

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00079/TELE

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.

24/00079/TELE

CASE OFFICER

Rachel Carney

DETERMINATION DATE 17.03.2024 EXT OF TIME

Address: Land Off Syke Road, Rochdale, OL12 9TQ

Proposal: Prior notification for a proposed 20m high telecommunications monopole and associated works

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	y	Site notice expired?	n/a
	Neighbour letters expired?	y	Press Notice expired?	n/a

DELEGATION	Significant departure from local plan?	n	Contrary to national policy?	y
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	n	Contrary to previous decision?	n
	Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval?	n	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	n/a

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	n
	Neighbour comments received?	y

EIA	Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?	n/a
-----	--	-----

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	n
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	n/a

RECOMMENDATION	REFUSE
----------------	--------

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: LA

DATE: 14.03.24

SITE

The application site is set off a small road that crosses Cronkeyshaw (Syke) Common, an large area open area of grassed land that contain footpaths, scattered tree cover and a large pond. The Common is bordered to the east and west by Syke Road and Dewhirst Road, both of which are predominantly lined by residential properties. The properties to Syke Road are generally older and include a number of listed buildings.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks prior approval for a 20m high telecommunications monopole and 5 no. equipment cabinets.

The mast would include a base cabinet and two equipment cabinets to the east side of the mast, with an additional three equipment cabinets to the west.

Part 16, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) allows *'Development by or on behalf of an electronic communications code operator for the purpose of the operator's electronic communications network in, on, over or under land controlled by that operator or in accordance with the electronic communications code, consisting of-*

- a. the installation, alteration or replacement of any electronic communications apparatus;*
- b. the use of land in an emergency for a period not exceeding 6 months to station and operate moveable electronic communications apparatus required for the replacement of unserviceable electronic communications apparatus, including the provision of moveable structures on the land for the purposes of that use, or*
- c. development ancillary to radio equipment housing.*

Before beginning the development described in paragraph A.2(3) of the above Order, the developer must apply to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether the prior approval of the authority will be required as to the siting and appearance of the development.

Paragraph 8 of A.3 (Prior Approval) states that the development must not begin before the occurrence of one of the following –

- a) the receipt by the applicant from the local planning authority of a written notice of their determination that prior approval is not required;*
- b) where the local planning authority gives the applicant written notice that prior approval is required -*
 - i. the giving of that approval to the applicant, in writing, within a period of 56 days beginning with the date on which the local planning authority received the application in accordance with sub-paragraph (5);*
 - ii. the expiry of a period of 56 days beginning with the date on which the local planning authority received the application in accordance with sub-paragraph (5) without the local planning authority notifying the applicant, in writing, that such approval is given or refused; or*
 - iii. the expiry of a period of 56 days beginning with the date on which the local planning authority received the application in accordance with sub-*

paragraph (5) without the local planning authority notifying the applicant, in writing, of their determination as to whether such prior approval is required.'

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (As Amended).

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – July 2021

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

SO3	Improving design, image and quality of place
P3	Improving design of new development
DM1	General development requirements

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1	Defined Urban Area
D10	Protected Open Land
G/3	Protection of Existing Open Space
G/8	Greenspace Corridor

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

N/A

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Conservation And Design

Summary

I am not able to support the proposal

Significance Assessment

Syke Common follows the route of the historic packhorse trail which linked Rochdale to Clitheroe. It was the presence of this historic route, which resulted in the development of the area from the late 18th century onwards, as part of the woollen and cotton industry.

There are many surviving examples of the areas' agricultural and industrial origins, in the form of weaver's cottages, farms and mills, which surround the Common. Council officers and local residents have been drawing up plans for a Conservation Area covering the Common and surrounding areas. These plans have not yet been formally consulted on, but are likely to incorporate the area covered by the application site. Key views within this draft document highlight the importance of the open views across the Common towards both the hills and Rochdale Town Centre.

