

---

## POLICY TE1 - CRITERIA FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS APPARATUS

OBJECTIONS: 051/2 Orange Personal Communications 070/135 GO-M  
090/2 Mr D I Maurice Jones 129/11 British Telecommunications plc  
COUNTER-OBJECTION: 090/K Mr D I Maurice Jones  
129/D British Telecommunications plc

### Summary of Objections

- 22.1 The word 'normally' should be deleted from Policy TE1 (070/135). The increase of telecommunications development requires tighter control to avoid environmental damage. The omission of any reference in Policy TE1 to residential amenity is unsatisfactory. More emphasis should be put on mast sharing, as encouraged by PPG8 *Telecommunications*<sup>1</sup> (090/2).
- 22.2 Policy TE1 should recognise technical siting and network operational efficiency considerations; code operators should be asked to minimise the impact of development, having regard to technical considerations. Criterion (ii) should be amended to reflect the expectation in PPG8<sup>2</sup> that telecommunications operators will have explored the possibility of erecting antennae on existing buildings, masts or other structures. Criterion (iii) should be clarified (051/2).
- 22.3 Policy TE1 should like PPG8<sup>3</sup> acknowledge the technical problems and special needs of telecommunications systems. The Policy fails to reflect the balance that Government advice states is needed between the economic, social and environmental benefits of telecommunications development, the need to protect areas of environmental quality and the problems faced by operators. The Policy does not anticipate circumstances where the need for telecommunications development in particular locations outweighs the need to protect the environment. Criterion (i) should therefore be amended (draft suggested) (129/11).
- 22.4 The proposed amended Policy TE1<sup>4</sup> should be extended to include reference to residential areas. The final paragraph of the amended Policy is a technical note and borders on bias (090/K).
- 22.5 The final paragraph of the amended Policy TE1 reads as a statement and should be amended to acknowledge that if technical considerations limit the choice of sites and type of apparatus used to achieve the optimum signal coverage, this will be taken into account in the determination of any planning permission (129/D).

---

<sup>1</sup> PPG8, paragraphs 27 and 28.

<sup>2</sup> PPG8, paragraph 27.

<sup>3</sup> PPG8, paragraphs 25 and 26.

<sup>4</sup> ALT/TELECOMMUNICATIONS/002 (CD056, page 314).

---

## Assessment and Conclusions

22.6 The proposed amendment to Policy TE1 omits 'normally'. The amended Policy does not make specific reference to the impact of proposals on *residential* amenity; in my view as the main issue of amenity is that of visual amenity, it would be wrong to lay particular emphasis on residential areas as distinct from other developed areas or areas of open countryside. The amenity of residents is capable of being considered under the Policy as drafted.

22.7 From my reading of the final paragraph of the amended Policy it is clear from that paragraph that in some cases, the difficulty the operator may have had in finding a suitable site due to network or other technical reasons, or the lack of suitable locations on existing installations or buildings will be a material planning consideration. Although it is maintained in Counter-objection 090/K that this is not an even-handed basis on which to make a decision, it does reflect current Government Policy and therefore has a proper place in the UDP Policy. No special local circumstances have been cited to justify any divergence from that approach. The Council have sought further to clarify this by publishing a second change to Policy TE1<sup>5</sup> which broadly adopts the wording suggested in Counter-objection 129/D.

22.8 It seems to me that the point the Objector is making in Objection 051/2 about Criterion (ii) of Policy TE1 is on a matter of fine detail. In my view the guidance in PPG8 about the applicant 'having explored the possibility of erecting antennas on an existing building, mast or other structure' is adequately covered by the wording of Criterion (ii). I therefore recommend no further change to that criterion. So far as Criterion (iii) is concerned, I agree with the Council that it seems clear as it stands.

## Inspector's Recommendation

22.9 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of Policy TE1 in accordance with ALT2/TELECOMMUNICATIONS/001, but that no modification be made in response to Objection 090/2 and Counter-objection 090/K.2

---

<sup>5</sup> ALT2/TELECOMMUNICATIONS/001 (CD057, page 40).

---

## **POLICY TE2 - CRITERIA FOR SATELLITE DISHES**

**OBJECTIONS:**        051/3 Orange Personal Communications    070/136 GO-M  
                          129/12 British Telecommunications plc

### **Summary of Objections**

22.10     The word 'normally' should be deleted from Policy TE2 (070/136). The Policy appears to relate to domestic satellite antennae rather than telecommunications. Telecommunications Code Operators (TCOs) are also required to site microwave dishes on buildings as part of their function. The Policy therefore needs to be clarified. If the Policy is to be of more general application then technical criteria and the restrictions imposed on TCOs should be taken into account (051/3). If the Policy is intended to relate to domestic installations, then the word 'domestic' should be inserted (129/12).

### **Assessment and Conclusions**

22.11     A published change to Policy TE2 omits 'normally'<sup>1</sup>. It is also proposed to insert 'television' into the title of the Policy; I accept that for practical purposes this clarifies the intended application of the Policy as relating to domestic dishes. Other dishes would fall to be considered under the 'telecommunications apparatus' definition in Policy TE1<sup>2</sup>.

### **Inspector's Recommendation**

22.12     I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of Policy TE2 in accordance with ALT/TELECOMMUNICATIONS/003.

---

<sup>1</sup> ALT/TELECOMMUNICATIONS/003 (CD056, page 315).

<sup>2</sup> Policy TE1 - Criteria for Telecommunications Apparatus.