

Comments for Planning Application 24/00380/TELCOM

Application Summary

Application Number: 24/00380/TELCOM

Address: Cackets Farm Cackets Lane Cudham Sevenoaks TN14 7QG

Proposal: The installation of a 20m high FLI Pine Tree Tower mast (painted green) accommodating 3no. antennas, 2no. microwave dishes & RRUs, and the installation of 3no. equipment cabinets with ancillary works. (56 DAY CONSULTATION BY TELEFONICA UK LTD REGARDING THE NEED FOR APPROVAL OF SITING AND APPEARANCE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT)

Case Officer: Lawrence Stannard

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Objection

Comment: Dear Mr Stannard

Regarding the proposal to erect a telecom tree mast tower in Cudham on land adjacent to Cackets Farm (ref 24/00380/TELCOM) I would like to express, as a neighbour, my strong objection.

The applicant appears to pursue a 'fourth time lucky' approach as the differences between this application and the previous three rejected applications (DC/20/03365/TELCOM, DC/20/04141/TELCOM and DC/20/01529/TELCOM) are marginal. This proposal negatively affects the openness of the greenbelt and the character of the immediately adjacent Cudham Conservation Area.

The argument that being painted green and being a tree replica makes this mast blend into the landscape and hence prevents it from clashing with the openness of the greenbelt and the character of the immediately adjacent Cudham Conservation Area is hard to follow. Anybody who has ever seen this type of mast in real life or on a photo will agree that they are a far cry from a real tree. At best one perceives them as a mast that tries to pose as a tree, but they remain a mast and need to be treated as such. Given that we are dealing with the greenbelt and a Conservation Area the standards of what constitutes a sympathetic development have to be particularly high and this 20 meters tall mast clearly fails to fulfil them. This type of design might meaningfully reduce visual disturbance when it can be mixed into a very large group of hundreds of trees, when

the eye struggles to pick out the one, odd, fake tree. But this isn't the case here as it is set right next to a group of just a few trees/shrubs and otherwise stands (out) in a large open plain.

It also doesn't help that this plain is crossed by a popular public footpath, as people slowly walk along and would definitely spot the large mast. The mast is therefore not just an issue for me as a neighbour who would overlook it, but also for the wider public whose enjoyment of this unique rural and green part of our borough in general and the Conservation Area in particular would be severely disturbed. Erecting a chunky telecom tower, especially of this height, would materially and adversely change the character of this large, open area and beyond its immediate impact set a precedent which would pave the way over time for a further erosion of the Green Belt and even more the Conservation Area, which ultimately would render it obsolete.

As I pointed out in the context of the previous three rejected applications it is also not credible that from all the sites in the Cudham area the only suitable one is right adjacent to the Conservation Area. And while obviously everybody knows that mobile reception can always be improved, I - as a neighbour directly overlooking the proposed tower and hence one of its main potential beneficiaries in terms of mobile signal strength - am not convinced about the need for such added mobile capacity. Most of the time we have three 4G bars on my phone in our house and garden and in fact our entire internet - which allows for movie streaming - is delivered by 4G rather than broadband.

Many thanks for your time.

Kind regards,
Dirk Wiemer