

DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/0191/23/TPN
Proposal: Application for prior approval under Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 for proposed installation of 20m phase 9 street pole supporting 6 no. antennas, 3 no. equipment cabinets and ancillary development thereto including 1 no. GPS module.
Location: Grass Verge at Cauldwell Avenue
South Shields

Site Visit Made: 04/04/2023

Relevant policies/SPDs

1 DM1 - Management of Development

Description of the site and of the proposals

This application seeks prior approval under Part 16 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for the erection of telecommunications equipment located to the northern side of Prince Edward Road adjacent to Lumley Avenue. The proposal seeks to enable CK Hutchison Networks (UK) Ltd (Three) deliver the latest 5G technologies and to provide additional coverage capacity for this area of South Shields.

Proposed works comprise of the installation of a new 20 metre high phase 9 street pole supporting 6 no. antennas, 3 no. equipment cabinets and ancillary development thereto including 1 no. GPS module. The proposed monopole would be steel in grey (RAL 7035) whilst the proposed equipment housing would be of steel and fire green in colour (RAL 6009).

Application details state that the proposal is required due to the upgrade to 5G connectivity within this area of South Shields. The submitted documents state that a 15m monopole was originally explored, however, in order for the proposal to reach operation requirements a height increase was needed. The monopole has been designed to accommodate the heavy 5G antennas and associated Radio Remote Units which are necessary to be placed at the top of the pole.

It should be noted that as part of the application, the applicant has confirmed that they have notified the Council as landowner in accordance with Condition A.3 'Prior Approval' of Part 16 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). This was via correspondence sent to the Local Highway Authority given that the land is adopted highway.

A number of requests for the application go to Planning Committee have been made, however as a decision has to be made within 56 days and the next Planning Committee is after this date, it is not possible to take the application to Committee and a delegated decision needs to be made.

Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date 14/04/2023)

29 neighbours sent direct letters of notification and three site notices posted.

1) Neighbour responses

132 letters of objection have been received from the following properties:

371 Bamburgh Avenue, South Shields (x3)
32 Banbury Terrace, South Shields

36 Banbury Terrace, South Shields
38 Belsay Avenue, South Shields
7 Blagdon Avenue, South Shields
17 Blagdon Avenue, South Shields
30 Blagdon Avenue, South Shields
40 Blagdon Avenue, South Shields
44 Blagdon Avenue, South Shields (x2)
36 Braemar Drive, South Shields
5 Cauldwell Avenue, South Shields
14 Cauldwell Avenue, South Shields
18 Cauldwell Avenue, South Shields
20 Cauldwell Avenue, South Shields (x2)
22 Cauldwell Avenue, South Shields (x2)
25 Cauldwell Avenue, South Shields (x2)
26 Cauldwell Avenue, South Shields (x2)
27 Cauldwell Avenue, South Shields (x3)
29 Cauldwell Avenue, South Shields (x2)
34 Cauldwell Avenue, South Shields
4 Cauldwell Place, South Shields
12 Cauldwell Place, South Shields
20 Cauldwell Place, South Shields
50 Cauldwell Place, South Shields
11 Cauldwell Villas, South Shields
12 Cauldwell Villas, South Shields
14 Cauldwell Villas, South Shields
18 Central Gardens, South Shields
5 Cressida Gardens, Hebburn
4 Hepscott Terrace, South Shields
27 Hepscott Terrace, South Shields
38 Hepscott Terrace, South Shields
41 Hemsley Road, South Shields
50 Hepscott Terrace, South Shields (x2)
54 Hepscott Terrace, South Shields
66 Horsley Vale, South Shields
99 Hyde Street, South Shields
2 King George Road, South Shields
4 King George Road, South Shields (x2)
5 King George Road, South Shields
6 King George Road, South Shields
7 King George Road, South Shields (x3)
8 King George Road, South Shields (x2)
17 King George Road, South Shields
19 King George Road, South Shields
22 King George Road, South Shields (x2)
32 King George Road, South Shields
7 Lindisfarne Road, Hebburn
96 Lumley Avenue, South Shields
1 Morpeth Avenue, South Shields
2 Morpeth Avenue, South Shields
4 Morpeth Avenue, South Shields (x3)
6 Morpeth Avenue, South Shields
7 Morpeth Avenue, South Shields
8 Morpeth Avenue, South Shields (x2)
10 Morpeth Avenue, South Shields (x3)
11 Morpeth Avenue, South Shields (x3)

12 Morpeth Avenue, South Shields
16 Morpeth Avenue, South Shields (x4)
28 Morpeth Avenue, South Shields
34 Morpeth Avenue, South Shields (x2)
36 Morpeth Avenue, South Shields
38 Morpeth Avenue, South Shields
41 Morpeth Avenue, South Shields
48 Morpeth Avenue, South Shields
113 Mortimer Road, South Shields
174 Mortimer Road, South Shields
238 Mortimer Road, South Shields
266 Mortimer Road, South Shields
269 Mortimer Road, South Shields
293 Mortimer Road, South Shields
5 Page Avenue, South Shields
27 Page Avenue, South Shields (x2)
41 Queensland Avenue, South Shields
3 St Aidans Walk, Hebburn
38 St George's Avenue, South Shields
68 Sunderland Road, South Shields (x2)
69 Sunderland Road, South Shields
70 Sunderland Road, South Shields (x2)
72 Sunderland Road, South Shields
187 Temple Park Road, South Shields
10 Tynedale Road, South Shields
21 Warwick Road, South Shields
75 Warwick Road, South Shields
79 Warwick Road, South Shields
83 Warwick Road, South Shields
92 Warwick Road, South Shields
101 Warwick Road, South Shields
102 Warwick Road, South Shields (x2)
112 Warwick Road, South Shields
71 Wheattall Drive, Whitburn

