

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number(s)

2020/2965/P

Case Officer:

Alyce Jeffery

Application Address:

12 Oval Road
London
NW1 7BH

Proposal(s)

Rooftop telecommunications installation upgrade including the installation of a new 7.5m high monopole at roof level to replace existing tower, with 6 new antennas, HSG module, EE GPS module and relocated transmission dish, and associated works.

Representations

Consultations:	No. notified	0	No. of responses	0	No. of objections	2
					No of comments	0
					No of support	0
Summary of representations <i>(Officer response(s) in italics)</i>	<p>A site notice was erected adjacent the site 22/07/2020 until 15/08/2020.</p> <p>The owner/occupiers of Nos. 26 West Hill Court and Flat 5, 57 Christchurch Hill have objected to the application on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">This work will impact the use of our building as a yoga and treatment centre. The teachers, therapists and students will be negatively impact their experience <p><i>Officer comment; The type of impact has not specified. Officers note that the proposed equipment is approximately 23m from Triyoga, and approximately 16m above ground level.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">There are residents in Camden Town who are electrohypersensitive					

("EHS"). Camden has an obligation to safeguard their health. I am one of those residents with a medical diagnosis of electro-hypersensitivity. This will cause loss of amenity to many people.

Officer comment; *The application has been supported by an International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) Declaration which demonstrates that the equipment meets national safeguards on emission levels in accordance with government guidelines. Consequently there are no direct public health concerns regarding this proposal. Para 46 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities must determine applications on planning grounds. They should not seek to prevent competition between different operators, question the need for the telecommunications system, or determine health safeguards if the proposal meets International Commission guidelines for public exposure. Thus the NPPF does not give scope for the local planning authority to determine health safeguards beyond compliance with ICNIRP. Furthermore the application is for prior approval for the siting and appearance of the equipment only. As such, it is not possible for objections to be raised on any other grounds, such as health.*

Further information relating to 5G can be found following the below link.

https://opendata.camden.gov.uk/views/j7mk-4ya8/files/33f6bce7-34e5-465e-b417-6b30f965c370?filename=Response_FOI%20-%20FOI14020.pdf&

- This building is amongst a group of buildings which is on Camden's local list. This project will cause significant visual detriment to the immediate area, spoil the character and appearance of this heritage site and is detrimental to the conservation area of Camden Town.

Officer comment; *The proposal is an upgrade to an existing antenna mast here and will increase its height above roof level from 4.45m to 5.80m. It is well set back by 16.6m from the street frontage so will not be visible from the public realm at ground level. See also comments below on townscape impact.*

- 5G is a newer type of telecommunication and should be a special case. It should not be lumped together with prior legislation which was relevant to previous types of masts for 3G and 4G. If this application is granted it will set the most dangerous precedent and the legislation will be misinterpreted.

Officer comment; *The application has been supported by an*

International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) Declaration. See also comments above.

Also it should be noted that the EE mast will be shared by ESN (Emergency Services Network) and thus this installation will also provide public benefits in improved coverage to the emergency services.

- This is a conservation area and in the Best Code of Practice 2016 p.30 it states "In conservation areas, special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area". This application does not do that, the height is increased and it detracts from the aesthetics of the area. The monolith type structure will stick out and spoil the skyline. The protuberance can be seen from all angles.

Officer comment: The proposed replacement equipment, although somewhat greater in overall scale and height than the existing, owing to its siting, is not considered to have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the adjacent conservation area or surrounding listed buildings. Therefore, it is considered that there is sufficient justification for the proposed replacement equipment in this location and that the public benefits of the proposal outweigh the harm to the Primrose Hill Conservation Area and surrounding listed buildings.

- It will be significantly more visually intrusive for even more homes and a constant reminder of the possible threat to their health for numerous households because they will know that the masts are there. There is a row of residential terraced houses next door to 12 Oval Road.

Officer comment: Officers note that owners/occupants to the rear of the site may have existing views of the equipment and consider it would be unreasonable to refuse the application on the basis that the equipment may be slightly more visible from some private views. Perception of risk to public health is not an adequate reason for refusal.

- The Pirates Club is very close by, it is a community project for children from the age of 8 to use their facilities and learn kayaking. My own children were members of this club when they were small and as a mother I am horrified at the thought of children as young as 8 years old being exposed to 5G radiation. There is also Cavendish school for children from the ages of 3 - 11 nearby. Have you consulted with Cavendish school or The Pirates Club? I do not see

	<p>any evidence of this.</p>
--	------------------------------

	<p><i><u>Officer comment</u>; The Council has fulfilled its statutory obligation by erecting a site notice, individual consultation is not a requirement. The application has been supported by an International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) Declaration. See also comments regarding health issues above.</i></p>
--	---

Recommendation:-

Prior approval required, approval given.