

**COMMENTS ON 20/00007 (REAR OF 65 CLARENDON WAY/VERGE OF LEESONS HILL, CHISLEHURST)
FROM CLLR KIERAN TERRY**

I have a number of concerns in relation to this proposed development as follows:

Detrimental to the living conditions of neighbours backing on to the application site – an objector living immediately adjacent to the site has kindly provided the Council with site photos from her back garden showing the existing mast. The current feature is a prominent and unpleasant feature, seriously impacting the living conditions of the resident here. An extension of the mast to 12.5m will make the mast even more prominent and have an unacceptable impact on her property.

Application is virtually identical to ones previously refused (10/00752/TELCOM and 10/02986/TELCOM) – it is unreasonable for the applicant to come back with virtually exactly the same proposal as one which has been refused twice. Virtually nothing has been done to overcome these reasons for refusal. I would look more favourably on an application which has made reasonable steps to overcome these reasons.

Application is on a hill so will be clearly visible from a significant distance. The trees are deciduous so will provide very little screening in winter. The proposed mast is also taller than these trees so it will be especially visible from lower down the hill. The mast is also much taller and bulkier than neighbouring street furniture making it, if built, an obtrusive and alien feature in the street scene. It will be noticeable to passers-by and detrimental to the adjacent Area of Special Residential Character.

Supporting appeal decisions back a refusal – I have circulated an appeal decision at Foxgrove Road in Beckenham which is a very similar site, is relatively recent in terms of the decision date and supporting planning policy and shares the fact it is on a hill.

Appeal decision document provided by the applicant is completely irrelevant – this is a fairly arbitrary document about a site in Hampshire which has little resemblance to the application site.

I feel some of these concerns could have been resolved with the applicant before planning – a pre-consultation email was sent out however this was sent to Cray Valley West councillors despite being in Chislehurst ward. As such the first I saw of this was in the application list sent to members. The pre-consultation is recommended

I accept there are some benefits to having additional masts – however this cannot come at any cost and this must be weighed against the environmental impact. In my opinion the damage to the street scene outweighs the benefits of the proposal.