The letters of objection are collectively summarised as follows:

Siting

- It is heart-breaking to think that this mast could be erected in one of the most beautiful areas of South Shields, spoiling one of few conservation areas in our town. I urge the planning committee to please reject this application, for the same reasons as they successfully refused the application in Cleadon Village.
- If the masts must be erected, then put them in industrial or commercial zones, or along highways. Don't put them outside people's homes.
- The proposed site is far too close to residential area.
- It is close to a primary school local shops etc there must be a better location away from properties within South Shields for this mast.
- I would like to object against the decision to install this street pole due to the proximity to residential properties. Another location must be considered for this piece of infrastructure that is not in plain site next to homes and where children live and play.
- It will be an eyesore, completely out of character with the surrounding area, including the beautiful parks and housing estates.

- The structure will present a total eye sore to the neighbourhood. The style of the Victorian houses and the green space at which this structure is planned should be preserved. This structure would be much more suited in more open spaces such as temple park leisure centre where it would be significantly lost in the open and vast unused space. I also believe that such works would drive away and intimidate the little wildlife we have in this green space - because it is not a huge space.
- Objecting to this planning application on the grounds it is the main thoroughfare into the town from all areas, taking away the character that exists now. The boxes that will be installed with it will get graffitied, causing more of an eyesore, the mast is excessive in height, and it will be only a matter of time before additional antennas are added on.
- The mast will ruin the character of the area as it will not fit in with character of the properties.
- The mast and cabinet would be a hazard to children and families who would have to navigate around them. This is a busy route to the schools nearby. The narrow path is often full of pushchairs, children, parents, dogs, bikes etc.
- I strongly object to a 5G mast being placed on the grass verge on Cauldwell Avenue due to the site and appearance, it will look totally out of place and out of keeping with the area.
- Currently the approach to and the roundabout itself with its grassed expanse create a very positive first impression to visitors to the town.
- The positioning of this 5G mast would be a huge disappointment to myself and my family if erected as it would spoil the vibe of the local environment. I strongly object to the positioning of this 5G mast in Cauldwell Avenue. My concerns are of the following, the application is definitely out of keeping with the character of properties in the area. Proposed site is close proximity to residential properties, schools, nurseries, shops and parks.
- It is my understanding that this mast will be extremely close to the boundary of the Westoe Conservation Area, and this is therefore wholly unacceptable. As one of the main routes into the town centre, the grass verge at Cauldwell Avenue is also a much needed green space adjacent to a well used area of natural beauty (Redhead Park). The erection of such an obstructive piece of industrial equipment, together with the series of ugly metal servicing boxes, will spoil the look of the entire area.
- I'm sure this mast would be more suited in an industrial area, the area in which you are planning to erect the mast is near a main road on the way into South Shields which will be an eyesore. You also have the beautiful Redhead Park just across the road from that area. This would not be a good move to erect a mast in this area.
- It is too close to a pleasant residential area of nice aspect with close proximity to a beautiful park and on a grass area which has been used by children for years as a play area.
- The industrial appearance of the mast and associated apparatus is an eye sore that is not in keeping with the existing character of properties within the area, causing visual clutter on a key route into the town centre.
- The site is totally inappropriate, given it is all residential and surrounded by nurseries, schools and parks. It is also a main route into town and would surely put off much needed visitors to our declining town centre.
- The proposed site is a well kept green area adjacent to the Redhead Park. The council recently planted a rose garden on the adjoining verge to upgrade the area.
- The proposed equipment would totally spoil the aesthetics of the area and is certainly not in keeping with the current surroundings.
- It will be an eye sore for those passing, playing and living in the area and is likely to cast shadow over gardens and houses surrounding it. There are more appropriate sites within the local area.
- To propose erection of a 20m monstrosity in what is a lovely part of South Shields, the entrance to the historic Westoe Village and one of the main routes in to South Shields centre for locals and visitors beggars belief and I would ask you to note my and my families strong objections to this.
- It would stick out like a sore thumb in this location, and on one of the main routes to the town centre/sea front it would become an unmissable eyesore - hardly what locals or visitors want to see in what is currently a lovely area of the town.

