

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4559/P	Francis Fawcett	29/11/2020 12:40:13	OBJ	<p>Strong objection to the proposals, on several grounds listed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Negative impact on Conservation Area &amp; setting of Listed Buildings: The proposed masts would still be unattractive, negative features. They fail to “enhance and preserve the character of the conservation area”; negative impact on several listed buildings nearby.</li> <li>2. Ugly features seen from within Haddo House Estate: From my front door (Clanfield, in the same estate as Haddo House) I see the full extent of the roofline of Haddo House (uninterrupted by any trees), and the masts would look highly visible and ugly from my view.</li> <li>3. Intrusive skyline features in a prominent location: For other local residents and visitors, the siting on Haddo House rooftop will lead to them appearing as very noticeable, intrusive features from both short/medium distances, as well as distant views where it appears on the skyline. As a taller building than any others nearby, it is a prominent local landmark and this will only highlight the new masts.</li> <li>4. Overly selective photomontage views: The submitted photomontages and claims of screening from trees are disingenuous and overly selective, as there are plenty of other locations where unobstructed views of Haddo House roofline are available (e..g point 2, above)</li> <li>5. No accreditation of Heritage Impact Assessment: it is not specified who wrote this report, so it seems clear that it was not by a qualified heritage consultant. As the author seemingly had no qualifications, professional memberships or relevant experience to make the assessment - the assessment cannot be seen as a reliable or objective report on the actual impact on local heritage.</li> <li>6. Possible health effects on residents: as a nearby resident, I am uncomfortable with the unknown impacts of high-power radio masts on nearby residents. This impact would seem particularly great for the residents of the upper floors of Haddo House. It seems unfair to put them, and those living nearby, at potential risk to health.</li> <li>7. Over-stated claims of significant Public Benefit: the masts seems to only relate to the O2 network - will not “plug the gap” in all networks, so public benefit limited only to those who use that network</li> <li>8. Alternative mast locations not fully explored: It is peculiar that the applicant has chosen to reapply at this location, but not at previously refused location D1 (refused 2017). In the “Supplementary Information” report, alternative locations D5 (among trees) and D7 (Amey Depot) seem like interesting, potentially more discreet locations - it would have been worth the applicant submitting a preapplication with a design proposal for each location, in order to understand the implications of each site. It appears that these alternative sites have been disregarded at an early stage without proper consideration - perhaps because it would be “easier” and cheaper to install &amp; maintain on an existing tall structure, compared to if they needed to build a new mast.</li> </ol>
2020/4559/P	Ben Ackland	28/11/2020 17:38:05	OBJ	This proposal or similar has been rejected before. All of the original objections remain.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4559/P	Pinal	28/11/2020 11:48:22	OBJ	

Please find below my objection for planning application 2020/4559/P :

Firstly, I wish to strongly object because I have a clear view of the skyline and of Haddo House, any addition to their roof would destroy my view and visually clutter the skyline as well as the roof of the building.

Secondly, I am a teacher and often have to deal with children being distracted by their mobile phones instead of concentrating on their learning. A mobile phone is a tool, instead it has become an addiction and as adults and people in positions of responsibility we must make considered decisions for the greater good. I'm not against technology, it has a time and place. Studies show how addictive they are and phone data analysis allows us to see our daily usage - often I'm shocked with the amount of pick-ups I have and I consider myself to be aware. There needs to be a switch off time, all you are delivering is more and more and at which point will it ever be enough? Who is driving this need to have faster, better phones, to compare ourselves to others? The companies who have something to gain - let's be clear profit is the driving force.

Thirdly, you must treat people with respect. Residents have clearly objected and have the right to live with the knowledge that they get to decide how they wish to live in their homes.

Lastly, it seems Waldons are hell bent on pushing through this application as quick as possible and I ask myself why? EE as a service provider has a large percentage of coverage in the area, Vodafone and O2 the least, the rushing through smacks of a desire to monopolise the area, they are trying to do this quickly and without due care for the conservation area. We know this because of the ugly, careless, thoughtless design submitted in this and the previous planning application.

2020/4559/P	A Richardson	29/11/2020 21:26:51	OBJ	This proposed development would present an unacceptable visual intrusion in a Conservation Area. It would be quite out of character for the neighbourhood whilst also destroying and dominating the skyline.
2020/4559/P	Jason Gormley	27/11/2020 10:42:02	OBJ	Please turn down this application. These plans compromise the aesthetic look of a beautiful building in a conservation area, potentially compromise the health of residents, and financially injure leaseholder properties.