Delegated Rep	Ort Analysis sh	neet	Expiry Date:	14/05/2019
(Refusal)	N/A / attache	ed	Consultation Expiry Date:	21/04/2019
Officer			n Number(s)	
Jonathan McClue		2019/1097/	P	
Application Address		Drawing N	umbers	
Mullen Towers Mount Pleasant London WC1X 0AG		Refer to De	ecision Notice	
PO 3/4 Area Team	Signature C&UD	Authorised	d Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
The installation of 48 smal the building, with the instal	•		•	
Recommendation(s):	Refuse Permission			
Application Type: F	Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Decision Notice		
Informatives:			
Consultations			
Summary of consultation:	A site notice was posted to the front of the site on 22/03/2019, and a press release was made on 28/03/2019.		
Summary of consultation responses:	<ul> <li>9 written objections were received from neighbouring residents, mostly from with the host building itself. The objections are summarised as follows:</li> <li>Health concerns due to significant amount of antenna, effects on the heart, blood flow and the increased risk of cancer in connection with exposure to electromagnetic fields</li> <li>Interference of telecommunications equipment with residents electrical supplies, wireless router, Wi-Fi networks, IT equipment etc.</li> <li>Noise concerns, due to new roof equipment shaking in wind on highrise block</li> <li>A previous withdrawn proposal, which had far less antennas mounted on higher polls, was withdrawn due to aesthetic impacts</li> <li>Disruption during installation and maintenance</li> <li>The owners/residents of the top floor flats have tried for several years to have the flat roof renovated. There have been repeated leaks in two of the three top floor flats and the insulation level is poor. Possible renovation/replacement of the roof insulation and covering will be virtually impossible if the antenna units are installed on the roof</li> </ul>		
CAAC/Local groups comments:	The Mount Pleasant Neighbourhood Forum was consulted on 19/03/2019. No comments were received from them or any other interest groups.		

### **Site Description**

The application building is Mullen Towers, which is a substantial 11 storey residential tower (plus plant and lift overrun) on top of a single storey podium (with restaurant/café use, car park and storage), located on the corner of Mount Pleasant and Laystall Street. It was built in the 1960's, is of brick construction and 31m high up to the main parapet (with overruns and plant at roof level extending to 34m). The site is located within the Hatton Garden Conservation Area, and is listed in Hatton Garden Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy as a building that makes a negative contribution to it. The Appraisal and Management Strategy states that the building fails to relate to the area's character as one of the taller buildings. It is noted that there are only approximately 15 buildings within the Conservation Area that are identified by Camden as having a negative impact upon the character and appearance of the Area, and this is due to its inappropriate bulk, scale, height, materials, poor quality design and construction, and failure to address the street.

The host building is not listed and neither are any of the adjacent buildings. Panther House, located immediately to the east across the narrow Mount Pleasant, contributes positively to the conservation area.

# Relevant History

The application site has had a number of withdrawn planning applications for telecommunications equipment. These applications were withdrawn as the Local Planning Authority suggested that the proposals were inappropriate and would result in a refusal. The applicant was made aware that the subject application is also unacceptable; however, the applicant did not withdraw the scheme. Below is the application reference, description of development and withdrawn date for the most recent formal full planning application:

**2017/3219/P:** Installation of 12 dual user pole mounted antennas, 3 transmission dishes together with 5 radio equipment cabinets at roof level – Withdrawn on 28/02/2018

# **Relevant policies**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019

**London Plan 2016** 

#### Camden Local Plan 2017

A1 Managing the impact of development

D1 Design

D2 Heritage

### **Camden Planning Guidance**

CPG Amenity (2018)

CPG Design (2019)

CPG Digital Infrastructure (2018)

### **Assessment**

### 1.0 Proposal

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought to install 48 small antennas poles mounted on 10 free-standing support frames on the roof of the building, with 2 equipment cabinets and ancillary development ancillary.
- 1.2 The proposal is on behalf of Luminet, which is the trading name of Urban Wimax Ltd based in Central London. Luminet supplies high quality internet connection and the proposal would transmit this through the high level dishes.
- 1.3 The dish antennas are grouped on support frames and project above the roofline of the building. They are located adjacent to the parapet around the perimeter of the rooftop, with a similar height as the existing plant room.

