

Mr Mather 14th and 9th June 2021

Mr Swithenbank

Thank you for your reply. I realise that the planning process will take its course. I did attend the Alton Parish Council meeting and the Councillors returned a vote to object to the planning application.

I still believe that this application should be declared Invalid, as the application does not truthfully reflect the actual site conditions and the actual equipment being installed. They are trying to install equipment on the site declaring it as Permitted Development (PD). I agree that street furniture is generally PD, however the extra three cabinets are being installed as part of a larger installation. As all of the equipment is dependent on the others to function, all the equipment should be considered under a planning application. This would render the existing application invalid.

Having had a little more time to review the actual application documents again, there are errors and discrepancies between the submitted documents. There are also discrepancies relating to the location of the proposed site and existing equipment and structures present. The applicant makes reference to items which are not there or are described differently from actual conditions. Also, the applicant makes reference to utilities near to the location will may provide a supply to the cabinets. This may be a problem as the cable in the grass verge adjacent to the proposed site is an 11000 volt cable, (oops!). I believe at this time the Street furniture in the photo has a light, but no supply to it.

Having carried out an internet search for references to planning applications made by the applicant (Sam Wismayer) there appears to be a generic approach to the applications made.

There appears to be a large number of cut and pasted paragraphs within his applications, which may have led to the discrepancies / errors within the Alton application (DET/2021/0021). This leads me to think that the location has not been correctly accessed by the applicant and therefore it should be challenged and rejected.

Simple examples are:

Quoting directly from the application – Section ‘Policy Analysis’

The proposed works are not to the visual detriment of the surrounding area (being suitably distant from sensitive receptors). The proposal would not result in demonstrable harm to the character of the immediate or wider area;....

The proposal would respect and continue to maintain the character of the area, would be suitably distant from potentially sensitive users,.....

How can the mast be in keeping with the adjacent properties when it is 4 times the high of the nearest house and at the entrance to an historic village?

How is it in keeping with other vertical structures close by, when there would be no high structures close to the proposed site for the mast to blend in with?

Again quoting directly from the application – Section ‘Pavement Width’

Planning Appeal Reference: APP/A5840/W/20/3254830 makes specific reference to this element where the Planning Inspector states:

“Along with the mast the proposal includes the installation of three cabinets. The mast would be located on the corner where the pavement is at its widest and free of street furniture. The cabinets would be positioned against railings just before the junction. It would reduce the width of the pavement. However, in my view even the narrower width of pavement available would still allow users to pass one another including those pushing a baby buggy or groups of people walking along the pavement. As such, the proposed development would not introduce excessive clutter on the pavement and would not present an obstruction to pedestrian movement or adversely affect pedestrian safety.”

From the above quote, can you confirm the following:

What does the planning appeal reference refer too, when a decision on the application has not been delivered yet?

How does the proposal include three cabinets when there is only one proposed and the other three are excluded due to an attempt to use permitted development?

How is it located on the corner?

How is it free of street furniture (SF), when they refer in the application to SF near the proposed mast and cabinets?

How are they positioned against railing, where there are no railings?

How do they narrow the pavement available, when they are proposing to use the grassed area?

This is a generic planning application (cut and paste) that has not been submitted with any form of due diligence.

Regards

John Mather

Mr Mather 9th June 2021

Arne

Thank you for your reply. I understand the planning process and understand that SMDC have placed a notice on street furniture further down the road. As the mast is proposed to reach a high of 18m and be the highest structure in the village, I believe it should be accepted that this mast will effect the visible amenities of more villagers

that will ever read the notice on Utttoxeter road or be directly contacted by SMDC or the applicant.

I also believe that the number of objections has been increased by information being passed by word of mouth and proves there is strong objection to this application.

The company making the application has chosen the location on the basis of a commercial decision, following its publicised information that it will not look for or use non public land. As the proposed location is on highway/ public land at the highest point in the village, with I believe a line of sight to the Alton Tower Flag Tower, they have taken the easy very low cost option, and have no other option to present as they have not looked for any.

With the 'background' information added to their application, they have made it clear, by using a soft threat that SMDC cannot reject this application, sighting National Guidelines. These guidelines however require the applicant and the authority to consider the local community, the environment, character of the village and residents. This mast is 4x the high of the nearest building and therefore cannot be considered in keeping with any street scene of the village. The SMDC can however reject the application on these grounds.

In my main objection I also indicate that I believe the application itself is incorrect (Invalid) as there are other structures (Street furniture), which are described as permitted development. As these extra cabinets would not be there if the mast was not there and the mast would not be able to function without these extra structures they should be considered related for planning purposes, as all are being installed as part of a larger installation. This being the case all of the equipment being installed should be included in the planning application.

I would like to ask if you will be in attendance at the Alton Parish meeting on Wednesday (09/06/21)?

Regards

John Mather

LPA 9th June 2021

Subject: DET 2021 0021 - mast application - your e-mail of 28th May 2021

Dear Mr / Mrs J Mather

There are statutory requirements placed on the Local Planning Authority for publicity. In this case there must either be site notices in a nearby public position or notices by

letter to neighbouring properties. In this case Staffordshire Moorlands District Council has done both. There are over 30 representations now on file from members of the public. This suggests that the application is well known about in the local area. The Council has in any event met its statutory duty for publicity.

With this type of application the Government has set regulations in place which mean that if the Council does not reach a decision on or by the deadline date they go through to approval by default. (I am working to the 1st July as my deadline although it cld be a day or two later – these things are not straight forward but I am away anyway.) I am however looking at whether there is the possibility of extending the deadline by agreement with the applicant which sometimes is possible.

Yours sincerely
Arne Swithenbank