

Brigstock Parish Council

Please reply to Nigel Searle Parish Clerk
7 Church Street Brigstock, Kettering, Northants NN14 3EX

Tel: 01536 373672 E-mail brigstockcouncil@aol.com

North Northamptonshire Council,
Cedar Drive,
Thrapston,
Northamptonshire,
NN14 4LZ

11th November 2021

Dear Sir

Planning Application NE/21/01506/PNT Proposed 16.0m Phase 8 Monopole C/W wrapround Cabinet at base and associated ancillary works. Mauntley Avenue Brigstock Northamptonshire

Brigstock parish council wish to **object** to this application in the strongest possible terms. The parish council appreciate that current legislation only allows North Northamptonshire Council to consider, when determining applications of this nature, the siting and appearance of the development.

The subsequent text demonstrates that the proposed site is absurd and will not meet any test applied when assessing the appearance and siting of the mast structure with its associated infrastructure.

Although each individual application of this kind is assessed on its individual merits, North Northamptonshire Council takes seriously the visual integrity of its built-up and historic areas.

Brigstock Historic Environment

Brigstock was the largest village within Rockingham Forest since medieval times and designated a royal hunting ground by William the Conqueror around the time of the Domesday survey.

Brigstock Parish Council

More recently the village Conservation Area was designated in January 1971 and subsequently extended in March 2009. An article 4 directive was introduced in 2018 to further add protection to the historic environment of the village. Currently there are 46 listed buildings with special architectural/historic interest including the Grade I listed Church of St Andrew, the II* listed Manor House and Fermyn Woods Hall, plus a Market Cross which is a Scheduled Monument erected in 1586. *It should also be noted there is a Grade I Historic Park and Garden associated with Boughton House, although not in the parish this mast would be part of its vista.*

The proposed siting of the mast and supporting infrastructure on the corner of Mauntley Avenue and Sudborough Road is totally inappropriate, although not directly in the conservation area there is no question as to the adverse impact this carbuncle will have on the historic environment. Its siting is only 44mtr from the conservation area, 185mtr from a Grade 1 listed church, 245 mtr from the grade II* manor and 339mtr from the village primary school, and only 6mtr from the adjacent property.

Other points regarding this application

Land ownership

The planning application unusually does not include any land ownership declaration. Although Highways have rights over the land, that does not infer ownership which I suspect still resides with the developer of the Mauntley Avenue site. **Is there a requirement for the owner of the site to be consulted?**

Consultation

The parish council received a consultation letter from the applicant dated 28th September via an e-mail on the 7th November. It is also noted that the actual planning application form was dated 3rd October 2021. Why did the applicant think it not appropriate to have a meaningful consultation prior to the formal application submission, which once received starts a statutory time clock?

There was no reason for this lack of formal consultation, since there was interest in this site and preliminary assessment investigation work done on the site some time ago.

Planning policy 117 states

Applications for electronic communications development (including applications for prior approval under the General Permitted Development Order) should be supported by the necessary evidence to justify the proposed development. This should include:

Brigstock Parish Council

- a) the outcome of consultations with organisations with an interest in the proposed development, in particular with the relevant body where a mast is to be installed near a school or college, or within a statutory safeguarding zone surrounding an aerodrome, technical site or military explosives storage area; and
- c) for a new mast or base station, evidence that the applicant has explored the possibility of erecting antennas on an existing building, mast or other structure.

One can only conclude that the applicant had **no intention to engage in any meaningful consultation dialogue and has not met the requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.**

Comments On the Applicants Application Form

Schools It states there are no schools/colleges in the proximity to the proposed location. This is not correct, Brigstock Primary School is 339mtr from the proposed site.

Airfields It states there are no airfields within 3km. This is not correct, there is an airfield 1.8km from the proposed site

Material impact

It states that the site selection has been influenced by numerous vertical elements of street furniture including street lighting columns. There are few vertical elements visible from this location.

It also states the equipment is unlikely to have any material impact on the local area. A 16mtr mast plus infrastructure a few yards from a conservation area on the corner of residential housing has enormous impact on the whole village.

Stating the development is sympathetic to its surroundings and will blend in with and not harm the surrounding area, appear incongruous and extremely well screened, not directly overlooked by residential properties is blatantly untrue, as one property is only 6mtr away. This statement stretches poetic licence to misrepresentation at best, most would interpret as dishonesty.

Site selection process

It is of concern that there is no selection rational or criteria behind the site selection process. If one was being a bit cynical it could be thought that all but the chosen location was actually considered because all the others listed were known to be unsuitable. One question that needs answering. **Was this site the only one considered due to cost only?**

There are many sites around the vicinity which are capable of accommodating such equipment. In fact, the only mast currently in the vicinity is on high ground situated off the village bypass. No information has been provided as to

Brigstock Parish Council

the optimum siting of such infrastructure in the locality (*this may not be on verges*), if there has been such assessments and I suspect there has, details should be made public.

Policy Documentation relating to this application

Brigstock Neighbourhood Plan

Policy B16: States that: Only developments which reflects the distinctive, traditional character of Brigstock and meet the requirements of the Brigstock Village Design Statement will be supported.

The siting of a 16mtr mast and infrastructure in the proposed location is in conflict with the aims and objectives of the neighbourhood plan

Core strategy

Policy 2 Historic Environment

The distinctive North Northamptonshire historic environment will be protected, preserved and, where appropriate, enhanced. Where a development would impact upon a heritage asset and/or its setting: Policy 2 c states. *Proposals should protect and, where possible, enhance key views and vistas of heritage assets, including of the church spires along the Nene Valley and across North Northamptonshire;*

Landscape Character

Paragraph 3.23 states *Some landscapes are more sensitive to change than others. Development can impact on the landscape through its effects on the character and the quality of the landscape and the degree to which development will become a significant or defining feature in the landscape, including skyline (where additional development appears disproportionately dominant), and loss of sense of remoteness. Visual impacts concern the degree to which proposed development will become a feature in particular views (or sequences of views) and the impacts this has on people experiencing views.*

The siting of a 16mtr mast and infrastructure is in conflict the above sections of Policy 2.

POLICY 3 – LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

Development should be located and designed in a way that is sensitive to its landscape setting, retaining and, where possible, enhancing the distinctive qualities of the landscape character area which it would affect.

Paragraph a) Should conserve and, where possible, enhance the character and qualities of the local landscape through appropriate design and management;

Paragraph c) Should safeguard and, where possible, enhance important views and vistas including sky lines within the development layout;

Paragraph d) Should protect the landscape setting and contribute to maintaining the individual and distinct character, and separate identities of settlements by preventing coalescence.

The siting of a 16mtr mast and infrastructure is in conflict the above sections of Policy 3.

Brigstock Parish Council

POLICY 8 – NORTH NORTHAMPTONSHIRE PLACE SHAPING PRINCIPLES

Paragraph d) States: Create a distinctive local character by:

- ii Responding to the local topography and the overall form, character and landscape setting of the settlement; and
- iii. The creative use of the public realm through the use of measures such as incidental play spaces, bespoke street furniture and memorable features.

Paragraph e) States: Ensure quality of life and safer and healthier communities by:

- i. Protecting amenity by not resulting in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of future occupiers, neighbouring properties or the wider area, by reason of noise, vibration, smell, light or other pollution, loss of light or overlooking

The siting of a 16mtr mast and infrastructure is in conflict the above sections of Policy 8.

Yours Faithfully,

Nigel Searle
Parish Clerk