To the northeast of the application site, there is a pair of grade II listed weaver's cottages (101 and 102 Syke Road). The adjoining 100 Syke Road, which was also

originally constructed as a weavers' cottage has also been identified as a non-designated heritage asset, following its delisting in 2022.

All three properties date from the early 19th century, at a time where handloom weaving took place in the domestic setting. The upper floors were used for weaving, resulting in the distinctive windows, designed to let in as much light as possible.

Further to the north along Syke Road and Dewhirst Road, there are more grade II listed weavers cottages. These are of a similar period to the houses at 100 to 102 Syke Road, and also exhibit a similar style of windows at upper floor level.

The Common forms an important part of the setting of these listed buildings. The textile industry developed along the Common as it was the historic route, linking Rochdale to Clitheroe. The openness of the space and the route, therefore reinforces the historic links between the Common and the weavers' cottages. The Common also provides a pleasant and open setting to the listed buildings, allowing them to take centre stage. The Common makes an important positive contribution to their setting.

The proposal is for the installation of a new 20m high monopole on the Syke Common to the north of Rochdale. The proposed telecoms mast would be a wholly alien feature within the open landscape, significantly taller than any surrounding structures. Its height, combined with its location in the middle of the Common would make it a highly visible and intrusive feature within the landscape and within the setting of these listed buildings, in particular 101 and 102 Syke Road. It would detract from their attractive and openness of their setting and dominate key views. The overall level of harm to the significance of the heritage assets is considered to be less than substantial.

No heritage statement has been provided and no justification has been put forwards for this harm. I am not able to support the proposal.

Highways And Engineering

We have no objections to these proposals on highways grounds.

The applicant has proposed housing this equipment beyond the boundary of the adopted highway on Cronkeyshaw Common.

The siting of the equipment is unlikely to cause any visibility issues on the adjacent highway and servicing of the equipment is unlikely to be problematic.

We have no highways objections to this proposal.

Env Health - Noise/Odours

No objections

REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised with neighbour notification letters. Two letters of support and 142 letters of objections, including objections from Councillors Tricia Ayrtton and Shah Wazir have been received.

The Councillor representations are provided in full and all other public representations are summarised below:

Cllr Shah Wazir

"I am in total agreement with the local residents and there are so many of them who are objecting to 5G mast installation on the public green space. The mast installation is totally inappropriate and technically unacceptable. Therefore as a ward councillor I am against the development."

Cllr Tricia Ayrton

"This is an entirely inappropriate location for the mast. It is in the middle of a greenspace corridor and is in a location where there are multiple utilities. There are gas and electricity pipes directly adjacent to the proposed site and a 20 inch water main close by. The height of the structure would overshadow all other structures (including trees) in the area. The proposed site is in an area that is being used for nature recovery, tree planting and rewilding and I have copied in the Council's Woodland and Natural Capital Officer to this email."

Objection

- The mast would be an eye sore and spoil views.
- The commons at Syke and Cronkeyshaw are probably the only remaining visually attractive green spaces in the borough, which are well maintained by the local authority and which attract hundreds of dog walkers and picnickers.
- The commons are for the children of Rochdale to play on and not for organisations to put monstrous structures on it.
- Under the impression that commons belonged to the people of the borough for the benefit of the borough, so why can WIFI companies erect these monstrosities where they please?
- I thought no building works were ever to happen on the common so how can one of these go up.
- The area is a local beauty spot which contains a number of listed and historical properties.
- A mast of this size which is not near any other structures will be visible from quite some distance.
- Wildlife frequent the area and in the fields around the prison there is a very healthy population of deer which often find themselves on the common. Bats and barn owls can also be seen. The mast would disrupt the natural habitat and have irreversible consequences on the local ecosystem.
- There must be a more appropriate siting within the borough.
- We are an unadopted road and would not allow access down for the development.
- The installation of the pole will irreparably tarnish the aesthetic appeal of one of the borough's most treasured landscapes.
- The ground works that would be required would need large remedial works.
- There are no details about the electricity supply that would require additional works to be undertaken.
- The mast is being moved from an industrial area to a green belt common and would not be in keeping with the local area.
- This will devalue the beauty of the area.
- This is not wanted or needed.
- No mast around Syke please. Cronkeyshaw common better with not as many houses.
- The industrial estates where the mast currently resides has been earmarked to be knocked down in the hopes it can be developed for a housing estate. Why can't the mast be added to the planned development?
- This represents not progress, but rather a regressive assault on the very essence of our shared natural heritage.
- This is within a proposed Conservation Area, the details of which have already been submitted to the Council. It is also next to or could be sited on an historical pack horse trail.

