

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>21/08/2006</b>	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		11.8.06	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Miss Kiran Chauhan				2006/2659/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
Bedford House 125 - 133 Camden High Street London NW1 7JR				Site Location Plan P_038270_01 revA; 02 revC; 03 revA; 04 revA; 08 revC; Covering letter dated 07 June 2006; 036947-Radio Plots; Supplementary Information; Health and Safety report, ICNIRP Declaration.			
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		<b>Date</b>		
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
Installation of telecommunications equipment on roof of building comprising of six pole mounted antennas (four to the front of the building and two to the rear), equipment cabinets and associated roof mounted equipment including 1.1m railings.							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse.					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission					

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>50</b>	No. of responses	<b>06</b>	No. of objections	<b>06</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>Site notice also displayed. 6 letters of objection received on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- equipment will be an eyesore and will impact on the skyline <i>Officer Response: Agree.</i></li> <li>- concern about health and safety impacts with regard to radiation; Arlington Road which the proposal backs onto is a residential area <i>Officer Response: See below assessment.</i></li> <li>- residential density is already increasing in this area with permission granted last year for new flats on the car park area <i>Officer Response: Noted.</i></li> <li>- noise and vibration from the equipment <i>Officer Response: It is unlikely that the equipment will cause noise and vibration pollution to surrounding residents.</i></li> <li>- the proposed lighting will cause a nuisance and implies need for maintenance which will result in creating overlooking into my home at 105 Arlington Road <i>Officer Response: No lighting is proposed. In any case, overlooking from maintenance of the roof would not amount to a reason for refusal.</i></li> <li>- the coverage is not poor in this area; we have never had any problems <i>Officer Response: The application is for O2 equipment, the objectors could have mobile phones from a different operator.</i></li> </ul>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> <small>*Please Specify</small>	<p><b>Camden Town CAAC</b> object: We have concerns about the proximity of the equipment to current and potential residential accommodation. The installations will also be prominent as they will be seen from the street. <i>Officer Response: See below assessment.</i></p> <p><b>Camden Town Speaks Residents Association</b> object: Concern about radiation from masts and that there could be long term dangers to the local population. They should be located in open space. Mast sharing doesn't solve the problem as more radiation will be emitted from one site. The equipment will also be an eyesore. <i>Officer Response: See below assessment.</i></p> <p><b>Arlington Road Residents Association</b> object: In October 2005, PP was granted for a 4 storey residential block on the Bedford House car park area. The residents of that new block will become the closest residents to the masts – does the developer know of this application? The group also object on grounds of visual impact and on grounds of health and safety. The building also contains Camden Offices and we would enquire as to whether Camden has consulted its own staff on these proposals. Would the masts conform to the ICNIRP guidelines? Mast sharing will encourage applications for multiple masts in the future. <i>Officer Response: It is not known whether the developer of that proposal is aware of this application but the required notices have been served in accordance with the requirements of Section 66 of the TCPA 1990. The third and fourth floors of the building are leased to Camden for office use (leases are short term leases of around 5 years unexpired) and consultation letters were sent to all of the occupiers of the building. The applicant has not made contact with our Property Services division regarding the application, but there is no requirement for the applicant to do this. The masts do conform to the ICNIRP guidelines. All other issues raised are assessed below.</i></p>					

## Site Description

The equipment are to be located on the roof of a 5 storey commercial building on the west side of Camden High Street, the rear of which is visible from Arlington Road to the west. The site is located in the Camden Town Conservation Area and is not listed.

## Relevant History

1990 – PP granted for the installation of a microwave receiving antenna at roof level.

## Relevant policies

RUDP 2006: SD6, B1, B5, B7, B9  
SPG Section 3.7 Telecommunications

## Assessment

The proposal is seeking permission for the installation of O2 telecommunications apparatus on the roof of the building in the form of six pole mounted antennas (four to the front roof of the building and 2 to the rear roof), six cabinets and other ancillary equipment including 1.1m railings. [It should be noted that although the railings are shown on the roof plan, they are not shown on the elevational drawing]. A series of supporting information has been submitted in the form of site coverage maps and the ICNIRP (International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection) declaration.

The supporting information has demonstrated that the current level of network service in the area is poor and additional equipment is needed to provide improved coverage.

### Siting, design and appearance

The antennas and cabinet equipment will be sited at roof level. The cabinets themselves will not be visible street level but the antennas will be 2.8m in height and the railings 1.1m and hence will be seen. The antennas and railings which are located to the rear of the building are not objectionable by virtue of being sited in a relatively discreet location and not being overly visible in views. However, the antenna and railings which are located to the front of the building are of a concern. Policy B5 is explicit in that it states that proposals for telecommunications equipment will be assessed with regard to their impact on the skyline and views. Although the building itself is of little architectural merit, it is the tallest building in the immediate vicinity and hence this rooftop level equipment, by reason of its height and siting is likely to adversely impact on the skyline and on views along Camden High Street, and hence, the character and appearance of the conservation area. Although surrounding buildings on Camden High Street and on Arlington Road do feature roof level equipment, some of these are domestic television aerials. The other equipment is located on buildings of smaller scale and are located away from the front parapet edges. The visual impact of the front antennas and railings was raised as an issue to the applicant at pre-application stage, and as such the applicant was asked to investigate whether the antennas could be set back from the main front parapet to avoid detrimentally impacting on views along Camden High Street. The applicant has stated that in order to receive the required level of coverage, they need to be positioned close to the front edge of the roof and therefore setting them back is not a practical option.

### Alternative sites/mast sharing

The applicant has stated that 6 other buildings were considered but were ruled out as the owners of those buildings did not want to enter into agreement with the applicant. One site was discounted on account of technical failure.

### Health and Safety

The objections received on the application regarding health and safety have been noted. The ICNIRP certificate submitted with the application states that the antennas conforms with ICNIRP guidelines on emission levels and as a result, there would be no risk to public health and safety. The Government has made it clear (within PPG8) that if a proposed development meets the ICNIRP public exposure guidelines, then it should not be necessary to consider health effects further.

The findings of the Stewart Report provides guidance relating to health concerns, in particular the need to take a precautionary approach. The report refers to these issues and concludes by saying that health is not a material consideration in the determination of this type of planning application.

It should be noted that there are no schools within close proximity of the site.

Therefore, until such guidance is made available to the local planning authority, the relevant issues in assessing the application remain as the siting, design and appearance of the apparatus – as referred to in PPG8 and in policy B5.

The application complies with the Councils policies and other relevant guidance and therefore planning permission should be granted. The proposals also comply with the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) public exposure guidelines as proved by the submitted certificate.

Concern has been raised on grounds of noise and vibration from the equipment, but it would be difficult to prove harm on this ground and this would not amount to a reason for refusal.

The proposal does not raise any other amenity issues.

**Recommendation: Refuse.**

**Disclaimer**

*This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613*