- A 20m mast is not in keeping with the rest of the area and is quite frankly a terrible idea.
- We believe that the proposed development would have a negative effect on the neighbourhood - and indeed on the aesthetics of this main thoroughfare into South Shields.
- The place what has been proposed for the location is totally inappropriate. It's in the middle of a grassed area in a nice leafy area.
- This proposed antenna installation is in absolutely the wrong place. It is right next to private housing It would stand at double the height of nearby houses, dominating the outlook for nearby residents.
- The mast will be an ugly sight from my house and will have a negative impact on the tone of the surrounding area of period housing and greenery. The mast will be detrimental to the characterisation of the historic landscape and will not blend in with the look of the surrounding houses and landscape.
- The site is totally inappropriate, given it is all residential and surrounded by nurseries, schools and parks. It is also a main route into town and would surely put off much needed visitors to our declining town centre.
- The height of the mast is above the adjacent tree tops and is of a much greater diameter than neighbouring street lighting posts, this with the ground unit is not in keeping with the local environment and is visually unpleasant.
- The appearance of this mast will be unsightly and will detract from the natural beauty of the trees area opposite the park and will undoubtedly devalue properties close to it.
- Strongly object to this plan as I believe it is not in keeping with the area. It will be total domination and ugly to all visitors to the redhead park and harton cemetery and the local residents.
- The mast will be an ugly addition and I have major concerns that a mast would be within short distance to a children's play area with the park. The mast would be an unwanted addition to an otherwise attractive residential area with historic character.
- It will be located approx 150m from Westoe Village - Grade II listed status (entry ref 1277142) and visible from this area.
- Whilst communication poles are necessary, the lower type should be used in domestic situations, and poles of this height located at less sensitive or in a shielded location, ie by trees in the nearby park or amongst the college buildings.
- The mast would be completely out of keeping with the local area, which includes the popular Readhead Park as well as the historic Westoe Village.

Appearance

- Unsightly monstrosity.
- Not aesthetically pleasing.
- It is unconscionable that ugly, obstructive industrial equipment is being erected in any residential area. As has happened all over the country, 5G masts are targeted heavily with graffiti, meaning our lovely streets will likely be made even more unsightly. It's as if we just don't care what our towns and villages look like anymore.
- The height of two lamp posts is far too big for the area.
- This is directly behind my house and will be a massive eye sore to the view from my window and the view of thjs area in general.
- This proposal for a 20m 5G mast will be very visually unpleasant. It will be twice the height of surrounding houses and greenery.
- Out of keeping to the character of these houses.
- This site is completely inappropriate and its appearance is too industrial.
- I do not agree with the proposed planning structure. It will look unsightly and stand out in the wrong way. It will take the beauty away from the green.
- The mast is obtrusive, industrial in appearance, out of proportion with the locality, not in keeping with the area.

- The proposed height of 20M for the mast will dwarf the local trees and all nearby properties. The ugly industrial appearance is out of keeping with the quiet residential properties in the area. The mast and apparatus would cause inappropriate visual clutter.
- Object to this proposal, it is out of proportion to the surrounding area. It is unsightly and overbearing.
- Dominate the skyline, damage the community and be an eyesore
- The proposed mast is 20m in height which will dwarf the nearby buildings and local trees, additionally causing a distraction to passing drivers on a busy road.
- It's going to be a huge ugly site, which is going to be a lot higher than the surrounding buildings, it's going to look totally out of place in what is at the moment a lovely residential area.
- A 20 metre high telecommunications mast, along with its apparatus, would look completely out of place in a pleasant residential area such as this, and I think it would look rather ugly and something of an eyesore, not only for local people, but also for visitors and passers by, as it is on one of the main entry routes into the town centre.
- I also consider the appearance of the associated equipment cabinets, etc to be inappropriate within this grassed residential area. A single, bricked enclosure to house the cabinets and maybe the base of the mast would be more aesthetically in-keeping with this location.
- The mast will be a considerable eye sore and have a damaging impact on the areas reputation.
- The size and scale of the proposed structure makes this location visually inappropriate; a 20m high tower will dwarf the whole area, creating an eyesore for all to see.
- I object to this construction in this area. The surrounding properties are Victorian Terraces and of other historic significance in the area. The proposed site is seen from the road, the park, will be seen by children going to and from school. It will be an eyesore in the area.
- The 20m pole would tower above the existing properties and be visually dominant on the skyline.
- The mast is far too big to be even considered with it being twice the height of a lamppost.
- The size, height, shape, proportion, design and layout of buildings, paths and spaces all have a part to play which interact with the area's social features. The mast would not fit in with the local area.
- The industrial appearance of the mast is out of keeping with the character of properties in the area.
- The mast and apparatus will cause inappropriate visual clutter and are sited on a key entry route to the town centre.
- The proposal will negatively impact the area by introducing an incongruous feature that is out of scale, character and context.
- The mast and apparatus will cause inappropriate visual clutter. It would be ugly, intrusive and not in keeping with the surroundings.
- The siting and appearance of the proposed installation would have a harmful visual impact on the character and appearance of the area by reason of its height, size, design and position which is exacerbated by the sites highly visible location.

Health Concerns

- I object to this due to the concern over health fears as being investigated by the health service and scientists.
- The health risks of 5G masts are unknown, which is concerning.
- I object to the installation of this mast it is far too near to Mortimer primary school and may have a detrimental impact on children's health.
- I object to this going ahead as we are local residents and don't want to live within a 5g mast area due to unforeseen health issues that could develop.

