval or planning permission for the type of telecommunications development proposed need to be accompanied with a declaration that the equipment will operate in full compliance with the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection ICNIRP guidelines. Where transmissions from a proposed base station meet the ICNIRP guidelines PPW11 (para 5.2.15) confirms that Local Planning Authorities should not consider the health aspects of mobile telecommunication equipment. The application documents include a Declaration of Conformity with ICNIRP Public Exposure Guidelines.

**Siting and appearance:** It has been demonstrated within the submitted application documentation that four alternative sites have been discounted due to impact upon highway safety, unsuitable pavements, proximity to education establishments and residential character of the area. It is accepted that out of the five potential sites for the telecommunications mast and apparatus, the application site is the least intrusive.

Notwithstanding the above, it does not automatically follow that as this is the least intrusive alternative that it is acceptable and should be supported. The proposed telecommunications mast and associated apparatus would sit on a prominent corner position at the junction of Stockwell Grove and Percy Road. The proposed mast will be significantly higher and have a greater diameter than any of the existing street furniture, making it a far more prominent feature in the street scene.

Whilst it is noted that there are mature trees along Percy Road and adjacent to the application site on Stockwell Grove, they would provide only limited screening of the mast from medium to longer distance viewpoints to the north, south and east, particularly during winter months when the trees lack foliage. The trees will also not assist in diminishing the prominence of the mast in the street scene from nearby views on Percy Road and Stockwell Grove.

The need to improve telecommunication coverage in this part of Wrexham is acknowledged. However the proposals would be a discordant feature in the street scene, having a detrimental impact upon the character of the area. The proposals therefore conflict with policy CLF8 and GDP1 of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan.

**Highway Safety:** The Highways Officer has confirmed they have no objections. The mast and associated equipment would be sited in a position that will not compromise visibility at the Stockwell Grove/Percy Road junction. It would also leave a sufficiently wide footway. It is therefore considered that the proposal would cause no unacceptable harm to highway or pedestrian safety.

## CONCLUSION

The development would have a detrimental impact upon the street scene and therefore conflicts with PPW11 and TAN19 as well as policies GDP1 and CLF8 of the Wrexham UDP.

## RECOMMENDATION

|                                        |          |
|----------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>GRANT</b>                           |          |
| <b>REFUSE</b>                          | <b>X</b> |
| <b>S106 Required</b>                   |          |
| <b>Cadw/ WG Referral Required</b>      |          |
| <b>Is application EIA Development?</b> |          |

## **INFORMATIVES**

|                                                         |                    |
|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Planning Manager</b>                                 | <b>Date Signed</b> |
| <b>Matthew Phillips Interim Head of Planning Policy</b> | <b>16/02/2023</b>  |