

Woodnewton Parish Council have noted the Appeal Statement submitted by WHP Telecoms Ltd on behalf of CK Hutchison Networks (UK) Ltd following the refusal of the Planning Application NE/21/01280/PNT | Proposed 15.0m Phase 8 Monopole C/W wrapround Cabinet at base and associated ancillary works. | Land Adjacent Orchard Lane Woodnewton Northamptonshire by the Local Authority Planning.

The Council and Village residents wish to re-iterate their thoughts and concerns, that were raised when the initial application was lodged, still stand. Over a third of this small village electorate (circa 400 people) objected to this proposal and continue to do so today. They wish their voice to be heard.

We do not wish to repeat ourselves; you have clearly stated all previous correspondence will be carried forward to the appeal.

However, we wish to raise the following:

1. Engagement

This was raised at the early stages after numerous attempts on our part to engage with Hutchison, today and over the past 10.5 months we have still, had nothing. There is no interest on their part to work with the local community when we have made the effort to reach out on many occasions.

2. The Appeal Statement

It is noted the Appeal Statement submitted is extremely similar to the 15-page document for Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/W/21/3286678. Only a handful of lines have been changed to suit the different location (same part of the county) This appeal was dismissed, and we hope this has set a precedent for APP/M2840/W/22/3295035

3. Grounds for Appeal

The supporting statement (1.5) that the applicant is confident the proposed monopole and ancillary infrastructure would not by virtue of design be detrimental to the amenity or character of the area and robust evidence has been provided. We feel there is no robust evidence and sadly no consideration for the Jubilee Tree planted here to commemorate the Queen's Jubilee. The location was specifically chosen after permission was refused last year as village sentiment wished to protect and encourage our verdant landscaping. This was to be achieved through the registration of the tree with the Queen's Green Canopy a unique tree planting initiative created to mark Her Majesty's Platinum Jubilee and is our Commemorative Memorial. Photograph to follow.

4. Technical Considerations (1.7)

In the report's technical considerations, it states the Parish Council objected to the proposal on the grounds concerning Siting, Appearance and Consultation. Disappointingly, there is no mention of **SAFETY**. This was a primary concern due to the proposed location being on a not so wide grass verge with no pathway between it and the road and adjacent to the village play area and a busy walking route. Concerns were raised due to the way the road bends forcing people to step into the road for visibility before crossing. This coupled with the noise of the fans in the cabinetry further obscuring the noise of oncoming traffic. This concern has not even been noted in the Appeal Report. I am sure this will be clear at the site visit when the close proximity to the play area can be seen, and one can envisage distracted children leaving in groups or chatting and being forced out onto the road due to lack of pavement and visibility. This will be a further concern as we have recently secured a £20,000 grant for additional play equipment which has been ordered and will encourage more people to use the play area and further exacerbating this safety concern.

5. The Appeal Site Context (3.8)

The report states robust pre consultation with local ward councillors – when we spoke to our local ward councillors and MP they were unaware of the application until the Residents had reached out and made contact. Key stakeholders were invited to meet and discuss at the pre – application stage. The Parish Council was not included in this process, or the Village Residents and we are key stakeholders. I can see no evidence of any stakeholder being reached out to in the original application. This is further confused when one looks at the discounted options in (5.0)

6. Discounted Options (5.0)

The robust report is particularly flimsy (15 lines) on its analysis and reasoning for discounting eight other site options. A repetitive phrase used is "Discounted due to highways" - there is no further explanation. What does this mean? Were highways consulted? They must be a key stake holder and they must have been consulted as the report states the appeals site is situated on highways land (3.3 and 3.4). If this is the case surely the robust report could provide more detail on why the other sites have been discounted? As a consultee in the initial planning stages, highways response was purely observational and gave little detail. To discount eight possible sites there must have been more detail.

The Parish Council have consulted at length with many of the villagers both in August 2021 and again at the time of this appeal. The response remains unchanged. The majority accept there is a need for better coverage and connectivity but **DO NOT** accept this location. Again no one seems to want to work with Woodnewton Residents or engage with us to help find a better solution.