- I don't agree with this also being so close to schools as a lot of research suggests that 5g masts may have health effects.
- The proposed area is close to a school and nursery and research shows that these masts are causing concern to scientists and health care professionals. I do not think it is acceptable to erect something where there are growing concerns around health risks in an area next to schools and children.
- Another location should be considered that is not on the doorstep of many children as this is a long standing debate where there are health concerns associated with these structures. Some older children play on the grassed area here and have done for many years, has their health been considered during this application?
- Object to application due to the potential health risks, this would have to the area. The proposal is where there is a large footfall of both children and adults accessing the park and cemetery, as well as infant, primary and secondary school children making their way to and from school along with their guardians.
- Aside from the associated health risks that are linked with living close to this type of electrical tower (an increase in certain types of cancer is the main worry) it is only 380 metres from the local primary school. This is far too close!
- Health risks of 5G are unknown but press releases have indicated that health experts and scientists have expressed growing concerns. I to with my family also are uncomfortable with what a 5G mast would result being erected near my home.
- I object to people being subject to vast amounts of radiation, it is known that radiation exposure levels within 500m of a mast increases the risk of neurological symptoms, headaches and loss of memory and learning capabilities, especially in children
- According to the World Health Organisation there is limited research to date on the health effects of 5G Electromagnetic radiation. Installation of this tower, so close to residential property, schools and parks, could be a potential health risk.
- I object to this plan for 5g mast as I have concerns about the health of my children, as a local resident. It is extremely close to a large primary school (Mortimer) and West Park Nursery, so I do not feel this is an appropriate place for such a new technology.
- There is no high quality research about the effects of 5G on health. Scientists have concerns about the density of transmitters needed with 5G and the potential impact of this density on health. The BMJ (British Medical Journal) states that more research is needed prior to full scale roll out.
- The Potential Health Impacts of these Mast's are as yet Un-Known. An Increasing number of Health Experts and Scientists are voicing their concerns with regards to the Potential Detrimental Health Impacts of 5G.
- The longer term impact of 5G technology is unknown, please note that I am not a conspiracy theorist but the wider scientific community are still unsure about the longer term safety of 5G technology.
- The health risks are unknown and it is in close proximity to houses, schools, nurseries and parks where children live, learn and play.
- Health experts are still uncertain as to the risk of cancer from the radiation coming from these masts, so not only does it affect the residents, but also the schoolchildren going to Mortimer Road, and people using the Redhead Park.
- Health risks of 5G are currently unknown and the proposed mast is due to be erected near schools, the college, the local park and shops, local residences as well as a busy roundabout and through way into town. An increasing number of health experts and scientists are voicing their concerns over the effects of this technology.
- I object to this planning application. The mast will be too near to housing and a school for primary age children. As well as having a detrimental effect on brain development it will be an eyesore in the surrounding environment. Surely there are more appropriate places to have this mast if it is actually necessary at all.
- Doctors and scientists are calling for a halt on 5G due to serious health and environmental concerns on largely untested technology.

- Object to this as health effects are yet unknown and increase in health experts and scientists concern around 5g.
- Health risks from 5G are unknown, with increasing numbers of health experts and scientists growing concerned.
- The mast would have an imposing and overbearing impact on the amenity of the nearby area causing local residents unnecessary upset and anxiety, impacting the quality of the local area.
- Also does anyone have any knowledge as to whether or not the emissions can cause cancer or other diseases? The council needs to look at every aspect including the fact that young children and other residents living in the area will be walking past the mast on a daily basis. At present there are young children who live close by, playing on the grass with the trees on it.
- It is completely unacceptable to have a 5g mast (which has various cancer related medical concerns) so close to so many homes and a school.
- I walk my grandchildren daily to school and baby sit them who live in close proximity to this and I am worried about their health in the future about an untested technology.
- The H&S issues to mental and physical health caused by the close proximity of 5G technology is still unproven that it is safe or otherwise. Until such time as the argument is settled the siting of such apparatus should be de-risked.
- This proposed location disregards health and safety to people and animals and is too close to residential areas and public spaces alike.
- Whilst health implications are not grounds for objection to the proposed siting of the mast, I must state that the quantity of verified research into the health problems that these masts can pose is causing me significant anxiety and stress, particularly due to having very young children in the house. The mental health toll that this proposal is taking not only on myself but also on fellow neighbours should not be disregarded. Should the mast be erected I feel I will constantly be wondering "what if?" the research is accurate and the children are being exposed to potentially harmful signals every day.
- The rapid mass roll out of 5G masts is evidence that the government have prioritised commercial interests over human health and news organizations have failed to inform the public what the scientific community thinks. This public-health experiment has been conducted without the informed consent of its subjects. This is wrong, irresponsible and needs to be addressed as a matter of great urgency. When public trust and confidence in local and national government is at an all time low. When the NHS is struggling to cope, when we have an ageing population, an obesity epidemic and a mental health crisis we can't afford any more people to become ill! Surely we should err on the side of caution and not encourage the mass roll out of 5G masts on every corner. We should be encouraging people to be active, in their environment, interact with others, exercising, gardening, anything that promotes health and well being rather than encouraging them to spend more time on their phones, computers and being isolated from the real world.
- 5G is the biggest biological experiment in human history because it has never been tested for health or safety and humanity are the guinea pigs. There's been no public debates and there is overwhelming evidence that 5G radiation is a threat to all life on earth. Thousands of peer review studies going back as far as the 1930's show that "Exposure to RF/MW is known to have a biological effect on animals and humans. Damage to major organs, disruption of important biological processes and the potential risk of cancer represent the dangers of RF/MW radiation to living organisms". Please read the peer reviewed in-house report from June 1994 from Air Force Material Command Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, titled 'RADIOFREQUENCY/MICROWAVE RADIATION BIOLOGICAL EFFECTS AND SAFETY STANDARDS: A REVIEW'. 5G exposes everyone to tens to hundreds of times more radiation than 4G because it uses millimeter waves that are dangerous for eyes causing (cataracts), it's the primary cause of cancer, heart disease and diabetes and deadly to insects. Moreover it's been established that 5G base stations and devices emit laser like beams that drive the millimetre waves into the body altering people's DNA through sweat glands. These beams