- The mast will not complement the listed building dwellings nearby.
- The construction would likely damage the newly planted trees and result in their loss.
- Although the plan of the development shows the trees at the site will remain, the actual building of the base for the mast will result in the trees being uprooted and or damaged these trees were planted by local volunteers. If this was positioned away from houses it would be much better. There is plenty of open landscape in this area which would be much more suitable and you would get a lot less complaints
- Our common land deserves preservation, not desecration.
- 5G masts required approximately 3x more power than a 4G mast and 5G's increase use could create up to 23% of global greenhouse gas emissions by 2030. The application contravenes Rochdale's Climate Strategy and action plan.
- What recycling measures are in place for these masts at the end of their life.
- The maintenance would result in a nuisance to residents.
- The developer have not adequately explored alternative solutions, such as placing the monopole at a less intrusive location, using existing structures or employing technology that minimises visual and environmental impacts.
- The mast may create a visual distraction to road users and its associated equipment cabinets would clutter and degrade the look and feel of the area.
- A 60'+ mast and metal cabinets would not be a visual benefit to anyone in the borough and if approved will be a huge blot on a visually attractive landscape.
- Telecoms apparatus is an industrialising feature, incongruous with residential neighbourhoods.
- There is already sufficient telecommunication coverage at the location, public enjoyment of the common should not be compromised by private companies pursuit of profit.
- Development will devalue houses in the area.
- The mast will attract litter and antisocial behaviour.
- The development would be in breach of The Commons Act 2006, Section 38, Section 3.
- The siting would cause anxiety and stress,
- Masts in close proximity have detrimental health effects. Emissions from masts are a pollutant that cause adverse health defects, beyond the effects recognised in the UK adopted ICNIRP guidelines. Despite the policy to only consider ICNIRP under NPPF para 118, it is important to make an evidence-based determination of the material planning consideration 'incompatible and unacceptable use' of land under NPPF para 185. The 2018 EECC code transposed into Law in Dec 2020 also clearly states that public health is an imperative and competent authorities should be reconciling the risks. In view of the mounting evidence of harm and any uncertainty, please apply precaution and refuse this mast.
- The specific exclusions states in ICNIRP guidelines should apply to children at home as well as at school. The elderly should also be consider as sensitive receptors.
- Local people (not telecoms or the Council) should have the right to say how it affects their local area.
- The operation of the mast will interfere with existing local users of the electromagnetic spectrum.
- The postcode for the site is a bit of a way from the proposed site, which will result in the contractors going down a private road of Cross Less, Syke, to which the postcode is attached. The application should be resubmitted with an accurate address. The site is on Scar Drive.
- The application includes a fraudulent ICNIRP certificate.
- No consultation received regarding this pole.
- There has been insufficient community consultation.

- Why would the planning authority even consider this application?
- Typical Rochdale Council move, spoil the natural beauty of the area and install an eyesore.
- The individual or committee responsible for conceiving the idea of placing this eyesore amidst the natural beauty of our borough's landscape ought to seriously reconsider their position and resign from their roles.

Support

- Good for communication as signal is poor in area.
- I work in the area and believe this will be a benefit for business and local people.
- Bring down the house prices so I can buy one, have a great phone signal and ensure I get brain cancer.

