

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015

PRIOR APPROVAL REQUIRED

APPLICATION REFERENCE: 22/01485/TELE

Name and address for correspondence:	Applicant name:
Mr Jamaal Hafiz Clarke Telecom Unit E Madison Place Northampton Road MANCHESTER M40 5AG	Cornerstone

Part 1 - Particulars of Application

Date of Application: 22 November 2022

Proposal:	Prior notification for the installation of a new 20m monopole tower to support 6 antennas, associated radio-equipment housing and ancillary development thereto
Location:	Heights Lane S.W., Rochdale, OL12 0AQ

Part II - Particulars of decision

The Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council hereby give notice in pursuance of the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 that prior approval **IS REQUIRED** for the development referred to in Part 1 hereof.

Date Decision Issued 12 January 2023

Daniela Ripa
Interim Head of Planning Services

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015

REFUSAL OF DETAILS

Name and address for correspondence:	Applicant name:
Mr Jamaal Hafiz Unit E Madison Place Northampton Road MANCHESTER M40 5AG	Cornerstone

Part 1 - Particulars of Application

Date of Application: 22 November 2022

Application No: 22/01485/TELE

Proposal:	Prior notification for the installation of a new 20m monopole tower to support 6 antennas, associated radio-equipment housing and ancillary development thereto
Location:	Heights Lane S.W., Rochdale, OL12 0AQ

Part II - Particulars of decision

The Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council hereby give notice in pursuance of the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 that approval has been **REFUSED** for the carrying out of the development referred to in Part 1 hereof in accordance with the application and plans submitted for the following reason(s):

- 1 The proposed installation, by virtue of its height, siting and appearance, would represent an incongruous and dominant feature of the street scene in a greenspace corridor. Furthermore, no thorough justified information in relation to alternative ground or rooftop based sites has been provided as part of this proposal, required under paragraph 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The development would therefore result in unacceptable harm to character of the site and be contrary to policies P1, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The height of the mast, combined with its position would result in a incongruous and intrusive feature, which would detract from views of Falinge Park from the east. As such, this would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the Grade II Registered Falinge Park, a designated heritage asset. This harm has not been adequately justified or mitigated. No public benefits have been put forwards that would outweigh this harm. The development would therefore be an incongruous and harmful feature which would detract from the setting of the Park, and would conflict with the requirements of Policy P2 and DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

Date Decision Issued 12 January 2023

Daniela Ripa
Interim Head of Planning Services

IMPORTANT

PLEASE ENSURE THAT YOU HAVE READ AND FULLY UNDERSTOOD THE CONTENTS OF THIS DECISION NOTICE.

YOUR ATTENTION IS DRAWN TO THE ATTACHED NOTES.

INFORMATIVE:

The Local Planning Authority's reasons for its decision are set out in the accompanying officer's report.

INFORMATIVE:

For the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following list of submitted plans / documents:

- Proposed Site Elevation Dwg No 301 Rev C
- Proposed Site Plan Dwg No 201 Rev C
- Site Location Maps Dwg No 100 Rev B
- Cornerstone Industry Site Specific Supplementary Information (England) V.5 - 21.03.2022
- Copy of the Developers Notice and letter served on the owner(s) of the site
- ICNIRP Compliance Certificate.

Article 35 Statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.