

From: Planning Support
Subject: FW: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : HGY/2022/2402
Site Address: Outside 550 White Hart Lane London N17 7RQ
Comments by: Irek C
From:
Flat 29, Brian Court
2 Rowland Road

Submission: Objection
Comments: Hello, I object to this proposal for the reasons mentioned below:

1. The attachments to this application are misleading and inaccurate.
2. We have already one 20m tall mast approved in this area (application from 2021 HGY/2021/2455) and current application is requesting permission for the 2nd mast, even closer to the residential area. According to the general policy framework of facilitating the growth of new and existing telecommunications systems, Paragraphs 113 of NPPF, the use of existing masts, buildings and other structure for new electronic communications capability (including wireless) should be encouraged.
3. Looking from the balconies and windows in the residential blocks the mast will be right in the face of the residents located on the upper floors. Mast will not assimilate into the area. Proposed mast will NOT blend with surrounding buildings as it will be much taller from Screwfix building and surrounding trees.
4. Mast will obstruct the view and will not fit in the character of the area.
5. This development will not provide any benefits to the community - in fact the local community will be most affected by the additional mast.
6. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF July 2021) provides a framework within which local people and their representative Councils can shape distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, which reflect the NEEDS and PRIORITIES of their own communities. I hope our needs will be taken into consideration - we don't need this mast and it will bring no benefit to our community. Additionally this project doesn't meet the criteria of sustainable development defined by the planning system - this mast will have no positive impact on economic, social and environmental dimensions.
6. This application does not utilise existing (approved) telecommunication structures and does not represent the optimum environmental solution. It seems the Mast Data register was not accurately examined prior the submission of this application.

7. Location D2 ' White Hart Lane (532262,191484) has been discounted due to unsuitable pavements and visibility splay issues. The location of this application is almost identical to the rejected D2, just on the west site of the building therefore this application needs to be rejected.

8. This location can not be chosen only due to lack of available options and planning constraints - the proposed street pole DOES NOT represent the optimum environmental solution and does not accords with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Kind regards,

Irek C