ANALYSIS

A number of representations received have raised concerns over the validity of the application and this is due to concerns over the legitimacy of the ICNIRP Certificate and whether the applicants are able to apply for the proposal under a prior approval, as set out in The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (As Amended).

The Council's Planning Solicitor has reviewed the application and advised that any company seeking to provide electronic communication services must apply for Code powers under section 106 of the Communications Act of 2003. Even if a company is owned by another company registered with Ofcom under the Electronic Communications Code, it is still able to apply for prior approval, provided it meets all relevant requirements and complies with the necessary regulations.

The Council's Solicitor has confirmed that the applicant is jointly owned by EE and 3G, which are mobile networks, and EE Limited is registered with Ofcom under the Electronic Communications Code and benefits from powers under the Code.

The Council's solicitor has also confirmed that ICNIRP provides guidance for compliance, rather than issuing certificates, and therefore there is no "valid" format for the declaration.

Based on the legal advice received it is considered that the Council are able to accept the application as valid and assess the proposals against the requirements as set out in The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (As Amended).

Legislation

Part 16, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) states that development consisting of the installation, alteration or replacement of electronic communications apparatus (other than on a building) is not permitted by Class A(a) if –

- (a) in the case of the installation of electronic communications apparatus (other than a mast), the apparatus, excluding any antenna, would exceed a height of 15 metres above ground level;
- (b) in the case of the alteration or replacement of electronic communications apparatus (other than a mast) that is already installed, the apparatus,

- excluding any antenna, would when altered or replaced exceed the height of the existing apparatus or a height of 15 metres above ground level, whichever is the greater;
- (c) in the case of the installation of a mast, the mast, excluding any antenna, would exceed a height of—
 - (i) 30 metres above ground level on unprotected land; or
 - (ii) 25 metres above ground level on article 2(3) land or land which is on a highway;
 - (d) in the case of the alteration or replacement of a mast, the height of the mast, excluding any antenna, would when altered or replaced exceed the greater of the height of the existing mast or a height of—
 - (i) 30 metres above ground level on unprotected land; or
 - (ii) 25 metres above ground level on article 2(3) land or land which is on a highway; or
 - (e) in the case of the alteration or replacement of a mast—
 - (i) the mast is on any land which is, or is within, a site of special scientific interest; and
 - (ii) the mast would, when altered or replaced, exceed the original width of the mast by more than one third.

The submitted application seeks prior approval for the installation of a new 20m high telecommunications monopole and 5 no. equipment cabinets, as would be development permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A.

Within their Site Specific Supplementary Information the applicant has made note of the pre-application advice provided (ref: PREAPP/00039/23) and acknowledged that the Council have advised that the development would not be acceptable. Through consultation Ward Councillors also advised that they would not support the proposed development at this location and residents have cited concerns over the visual impact of the scheme.

In regards site selection the application states that the site has been chosen as the most viable town planning solution within the local area, which will meet the necessary coverage requirements of the operator. The applicant acknowledge that residential housing around the common includes two Grade II listed cottages north of the site, they then, somewhat confusingly, state that the development is not in close proximity to any listed buildings.

It is stated that the location of the apparatus has been selected to ensure that it is as far away as practical from residential properties. The applicants have also accepted that the height of the installation will result in a visual feature on the landscape but it is stated that the slimline nature of the development will ensure that the visual impact is reduced as far as is practicable.

The development is required as it is stated that the existing base station at Fieldhouse Industrial Estate is soon to be lost for reasons beyond the operator's control and that the development will work in tandem with the approved 20m high monopole at Whitworth Road. It is stated that a second installation is required to ensure that all network services are replicated and that no coverage gaps are created within the wider area.

The application advises that the mast will be shared by two major mobile operators as well as the Emergency Services Network (ESN)

It is stated throughout the Site Specific Supplementary Information that the site is the most viable solution and a table of alternative sites that have been considered and

not chosen has been submitted. However, the application does not explicitly detail that in accordance with paragraph 121 of the NPPF, the applicant has explored the possibility of erecting antennas on an existing building, mast or other structure. The application also does not include a cell search area.