can also penetrate through buildings too. Research has shown that we have lost 80% of the insect population because of this silent invisible bioweapon 5G and the powers that be are hiding the catastrophic fallout from humanity and blaming global warming when nothing is further from the truth. Over 10,000 peer reviewed studies prove that biological effects occur even at zero power levels. It's the informational content-the frequencies, pulsations and modulation patterns and not just the power levels that cause the harm. This is what makes 5G so dangerous. Looking at some of the evidence, I ask you" why would the council even consider putting one of these 5G towers right next to schools in a built up populated area that has proven to cause catastrophic harm to humanity.

- I am concerned however regarding the effects on wild life and the local human population about the as yet unknown effects of the silent and unseen products that emanate from the mast when in use. All such matters need to be either proved as either hazardous, or harmless, before any agreement is considered.
- Whilst I appreciate there is no conclusive evidence that the radiation emitted by 5G masts damages people's health, there is also no conclusive evidence that it does not. Siting such a large mast in a residential area close to a primary school will cause serious worry and anxiety for many residents.
- I am concerned about the possible health risks of this largely untested 5G technology, bearing in mind that the proposed site for this mast is in close proximity to schools, nurseries, shops and parks, as well as many residential properties. I have read that increasing numbers of doctors and scientists have concerns about this, and have called for a halt on the rolling out of this technology, until these health concerns can be addressed.
- How confident are you that this will not cause death due to its positioning of strong winds cause it to fall on to neighbouring homes and one of the main entry routes into South Shields?
- An installation of this size will be detrimental to people's mental health due to the despoiling of a precious green space and the visual ugliness of the tower.

Highway Safety

- You would be creating an accident hotspot by people focusing on this tower (Target Fixation) instead of watching the flow of traffic.
- This is one of the major roads leading into the town & I am sure people would not want to remember South Shields because of a giant mast erected in a housing estate, instead of viewing trees & grass.
- The proposed site is adjacent to a very busy roundabout. A 20m high mast will undoubtedly catch the eye of motorists attempting to negotiate the roundabout causing distraction and leading to increased risk to road safety.
- The danger to traffic will be immeasurable. During peak times the traffic flow is extremely intense. A 20m telephone mast will be a major distraction, not to mention the requisite maintenance vehicles causing further tailbacks particularly at times when school children are passing to access local schools or returning home.
- I have witnessed emergency vehicles having difficulty navigating the roundabout due to excessive traffic flow. Your proposal to erect a huge mast will undoubtedly exacerbate that major (on occasions life threatening) issue.
- The area proposed aligns a busy roundabout and access vehicles servicing the mast will cause an obstruction to passing traffic, particularly cars using the back lanes of Sunderland Road for access to car parking areas on Morpeth Avenue. This particular route is already very dangerous. The erection of the mast will obstruct the views of cars leaving the back lanes to join Cauldwell Avenue and will potentially cause a serious accident.
- It could also provide a distraction to motorists negotiating the busy Cauldwell roundabout.

Other Matters

- Property devaluation
- There could also be future implications and impact upon housing values.
- It will become a target for vandals & graffiti, which again is not what you would desire for this area
- Very likely to have a negative impact on the value and desirability of our local properties.
- With it being so close to redhead park also this might affect the eco system of a lot of wildlife.
- Maintenance vehicles parked in Cauldwell Avenue could cause H&S issues with traffic congestion on a busy main arterial route roundabout. Cauldwell Avenue is on the school run and has the usual peak traffic times.
- I am concerned that the mast and equipment may have an adverse impact on local wildlife, birds, insects, trees, etc. We have owls, bats, squirrels and foxes in the local area and the size and the scale of the structure raises concern for wildlife and biodiversity.

Officer comment – *Property devaluation, possible vandalism are not a material planning consideration.*

Joint comments from Cllr Anne Best and Former Cllr Anne Hetherington (ward member for Westoe)

We contend that the application is in contravention of South Tyneside Council's Development Management Policies DM1 A, B, C and G as well as DM 6 B and DM7 B.

