

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		20/01/2015	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		01/01/2015	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Obote Hope				1) 2014/6766/P 2) 2014/7509/L			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
Academic House 24 Oval Road London NW1 7DJ				See decision notices			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Installation of 6 antennas, 2 microwave dishes, and 2 equipment cabinets and GRP screens with associated ancillary equipment at roof level.							
Recommendation(s):		1) Refuse planning permission 2) Refuse listed building consent					
Application Type:		1) Full Planning Permission 2) Listed Building Consent					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified		95		No. of responses	
						03	
						03	
						No. of objections	
						03	
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>A site notice was displayed on 10/12/2014 expiring on 31/12/2014 and a press advert was published on 11/12/2014 and expired on 31/12/2014. No comments were received.</p> <p><u>Flat 60 Gilbey House, 38 Jamestown Road</u>: Objection received. Concerns regarding the size and scale of the proposed antennae, the site already have a significant amount of telecommunications equipment and the effect the proposal may have on their wellbeing</p> <p><u>30 Gilby House</u>: Objection received regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed height - Loss of light into the air well and - Noise from the proposed equipment 					
CAAC comments:		<p><u>The Regents Canal CAAC</u>: object.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed screen surrounding the antennae would add an additional 2.5 metres that would create a tower which would spoil the appearance of the listed building from a southerly direction - The highest part of the roof is shown on the plan as 23.7m and it should read 25.3m 					

Site Description

The site is a seven storey office building on the eastern side of Oval Road north of Jamestown Road the site was built in 1894 by William Hucks with addition of 1937 by Mendelsohn and Chermayeff, and have been in commercial used for wine importers and gin distillers Gilbey's. There is an existing plant enclosure at roof level that covers approximately 14.5m².

The site Grade II listed and is located within the Regents Canal Conservation Area.

Relevant History

PEX0100887- Installation of six additional air conditioning units plus acoustic screens on the roof of the building.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Page 31 – paras 132-133

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS1 - Distribution of growth

CS5 - Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 - Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP17 - Walking, cycling and public transport

DP21 - Development connecting to the highway network

DP24 - Securing high quality design

DP25 - Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden Planning Guidance 2013

CPG1 – Design – Chapter 11

Assessment

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the installation of 6 antennas, 2 microwave dishes, and the erection of 2 equipment cabinets, within GRP screens/shrouds, and associated ancillary equipment at roof level.

The scheme is not permitted development under Part 24 of the GPDO as it involves new antennae beyond the permitted volume. Notwithstanding this, full planning permission is sought here.

Justification

The application was submitted with associated documents which state that the site is the only viable option for the proposed telecommunication equipment and as a result of the works; the telecommunication equipment would help the network coverage in this area. The supporting document includes 'key to coverage plots' from CTiL annotated with various colour blocks which represents 50m radius around the proposed site, this show various areas in Camden Town and Hampstead where there area existing telecoms equipment along with the existing level of radio frequencies.

There are existing telecommunication installations that are annotated in orange which suggest that there is sufficient signal available for 3G usage, the documentation stipulate that the 3G signal would be suitable for indoor use of hand portable mobile in suburban areas and the additional equipment are required to improve the current signal levels. Which they categorised as being of significant importance to the telecommunication network. Several sites were identified within the borough, including 12 and 35 Oval Road (approvals were not given by the landlords), 38 Jamestown Road (approval not given), 10 Jamestown Road (Height of the property too low, unusable for a radio prospective), 30 and 32 Jamestown Road (Height of the property too low, unusable for a radio prospective), 226 Arlington Road (Height of the property too low, unusable for a radio prospective and no prior telecommunication equipment) and 34-36 Jamestown Road (Height of the property too low, unusable for a radio prospective). That has lead to the submission of the planning application for this site.

Principle

Central Government guidance is contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF encourages local planning authorities to support the expansion of electronic communications networks, including telecommunications and high speed broadband. However, the NPPF stipulates that character and special historical interest of building should be material consideration when determining application for planning/listed building consent. Furthermore, the NPPF states "*As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification*".

The applicant has provided supplemental information to address environmental concerns covering:

- Preference for mast sharing
- Coverage plots
- Frequency and signal characteristics
- Maximum power output
- ICNIRP documentation
- Health and mobile base station documentation

The Council's Regulatory Services raise no objection to the replacement plant.

Visual Impact

The building is seven storeys high and has existing rooftop plant enclosures comprising various air condensers units, plant enclosure and plant screen for telecommunications equipment and air condenser units of various sizes. The existing plant enclosure is visible from street level.

Two additional cabinets to screen the telecoms equipment are proposed in two locations on the roof. The first of which would be a high level equipment cabinet that measures approximately 2.7m in high x 4.2 wide x 3.2m deep would be located above the existing plant enclosure in the centre of the roof. The equipment on top of the existing plant enclosure would have a combined height of 5.7m.

It is also proposed to erect a 2.0m high screen and cabinet. The enclosure would measure approximately 6.8m in depth and 5.5m in width at roof level located behind the GRP screen. Given its location at the edge of the roof it is considered that the enclosure would also be visible in public views.

The Conservation Area Officer requested a photo montage. The documents submitted show that there would be visual harm to the building as a result of the proposals. The photographs show that the proposed shrouds to screen the telecoms equipment would be visible in public views. Therefore, the proposed works would have a detrimental impact on the special interest of the Grade II listed building and the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Owing to the height of the proposed shroud (5.7m) it is considered that the proposal would result in an incongruous addition to the roof which would be visible in views from street level. The 2m high enclosure at the edge of the roof is also considered to have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host property and conservation area. The application documents do not sufficiently demonstrate that the equipment would not have a harmful impact.

The proposed works are considered unacceptable due to the location and scale of the equipment cabinets and the detrimental visual impact this would have on the listed building and conservation area. The requirement for additional telecommunications equipment does not outweigh the harm to the listed building.

Amenity

The proposed equipment is not considered to be so substantial or in such close proximity to residential windows as to have a material impact on daylight, sunlight, loss of outlook or sense of enclosure to adjoining and nearby properties. The objections received from neighbouring properties regarding the potential noise impact and the loss of light are not considered to justify refusal of these applications.

Recommendation

Refuse the application on the grounds that the equipment and associated screening would fail to preserve or enhance the character, appearance and special interest of the Grade II Listed Building and the Regents Canal

Conservation Area.