A table of five alternative site options has been provided. It is noted that the first one relates to the existing site of Fieldhouse Industrial Estate which it is stated is to be redeveloped as housing. While it is understandable that the applicants will want to be prepared for any sites being developed, it should be noted that there is no planning permission for development of Fieldhouse Industrial Estate, nor is there any current planning application under consideration. While the existing Fieldhouse Industrial Estate may become unavailable in the future, any proposals for development are currently speculative. It may also be possible to develop the site to incorporate a suitable site for telecommunication development.

It is also noted that Fieldhouse Industrial Estate is located at a similar altitude to Binns Nook Road (approx. 145m above sea level) so the rationale behind discounting option 2 (Binns Nook Road) is unclear.

In respect of option 3, Fieldhouse Road Streetworks, this has been discounted as it has been confirmed through pre-application that the location would not be supported. As detailed above, pre-application and local consultation advised that the proposal would also not be supported on the current application site, yet an application has still been submitted.

The applicant has stated that there is no requirement for them to investigate alternative sites, and whilst the NPPF may not explicitly require alternative site investigation, it is clear that sufficient evidence to justify the proposed development should be submitted and this should include (as referenced above) under para 121, evidence that they have explored the possibility of erecting antennas on an existing building, mast or other structure.

Another two sites were discounted due to a lack of space and insufficient network coverage.

The application is not sited close to a school or college, it would also be in excess of 3km from an aerodrome or airfield and would not otherwise be within a statutory safeguarding zone.

The applicant has provided a certificate which confirms that the proposed installation would be in full compliance with the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidance.

The application is therefore for a determination whether the prior approval of the Council will be required as to the siting and appearance of the installation, as required under paragraph A.3 of the Order.

Prior approval of details

Paragraph 119 of the NPPF requires installations to be kept to a minimum and encourages the reuse of existing electronic communications infrastructure such as existing masts, buildings and other structures. Where new sites are required such as for new 5G networks, equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate.

The adopted Rochdale Core Strategy does not contain any policies specific to telecommunications application given that the NPPF contains a clear expression of Government policy that advanced, high quality communications infrastructure is essential for sustainable economic growth and in this respect there is encouragement to local planning authorities to support the expansion of electronic communication networks, including telecommunications. However Policy DM1 states that proposals should be compatible with surrounding land uses and not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

Policy P1 of the adopted Core Strategy will require high quality design in all new developments and Policy P3 requires all new developments, regardless of location in the borough, to adhere to high standards of design, and enhance the boroughs identity and sense of place by respecting context where it is positive and having regard to the scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access of surrounding buildings and areas in general. The contents of these policies aligns with the contents of Paragraph 135 of the NPPF which states that planning decision should ensure that new development is visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and is sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

In addition to the above, the application site is allocated as protected land and therefore subject to saved UPD policy D10. This establishes that proposals will be permitted if it falls within a number of listed categories that include; development that would be acceptable were it in the green belt, limited infill within an established pocket of housing or industry, where it is in scale with the area and not adversely affect its character or surrounding, or limited to an existing building.

Where new buildings are permitted in Protected Open Lane, they should be sited to form a group with existing building and where this is not possible the should be well screened and unobtrusive in the landscaping.

The application site is also designated as recreational open space, where saved policy G3 establishes that the development of public or private recreational open space for any other purpose will not be permitted unless it meets one of the policies exceptions which include;

- development for a non-commercial use that is ancillary to the recreational use of the area and would not lead to a deficiency in open space.
- Alternative provision of at least the equivalent quantity and quality open space is made
- The development funds improvements to existing outdoor sports facilities
- The development comprises a recreational facility of greater benefit than the open space being lost and does not result in a serious deficiency of open space.