The application is 5 metres higher than that proposed in the pre-planning application sent to local elected members. This dramatically raises the structure above tree lines and sight lines.

The developer did not respond to e-mailed objections sent on 15th March 2023 by Cllr Anne Hetherington. In fact, in their papers stated no response had been received from Cllr Hetherington.

Road & Pedestrian Safety - The proposed location sits on the boundary of the West Park and Westoe Wards, at one of five entrances to a large and busy gateway roundabout. The roundabout serves traffic destined specifically for South Tyneside (Tyne Coast) College, Harton Cemetery, Readhead Park, Mortimer Community College and Mortimer Primary School as well as the shopping areas at Westoe and Harton and the Westoe Conservation Area. Cauldwell roundabout, on Sunderland Road, forms part of a major bus route into South Shields Town Centre, a route which is currently being upgraded as part of the Transforming Cities initiative. The proposed monopole, with its disproportionate height and presence, proximity to the roundabout and its associated cabinets, will provide a significant visual distraction for motorists and pedestrians and could compromise road and pedestrian safety.

To one side of the proposed location, the back lane that joins Morpeth Avenue to Cauldwell Avenue, is already difficult for motorists, as the entrance forms at a right-angle, making incoming cars from the southern end of the lane totally unseen until northerly traffic clears the end of the lane. The monopole would be in the direct forward sight line of the motorists heading south and would prove a significant visual distraction, at a time when they need to be looking fully right to avoid oncoming cars and delivery vehicles seeking to enter the lane from the south side. Even a momentary lapse of concentration or a visual diversion at this difficult point on the lane could result in an accident for both motorists and pedestrians.

Proximity to a Conservation Area - The proposed location is only separated from the Westoe Conservation Area by the three streets of Morpeth and Blagdon Avenues and Hepscoot Terrace. The location also sits on one side of Sunderland Road, which forms part of the Westoe Conservation Area itself at the north end. There are buildings on Sunderland Road just along from the proposed location which have Article 4 directions and the conservation area itself contains numerous listed buildings and historically significant structures. The very close proximity of this proposed Monopole at the entrance to the Westoe Conservation area will detract significantly from the historic nature and identity of the area,

as it is overbearing, incongruous and distracting. This makes the proposed location totally unsuitable for such a structure, yet no mention is made in the application that it is so close to the Westoe Conservation Area. In a recent planning application, which was refused along the road from this proposed location, the officer stated that "Development must be viewed in terms of the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area." We very much contend that this monopole will have a significantly detrimental impact on the character and appearance of an area which sits directly adjacent to the Conservation area boundary. The Character Appraisal previously undertaken for the Westoe Conservation Area stated that it benefits from a "low density green feel". This proposed monopole would be completely out of sync with the character of the Cauldwell area, which is effectively a close extension of that valued character area.

Interference with Already-agreed Community Improvements - We are currently awaiting funding estimates that establish and acknowledge the status of Cauldwell Roundabout as an important gateway, seeing further development of the roundabout as a major, welcoming, feature for South Shields, with significant investment in planting and feature structures on the roundabout itself. The installation of such an incongruous and overbearing structure as a huge monopole on one side of the roundabout would greatly harm the visual impact and the benefits of this important piece of community development in the Cauldwell area.

Potential Impact on wildlife and green spaces - The application ignores the significant potential impact on the important green spaces adjacent to the location and the wildlife that inhabits the area. We understand that the higher frequencies used in 5G technologies can be harmful to insects, birds, bats, and other wildlife nearby. The very close proximity to the rich array of wildlife inhabiting both the Readhead Park and Harton Cemetery as well as in the trees surrounding the proposed monopole cannot be ignored, yet there is no ecology impact assessment associated with this application. South Tyneside Council has recently declared an Ecology Emergency, to protect and nurture our green spaces and wildlife, supporting the Council's mission to create strong communities, where people live in clean, green spaces. The installation of such powerful technology so close to our large green spaces at this proposed location is not acceptable on that basis.

The Cauldwell area has been a focal point in the approach to South Shields town Centre for decades and was reconstructed and remodeled after severe bomb damage sustained in WW2. The grassed verge areas, the open and green expanse of the roundabout area, mature trees, and wide road layout, flanked by the Readhead Park and the tree-lined avenue of Cemetery approach, as well as Harton Cemetery itself, is a collective haven for wildlife, including owls, bats, squirrels, foxes, woodpeckers, hedgehogs and a wide variety of wild birds, and for families and community activities. Anything that could adversely impact on the enjoyment by the general public of the Cauldwell area should be robustly challenged. We believe that a thorough environmental impact and ecology impact assessment should be/should have been carried out.

There is potential damage to the health of trees from mast radiation, yet this application actually promotes the siting of a powerful mast right amongst mature and established trees which are a feature of the Cauldwell and Westoe community and a habitat for local wildlife.

