

**Hutchinson Networks UK Limited 5G mast on Sea Mills Square – New application**  
**September 2022** Ref: 22/04513/Y

Sea Mills and Coombe Dingle Together (SMCDT) will be objecting to the proposed siting of this 5G mast on Sea Mills Square because of the effect it will have on the character and appearance of the area. Whilst we recognise the need for 5G in the area and welcome more coverage, we are against the siting of this particular mast.

You may have commented on the previous application and the appeal but please do so again to:

- Show there are continued strong feelings about the position of this mast
- Respond to claims the operator has made

We have provided this information sheet to give you an idea of the sort of objections that have been used successfully. Some of the wording comes from planning inspector reports when they have refused masts at appeal. We will also include some information from the [Sea Mills Conservation Area Character Appraisal](#).

### **Why would I comment and what would I say?**

Hutchinson have submitted a new application which you can read [here](#), they state that they have reduced the height of the mast from 18m to 15m. This is misleading as the previously rejected mast was 15m. They further elaborate on the proposal in [this document](#), where they briefly consider the conservation area status and conclude that the presence of mature trees and street lamps will provide a level of ‘assimilation’ for the 15m mast.

We feel that the trees on the Square, the existing 6 metre street lamps and 15.4 metre Addison’s Oak will do little to disguise the mast. We feel the mast will dominate the Square and will be detrimental to its setting of the Addison oak and the Methodist Church which is a landmark building in the Conservation Area.

The [Character Appraisal](#) for our conservation area states in section 4b that threats to the character of the area include:

- Alterations to the original plan form or character of Sea Mills Square
- Unsympathetically placed mobile phone and other masts

Also stating:

- Enclosed open spaces are an important defining characteristic of a garden suburb (Paragraph 6.1.28) (The Square is an enclosed open space)
- The preservation of all types of views both within and out from the Conservation Area is vital in protecting its character and special interest (Paragraph 6.2.11)
- It is important to the roofscape of the Garden Suburb that no more buildings are permitted to punctuate the skyline as this would detract from the skyline as originally planned with just the two churches punctuating it. (Paragraph 8.40)

## **I want to help - how do I do it?**

Comments must be received by **17<sup>th</sup> Oct 2022, either online or by post**. They can be made [here](#) or via the new planning application link at the bottom of the page - it's a good idea to write your comment elsewhere and then paste it in. Alternatively, by email [development.management@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:development.management@bristol.gov.uk) or **post** to Development Management, City Hall, Bristol City Council, PO Box 3399, Bristol, BS1 9NE

## **Key phrases used in previous rejections of this and other masts (for your inspiration):**

- would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area
- visually prominent location
- significant harm to the living conditions of nearby residents through the creation of poor outlook
- considerably more prominent than the existing street furniture
- would sit uncomfortably in this context and would significantly erode the character of the local street scene
- incongruous unnatural and out of scale
- stark, industrial and alien feature
- would not visually integrate
- visually prominent within the skyline
- rising above the low-level built development
- not capable of being effectively screened by the existing street furniture

Please note that comments on character and appearance of the development will hold the most weight and those relating to health issues will be disregarded.

You can also read the previous rejection reports about this mast, from [Bristol City Council](#) and the [Planning Inspector](#) which provide lots of reasons why this development should not be accepted.

## **Full links**

New planning application

<https://pa.bristol.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=RI9ADCDNLH700&activeTab=summary>

Planning Inspectors previous report

[https://pa.bristol.gov.uk/online-applications/files/765CDA2B05ECF362CFB3B556FB3C9E59/pdf/21\\_02990\\_Y-APPEAL\\_DISMISSED-3181403.pdf](https://pa.bristol.gov.uk/online-applications/files/765CDA2B05ECF362CFB3B556FB3C9E59/pdf/21_02990_Y-APPEAL_DISMISSED-3181403.pdf)

Bristol City Councils previous rejection

[https://pa.bristol.gov.uk/online-applications/files/FAEA665BBF370106A0F063F0FA9835A3/pdf/21\\_02990\\_Y-OFFICER\\_REPORT-2996991.pdf](https://pa.bristol.gov.uk/online-applications/files/FAEA665BBF370106A0F063F0FA9835A3/pdf/21_02990_Y-OFFICER_REPORT-2996991.pdf)

If any of these links are not working you can find the on the [Bristol City Council Planning website](#) by searching for case 22/04513/Y for the current application or 21/02990/Y for the previous one, and then look under the documents tab