Policy G8 for Greenspace corridors requires that the corridors will be protected and that the Council will not permit development that would:

- Lead to an unacceptable narrowing or division of the corridor
- Result in the loss or severance of links between areas of open space
- Result in the loss of existing recreational facilities or prejudice proposed new facilities
- Prevent public access at strategic locations

Or result in unacceptable harm to

- The better landscape qualities and character of the corridor

- The amenity value of the corridor where it provides welcome relief from urban development, including attractive views in and out of the corridor
- Features of nature conservation interest
- Viable agricultural operations.

Additionally the application site is located 94m from a Grade II listed building. When making a decision on a planning application for development that affects a listed building or its setting, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires local planning authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

The 1990 Act also requires local planning authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. This duty goes beyond just decisions on permissions and applies to the exercise by the local authority in all of its functions under the planning acts.

NPPF paragraph 206 states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting) should require clear and convincing justification.

NPPF paragraph 207 states that 'where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Rochdale CS policy P2 seeks to protect the borough's heritage by conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets, which include listed buildings and conservation areas.

As detailed above, there are significant constraints regarding this site and these were identified by the Council under a pre-application enquiry (ref: PREAPP/00039/23), and where applicants were advised that the siting and appearance of a very similar telecoms development would not be considered acceptable. It is noted that the applicants for the pre-application enquiry and the current application for prior approval are different. However, the pre-application enquiry is referenced in the current submission and it therefore appears that the current applicants and those for the pre-application enquiry have links.

Within the pre-application enquiry the applicants were advised that the existing common is devoid of any built form within its centre, providing a visual break between the properties and particularly the terraces along the eastern and western boundaries. The applicants were also advised that the site is designated as a Greenspace Corridor that provides long range views of the borough to the north, as well as views of Grade II cottages to the north and south. In addition to the impact the proposal would have on adjacent heritage assets, the purpose of the Greenspace Corridor (Saved UDP Policy G/8 (A)) is detailed as 'The Council will not permit development proposals which would result in unacceptable harm to [...] e) the better landscape qualities and character of the corridor' and f) 'the amenity value of the corridor where it provides welcome visual relief from urban development, including attractive views in and out of the corridor'. As a result, the site would be wholly suitable for the proposal.

Through the current application comments have been provided by the Council's Conservation Officer. Through this it is advised that Skye Common follows the route of an historic packhorse trail that linked Rochdale to Clitheroe and it was the

presence of this historic route which resulted in the development of the area as part of the woollen and cotton industry.

As the area has developed there are many surviving examples of the areas agricultural and industrial origins and this is being recognised through a planned Conservation Area that would cover the common and surrounding areas. Plans for this Conservation Area have not yet been formally consulted on but are likely to incorporate the area covered by the application site and key views within the draft documents highlight the importance of the open views across the Common towards both the hills and Rochdale town centre. It is recognised that this draft conservation area currently holds no weight, however the proposals demonstrate the heritage value of the area.

The application site is also in the setting of a pair of Grade II listed weavers cottages. The adjoining property is also a non-designated heritage asset (adjoining cottage no. 100 Syke Road) following its delisting in 2022.

It is noted that no heritage statement, as required under paragraph 200 of the NPPF, has been submitted with the application and no justification for the harm to heritage assets has been provided.

The Conservation Officer has advised that the common forms an important part of the setting of these listed buildings. The textile industry developed along the Common as it was the historic route, linking Rochdale to Cliteroe. The openness of the space and route therefore reinforces the historic links between the common and the weaver's cottages. The common also provides a pleasant and open setting to the listed buildings, making an important positive contribution to their setting and allowing them to take centre stage.

The Conservation Officer has advised that the proposed installation of the 20m mast would be a wholly alien feature within the open landscape, significantly taller than any surrounding structures. Its height, combined with its location in the middle of the Common would make it a highly visible and intrusive feature within the landscape and within the setting of these listed buildings, in particular nos. 101 and 102 Syke Road. The development would detract from the attractive and open setting of the listed building and dominate key views, resulting in less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets.