Proximity to homes - We believe that the required distance needed to reduce radiation exposures to the public from this technology at a precautionary level of 100 microwatts per metre squared is around a quarter of a mile (1320 feet or 400 metres). The proposed siting of this mast is extremely close to homes on three sides, and as such could pose a risk to residents living in and around those homes. Given the major concerns and uncertainty of many residents and citizens about the safety of 5G masts, we ask that this application be assessed robustly by the Director of Public Health, so that an evidence base can be provided to determine whether there is an incompatible and unacceptable proposed use of the site. PHE guidance states that radiofrequency radiation is regulated through Planning policy. Furthermore, the European Electronic Communications Code, brought into UK law in December 2020, has clauses on public health. This provides that local authorities should make human public health their imperative and should reconcile environmental and public health concerns under the code.

Radio-based stations can be noisy if high revolution-per-minute fans are fitted to the chips at a cool temperature. Such activity would impede on the residents living in close proximity to the proposed mast.

In respect of residents living immediately adjacent to the proposed site, whilst it is understood that technology should be accessible and of the best quality, this should never be to the detriment of residents' ability to enjoy the homes they choose carefully for their families, or to the sudden loss of visual amenity which would be imparted upon them by the location of a 20m high mast, easily visible from their windows, doors and gardens, which is overbearing, given the scale and proximity of the homes adjacent. These homes are also of period architectural interest, bought at high value, in a sought-after area of the town and there is a real risk that the homes of these residents could be made less desirable and even devalued at a time when families are already facing significant financial pressures. Such a situation could be highly detrimental to the wellbeing and mental health of families who feel they could suffer material losses if this mast is placed too close to their homes.

Residents near this location say they have previously been informed by the Council that the area of amenity grassland on which it is proposed to site the mast is protected in such a way that prevented the provision of car parking spaces for local residents. They therefore assert that it is equally unacceptable to dedicate an entire area of this public amenity to a private telecommunications company.

Residents have told us that they strongly believe that the mast and its cabinets would act as an attraction for graffiti and vandalism. This belief is completely borne out by damaging, costly and frequent attacks on telephony cabinets and also private and public property throughout the area of Westoe and West Park. Indeed, the problem has not only been repeatedly dealt with by South Tyneside Council at their cost, but also discussed numerous times at the Community Area Forums for the area. The Council is about to undertake a Scrutiny Commission to tackle this neighbourhood blight. We should not be expecting residents to face the prospect of intentionally siting cabinets so close to their homes. Residents also fear that such a prominent structure could attract unwanted attention from environmental activists to their street, which is an otherwise quiet, family neighbourhood. Residents have also expressed their view that they believe the proliferation of such huge masts in very close proximity to homes creates an unwanted precedent, potentially overwhelming neighbourhoods.

Precedent - On the 4th of January 2023, South Tyneside Council's Planning Committee refused permission for a shorter mast (18metres) in the Cleadon area, citing excessive height, proximity to a Conservation Area, incongruous visual clutter and proximity to homes. This proposed mast is even higher than the one that was robustly refused and meets the same criteria as those listed for refusal of that application. We strongly believe this sets a clear and undeniable precedent and that this Cauldwell application cannot be approved, given the stark similarities between the two sites.

On this occasion, and for the reasons outlined above, we strongly object to the siting of this mast at the proposed location and ask the Planning Committee to robustly reject the application.

Support (x2)

- I think it is great to see 5G arriving in my local area. The location chosen is away from people's houses and is in my view a suitable location. There is already a green telecoms box on this site. The mast may be a tall piece of infrastructure but we need to embrace new technologies. I hope that this mast is approved so that I can enjoy faster 5G connectivity in my home.
- Excellent to see infrastructure improvements, and better accessibility to high speed data. As an occasional visitor to the park, it's good to know the coverage in the area will be improved. Hopefully we will see more of these popping up.

2) Other Consultee responses

Transport Development Officer (as Local Highway Authority) – In respect of our consideration of the proposal, the Highway Authority has no objection in principle to the proposal. The usual Streetworks processes will be required regarding any installation of the facility and associated works.

Assessment

The prior approval process

Before installing certain telecommunications apparatus under permitted development rights an electronic communications code operator must apply to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether their 'prior approval' of the siting and appearance of the development is required - as set out in Schedule 2 Part 16 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). A prior approval determination is therefore not the same as an application for planning permission in terms of decision making as the Council must only consider the siting and design of the development.

The Council must make its decision within 56 days of receiving the application on the acceptability of the siting and appearance, or the applicant may proceed to erect the proposal as permitted development.

Siting

The proposal would be located within a predominantly residential area at Cauldwell Avenue, South Shields. Application details state that the mast has been sited and designed in order to provide 5G coverage and to fill the hole in coverage for this mobile network. Alternative locations were considered but the mast must be in a position where it can be physically constructed and not interfere with existing underground services and the existing sites are struggling to cope with demand and an increase in capacity is required. The submitted documents also state that a 15m high mast was considered however the mast would not be able to fulfil its operational requirements at 15m.

Comments were received regarding the proximity the mast would be to the highway and that it could potentially create an obstruction to nearby vehicles. The Council's Transport Development Officer responding in their capacity as Highway Authority confirmed that they had no objection in principle to the proposal.