### 2.0 Design and Conservation

- 2.1 Policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan seeks to secure high quality design in development; specifically requiring development to respect local context and character; preserve or enhance the historic environment and heritage assets in accordance with Policy D2; and preserve strategic and local views. Policy D2 states that the council will seek to protect heritage assets. Policies D1 and D2 are supported by the Council's Design CPG and Digital Infrastructure CPG.
- 2.2 The NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to keep the number of radio and electronic communications masts, and the sites for such installations to a minimum, consistent with the needs of consumers, the efficient operation of the network and to provide reasonable capacity for future expansion. Use of existing masts, buildings and other structures for new electronic communications capability (including wireless) should be encouraged. Where new sites are required (such as for new 5G networks, or for connected transport and smart city applications), equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate.
- 2.3 The proposal would introduce a significant amount of telecommunications equipment, near to the parapet of the building, and would be visually prominent on this tower block due to its height, size and siting. The impacts of the proposal would be wide ranging with inappropriate development visually prominent from a number of public and private views. These include from following:
  - **Mount Pleasant** (the street and within the new development under construction) to the south and north
  - Gough Street views from intersection of Mount Pleasant, Elm street and Gough Street, as well as views from further north on Gough Street
  - Laystall Street view from intersection of Rosebery Avenue, Laystall Street (eastern pavement), and from further along Laystall Street towards Clerkenwell Road
  - Private views from all the surrounding buildings/developments, including from the top of other buildings
- 2.4 Due to the visual prominence of the proposal and inappropriateness due to the bulk, size and siting of the unsympathetic telecommunications equipment, the proposal would neither preserve nor enhance the Hatton Garden Conservation Area. The introduction of 48 antennas and 10 support frames would cause further detriment to this already 'negative' contributor leading to less than substantial harm to the designate heritage asset of the Conservation, to its character, appearance and setting. It is not considered that this harm would be outweighed by any public benefits, as any minor benefits would only potentially be to individuals and businesses subscribing to this particular private internet provider. Furthermore, the applicant has not demonstrated that the service can be provided through other means.

2.5 On this basis, the proposal by virtue of its inappropriate siting, scale and bulk, would result in a highly visually prominent, visually cluttering and incongruous development which would harm the character, appearance and setting of the host building, surrounding area and the Hatton Garden Conservation Area, contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017, The London Plan and NPPF.

# 3.0 Amenity

- 3.1 Policy A1 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered.
- 3.2 Due to the nature of the proposal it is unlikely to result in significant harm to neighbouring occupiers by way loss of light, outlook or privacy. Noise issues could be controlled by way securing acoustic information and conditioning maximum noise levels. Any construction and maintenance impacts would be temporary and if necessary, could be secured through a Construction Management Plan.
- 3.3 Paragraph 115 of the NPPF requires applications for electronic communications development to be supported by the necessary evidence to justify the proposed development, including:
  - 'a) the outcome of consultations with organisations with an interest in the proposed development, in particular with the relevant body where a mast is to be installed near a school or college, or within a statutory safeguarding zone surrounding an aerodrome, technical site or military explosives storage area; and
  - b) for an addition to an existing mast or base station, a statement that self-certifies that the cumulative exposure, when operational, will not exceed International Commission guidelines on non-ionising radiation protection; or
  - c) for a new mast or base station, evidence that the applicant has explored the possibility of erecting antennas on an existing building, mast or other structure and a statement that self-certifies that, when operational, International Commission guidelines will be met.'
- 3.4 The applicant has not provided the necessary evidence outlined above. No details have been submitted including details of consultations with organisations with an interest in the proposed development. This includes the residents within the tower block (Mullen Towers) that is the subject of this application, and it is noted that many of the occupiers objected to the proposals, as well as neither the landlord/owners of the building. The site lies adjacent to Christopher Hatton Primary School and no consultation with them was undertaken. The NPPF makes a particular reference to schools and colleges. Furthermore, no details have been submitted to evidence whether the applicant explore the possibility of erecting the proposal on an existing building/mast/structure and more fundamentally, it has not been confirmed whether the proposal would not exceed International Commission guidelines on non-ionising radiation protection (ICNIRP) Public Exposure Guidelines.
- 3.5 The applicant confirmed in writing that they did not undertake pre-application consultation nor do they have any of the evidence required under National policy, including ICNIRP. They elected not to submit the information to address these matters. On this basis, the lack of consultation and safety evidence forms a further reason for refusal.

#### 4.0 Conclusion

4.1 The proposed antennas support frames, by reason of their siting, height, size, number and prominence, would result in a highly visually prominent, visually cluttering and incongruous development which would harm the character, appearance and setting of the host building, surrounding area and the Hatton Garden Conservation Area, contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

4.2 The proposed electronic communications development has not justified that it has undertaken proper consultation and would be safe in terms of not exceeding the International Commission guidelines on non-ionising radiation protection (ICNIRP) Public Exposure Guidelines, contrary to policy A1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 and paragraph 115 of the NPPF 2019.