

MICKLEFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

The Case Officer
Planning Services
Leeds City Council

City Development Directorate
Merrion House
110 Merrion Centre
Leeds
LS2 8BB

Ms Joanne Hebden
Clerk & RFO to the Council
Micklefield Parish Council

6 Churchville Avenue
Micklefield
Leeds
LS25 4AS

Date : 7th June 2021

DETERMINATION OF PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATION : 21 / 04279 / DTM

- Applicant** : CK Hutchison Networks (UK) Ltd ,
C / O : WHP Telecoms Ltd (Eve White) , Troy Mills , Helena House , Troy Road ,
Horsforth , Leeds , LS18 5GN .
- Location** : Land (near the junction with the Great North Road) at Churchville Drive
Micklefield , Leeds , LS25 4AW .
- Description** : Application for a Determination as to whether Prior Approval is required , and
(if so) whether it should be granted , for a 5G 18m phase 8 monopole c/w
wraparound cabinet at base and associated ancillary works .

Dear Sir ,

At the Ordinary Meeting of Micklefield Parish Council held on Thursday 3rd June 2021 :

It was Resolved that Micklefield Parish Council OBJECTS to this Determination of Prior Approval Application and recommends that the Local Planning Authority determines that a) Prior Approval of the proposal *is* required and b) that Prior Approval be not granted .

Prior Approval should not be granted for this development , as the proposal is completely unacceptable in terms of the Siting and Appearance of an 18m high monopole with cabinets etc. in the location proposed .

The Parish Council can see no way in which the proposal can be made to be an acceptable form of otherwise Permitted Development in this location at the junction of Churchville Drive and the Great North Road , and hence any Prior Approval should be completely refused .

The Parish Council's considered view is based on the following issues :

1.0 SITING

- 1.1 The proposed location at Churchville Drive is not just a detached piece of spare unused land : it forms an area of publicly accessible amenity space either side of the carriageway of Churchville Drive on the west side of the junction with the Great North Road .
- 1.2 Many residents of Old Micklefield like to visit this area to relax , take in the pleasant atmosphere and ambience and enjoy the view . There is no doubt that the area is used by members of the public in this way , as there is a seat on the other half of the amenity space directly opposite the site of the proposed monopole .
- 1.3 Numerous dog-walkers also frequent this location , and many residents purposefully choose to walk through this amenity space , rather than alternative routes to and fro in Old Micklefield , because it is such a pleasant area .

- 1.4 The proposed monopole and three cabinets are a significant amount of metal structural equipment. These items and the associated paving will use up an appreciable amount of the amenity space.
- 1.5 Most importantly, the 18m high monopole and the cabinets will become the focus of the amenity space, because they will be internal to the amenity grassed area itself. It should be noted that the amenity grass straddles the carriageway and is enclosed by the two detached highway footways on either side of Churchville Drive, to form what is clearly a single area of amenity space.
- 1.6 Micklefield Parish Council does not accept the applicant's statement that this is the only location in Micklefield where the monopole and its associated infrastructure can be located, nor even that this is the best location.
- 1.7 The Site Selection process that the applicant has undertaken is deficient, both in terms of its scope and its accuracy. Location D1 is not even shown on Figure F5 (but see para. 1.10 below); location D3 has been discounted as being near a bridge and yet, as annotated on Figure F5, location D3 is nowhere near a bridge; and location D2 has been discounted "due to obstructing overhead cables", but the overhead cables were removed several years ago in advance of building the Manor Farm housing allocation.
- 1.8 Location D8 (adjacent to Micklefield Public Footpath No.3 to the north east of Manor Farm) has been discounted simply "due to its proximity to private land". What kind of proscriptive criteria is this? If it were a legitimate reason for sifting out potential sites for the monopole, then it would pretty much preclude *any* location within the Churchville and Hallfield estates (or most other locations within the settlement boundary), as virtually every site will be in close proximity to a privately owned residential property (which by definition is private land).
- 1.9 The "Site Specific Supplementary Information" document submitted by the applicant is woefully inaccurate, not just in the bowdlerised descriptions of locations D1 to D8 in the sequential site selection, but in the illogical conclusions of that very site selection process. The document is also wildly inaccurate in other respects.
- 1.10 On page 5, it says and we quote: "The site is designated as being beyond the settlement boundary.....". This is nonsensical – the application site is clearly within the settlement boundary. More damningly, on page 6, the Nominal for the CK Hutchison required cell is the actual application site.
- 1.11 The application site is the location of the Nominal (ie. the ideal location for the monopole for the CK Hutchison Cell), but the location of the Nominal in the sequential site selection relating to Figure F5 is D1.
- 1.12 D1 (the Nominal) has been correctly discounted "due to proximity to residential properties", but quite amazingly, the applicant (in the Site Specific Supplementary Information document) does not realise that its Agent is expertly describing the actual application site.
- 1.13 On page 2 of the same document, the applicant's Agent has asserted that the [monopole] structure will not be within 3km of an aerodrome or airfield. This is a disingenuous answer to the proforma question in the document. The application site *is* within 3km of the airstrips at Sturton Grange, to the west on the other side of the A656 Ridge Road.
- 1.14 Interestingly, this wrong assumption that "aerodrome or airfield" does not somehow also include airstrips was also made by the applicant for the Hook Moor Wind Farm in 2007 and they quickly had to acknowledge that the Sturton Grange airstrips *were* relevant and were a material consideration for their application.
- 1.15 It may be that the distance of the airstrips at Sturton Grange to the proposed 18m high monopole will still be sufficient for it not be a problem, but the obvious lack of rigour in the document on this particular issue, and the other aspects described above, just adds to the sense that the L.P.A. should have little or no confidence that the proposed location for the monopole has been soundly selected.

- 1.16 It would appear that the real driver for the choice of this site is simply because of the level ground, the ease of construction and the seamless connection to existing electrical services, regardless of what the site at Churchville Drive is, how it relates to the surrounding residential area and in what way it is used by the village community.
- 1.17 In fact, the Site Specific Supplementary Information document and the other documents submitted as part of this application lead the Parish Council inexorably to an overarching sense that that the applicant is being driven by a desire for the monopole to be on Leeds City Council - owned land, where the City Council can derive the annual rental, regardless of which site or sites in Micklefield would actually be the most appropriate, if identified by an accurate and well - founded sequential site selection process.

2.0 APPEARANCE

- 2.1 The proposed monopole would be 18m (60 feet) high . It would be an alien feature within the amenity space and , with the associated cabinets , the development would dominate the views from *within* that amenity space .
- 2.2 The seat (which is self - evidently synonymous with the function of this location at Churchville Drive as useable public amenity space) faces due south east . Therefore , anybody wishing to sit there and enjoy the currently pleasant and attractive view will be looking directly at an 18m high telecommunications monopole and its metal cabinets .
- 2.3 The existing trees are further to the east and therefore cannot screen this most important view . In any case , the trees (6no. cherry trees) are , at best only 9m high and , even at full maturity , will only reach a height of about 11m .
- 2.4 As a result , the monopole will puncture the skyline and be directly visible from all directions within the amenity space , for all the various users that we have described above , and from all the highway footways on the surrounding roads (Churchville Drive , Churchville , the Great North Road and Grange Farm Court) .
- 2.5 We would also point out that the monopole will be over three times the height of the nearby bungalows on the Great North Road , which reinforces just how incongruous this structure will be in such a location .

For all the reasons we have set out above , Micklefield Parish Council cannot possibly support this application , and implore Leeds City Council , as the Local Planning Authority , to reject it .

Yours sincerely ,

Joanne Hebden (Clerk & RFO to the Parish Council)