The applicant's agent has confirmed that the site selection was progressed in accordance with the applicant's license obligations, guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (February 2019) and the Code of Best Practice, and is the only feasible site within the locality. Six other sites were considered due to the cell search area, however these were discounted for various reasons including residential amenity issues, impacts to overhead services and overhanging tree canopies.

Numerous neighbours have objected to the proposed location, citing the infrastructure should be located at alternate locations and that a mast has already been approved at Temple Park Road (adj to Ascot Gardens) and another constructed along Stanhope Road which are in very close proximity to the mast proposed on Cauldwell Avenue however these masts are some distance away and deliver 5G connectivity for other areas of South Shields.

Comments were received regarding the adverse impact the mast would have on the Westoe Village Conservation Area. The proposed mast would be located more than 200m from the Conservation Area which is a sufficient distance.

Objections were received regarding the potential impact the mast would have on biodiversity and wildlife/. The area the mast would be constructed on is a flat grassed area with no designations or constraints in terms of biodiversity.

It is therefore considered that the siting of the mast is acceptable.

Appearance

The main visual impact of the proposal would be the fact that the new monopole would be relatively high at 20 metres (and so approximately ten metres taller than the tallest streetlight within the vicinity of the site, and approximately nine metres taller than the adjacent mature trees). 5G radio technologies operate in higher frequency bands than older technologies, and so attenuation of the radio signal is naturally higher. This means the frequencies do not travel as far as those frequencies currently in use and consequently not all of the existing sites can be upgraded. The design of the column resembles as closely as possible other existing vertical structures within the immediate area, including lighting columns. However, numerous residents have raised concerns regarding the proposed appearance of the infrastructure, considering it to be an eyesore.

Despite the height of the monopole, it is considered that the proposal including the equipment cabinets and associated development would be of an acceptable appearance. Evidence has been submitted demonstrating that the proposed monopole would be of the least visually intrusive design possible to enable technologies to operate efficiently due to the required cell search area. The equipment cabinets would be small in scale and so would also have an acceptable visual impact. Both the monopole and equipment cabinets would be of an acceptable colour (grey and green). The proposed monopole would be viewed within the context of built development, lighting columns and mature trees and views of the monopole would in part be screened by such features in terms of views from the surrounding area. The proposed monopole would be positioned opposite a secondary side gable elevation of the nearest dwelling to the south with the main front and rear elevations of that dwelling not directly overlooking the monopole. The closest dwellings to the north and west also do not have principal elevations that directly overlook the site of the proposed monopole and there is also some tree planting between such dwellings and the application site that would partially screen views of the monopole from these properties. The rear elevations of dwellings further to the north on Morpeth Avenue do directly overlook the site of the proposed monopole but this is at a distance of 30 metres which is considered acceptable. Whilst it cannot be denied that the 20 metre high monopole would have some visual impact due to its height, bearing in mind all of the above its appearance is not considered to be so detrimental as to warrant refusal of the application.

ICNIRP declaration

A number of residents have raised concerns with the proposal being a risk to health. Paragraph 118 of the NPPF clearly states that *“Local Planning Authorities must determine applications on planning grounds. They should not seek to prevent competition between different operators, question the need for the telecommunications system, or determine health safeguards if the proposal meets International Commission guidelines for public exposure.”* Paragraph 118 of the NPPF also clearly states that Local Planning Authorities should not set health safeguards different from the International Commission guidelines for public exposure.

The applicant has confirmed that the proposal conforms to current government guidelines regarding health safeguards. An ICNIRP declaration has been submitted with the application, which declares that the proposal is designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency (RF) public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) for public exposure. In this regard, it is not considered any health safeguards in excess of those permitted within government guidelines are considered to arise as a result of the proposal.

Summary

For the reasons articulated above, it is considered that the siting and appearance of the proposal would be acceptable.

In assessing this application due regard has been had to the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

Recommendation

Prior Approval Required & Given

Conditions

N/A

Informatives

- 1 In dealing with this application the Council has implemented the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework to seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.
- 2 The proposed development lies within a coal mining area which may contain unrecorded coal mining related hazards. If any coal mining feature is encountered during development, this should be reported immediately to the Coal Authority on 0345 762 6848.

Further information is also available on the Coal Authority website at:
www.gov.uk/government/organisations/the-coal-authority

- 3 NOTE TO APPLICANT

The applicant is advised that any apparatus should be removed from the land on which it is situated as soon as reasonably practicable after it is no longer required for electronic communications purposes. Such land should be restored to its condition before the development took place, or to any other condition as may be agreed in writing between the Local Planning Authority and the developer.

List of plans for standard note

Plan Reference

Drg. No. STY22972_NA_NA_M001_H3G_DNSW_GA_A Issue A – 210 Proposed Site - Received 16/03/2023

Drg. No. STY22972_NA_NA_M001_H3G_DNSW_GA_A Issue A – 260 Proposed Site Elevation A - Received 16/03/2023

Drg. No. STY22972_NA_NA_M001_H3G_DNSW_GA_A Issue A – 002 Site Location Plan - Received 16/03/2023

Case officer: E. Thomas

Signed: E. Thomas

Date: 10/05/2023

Authorised Signatory: G.Horsman

Date: 11/05/2023

«END»