In addition to the above it is considered that the development would contravene the requirements of policies D/10 and G8. As detailed above, the mast would be a highly visible and intrusive feature within the landscape and this would result in unacceptable harm to the landscape qualities and character of the corridor and as detailed above, it would also significantly detract from the attractive views that are provided into and out of the common., adversely affecting the sites character and surroundings. Additionally, through the Council's designation of the land as recreational space, although the development would not significantly physically restrict the use of the land, its visual and overly prominent presence would detract from the enjoyment of that space.

Further to the above it is considered that the siting and appearance of the 20m mast and associated infrastructure is wholly inappropriate. The mast would appear as a visually prominent structure within the common that would be significantly higher than existing structures. This would represent unacceptable development in protected open land through an adverse impact on the sites character and surrounding landscape. It would also significantly detract from the enjoyment of the common and its designation as recreational open space through the addition of a highly visible and intrusive feature within the landscape. The visual prominence of

the development within an existing open space would furthermore detract from the attractive and open setting of the listed building, dominating key views and resulting in less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets, which has not be justified through a heritage statement. This prominence would also result in unacceptable harm to the landscape quality and character of the designated green space corridor. In light of the above it is considered that the development would result in unacceptable harm to visual amenity and unjustified less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset. The application is therefore contrary to policies P1, P2, P3, D10, G3, G8 and DM1 of the Rochdale Core Strategy.

In addition to the above it is considered that the information provided regarding the discounted options is insufficient and it is considered that insufficient information has been provided with the application to demonstrate that the applicant has adequately explored the possibility of erecting antennas on an existing building, mast or other structure.

Other considerations

Highway Services have advised that the proposed development would be beyond the adopted highway and would be unlikely to cause any visibility issues on the adjacent highway, or cause issues with servicing. There are therefore no highway safety concerns in respect of the development and the application would accord, in this regard, with policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Environmental Services have also confirmed no objections to the application.

Summary

The proposed siting and appearance of the proposed development is not acceptable. The mast and associated infrastructure would result in a prominent new addition to the Cronkeyshaw Common, which is protected open land, a designated green space corridor and recreational open space. This would result in a highly visible and intrusive feature within the landscape that would detract from the existing open setting and dominate key views in and out of the open space and from the adjacent Grade II listed buildings. Furthermore, insufficient information regarding alternative existing masts or buildings has been provided as part of this proposal, as required under paragraph 121 of the NPPF. The application therefore fails to comply with the requirements of paragraph 121 of the NPPF and would conflict with the policies P1, P2, P3, D10, G3, G8 and DM1 of the Core Strategy. Prior approval for siting and appearance is therefore refused.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

1. The proposed installation, by virtue of its height, siting and appearance, would represent an incongruous and dominant feature on Cronkeyshaw Common which currently comprises predominantly open land that is devoid of tall structures. The installation would dominate the Common, resulting in a highly visible and intrusive feature in the landscape, detracting from the open setting and dominating key views in and out of the open space and from the adjacent Grade II listed Buildings, 101 and 102 Syke Road. This would significantly detract from the enjoyment of the common, which is designated Open Space, adversely impact on the landscape and appearance of the Protected Open Land and Greenspace Corridor and result in less than significant harm to the setting of nearby Grade II Listed Buildings. Furthermore,

insufficient information regarding alternative existing masts or buildings has been provided as part of this proposal. The application therefore fails to comply with policies P1, P2, P3, D10, G3, G8 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Notes for Applicant:

INFORMATIVE:

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

002 Site Location Plan – Drawing no ROD154_OL01002_M004 Issue D
100 Existing Site Plan - Drawing no. ROD154_OL01002_M004 Issue D
150 Existing Elevation A - Drawing no. ROD154_OL01002_M004 Issue D
Max Configuration Site Plan - Drawing no. ROD154_OL01002_M004 Issue D
Max Configuration Elevations - Drawing no. ROD154_OL01002_M004 Issue D
Site Specific Supplementary Information
Declaration of Conformity
Developers Notice

Report Author Rachel Carney