

**HARROW COUNCIL**

**SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL ADDENDUM**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**DATE: 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2020**

<b>2/03</b>	<p><b><u>Supplemental Addendum Item 1:</u></b></p> <p><i>Following the previous addendum further amend the Summary of Comments subsection (para 4.3, pages 5-6) to also include (see bold):</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #cccccc;"><b>Summary of Comments</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> <p><b><u>Character and appearance / Residential Amenities</u></b></p> <p>Proximity to local residences, school and nursing home; Alternative site should be sought; Impact of siting behind trees and within the grass verge would eclipse the tree line and damage to the detriment of the area; Existing telecommunications equipment in the locality is already a detriment to the area erection of further equipment will change character of the street; Excessive height of the proposal; Proposal would block light and outlook; Other LPAs are refusing planning permission.</p> <p><i>Officer response: The proposal has provided documentation which detail the inappropriate nature of other sites in the locality. It is considered the proposed siting of the telecommunications mast would be the most appropriate of the all potential locations due to the screening offered by surrounding trees and the established presence of the existing telecommunications equipment in close proximity. Although the height of the telecommunications would eclipse the tree line, the 20m height of the proposal is the minimum height required to facilitate the required 5G services. It is considered the limited visual intrusion this causes would be significantly outweighed by the public benefit of 5G provision in the area and its siting is in an area considered to cause the least amount of harm to the character and appearance of the locality. The proximity to residential areas and schools and nursing homes would not be a reason for refusal in its own right and should only be refused on the impact of the development which has been deemed to be acceptable.</i></p> <p><i>The impacts to the residential amenities of the adjacent block of flats is considered to not be of significant detriment which would warrant a reason for refusal due to the siting of the mast itself and the relatively narrow nature of the development.</i></p> <p><i>Although it is appreciated other Local Planning Authorities may take a different view to the acceptability of 20m high monopole structures. The current proposal has been assessed on its own merits against Harrow Council’s own Development Plan Policies and relevant allowed appeal decisions for previously refused applications within the borough. It is considered on planning balance, the impact of the proposal would be acceptable.</i></p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<p><b><u>Character and appearance / Residential Amenities</u></b></p> <p>Proximity to local residences, school and nursing home; Alternative site should be sought; Impact of siting behind trees and within the grass verge would eclipse the tree line and damage to the detriment of the area; Existing telecommunications equipment in the locality is already a detriment to the area erection of further equipment will change character of the street; Excessive height of the proposal; Proposal would block light and outlook; Other LPAs are refusing planning permission.</p> <p><i>Officer response: The proposal has provided documentation which detail the inappropriate nature of other sites in the locality. It is considered the proposed siting of the telecommunications mast would be the most appropriate of the all potential locations due to the screening offered by surrounding trees and the established presence of the existing telecommunications equipment in close proximity. Although the height of the telecommunications would eclipse the tree line, the 20m height of the proposal is the minimum height required to facilitate the required 5G services. It is considered the limited visual intrusion this causes would be significantly outweighed by the public benefit of 5G provision in the area and its siting is in an area considered to cause the least amount of harm to the character and appearance of the locality. The proximity to residential areas and schools and nursing homes would not be a reason for refusal in its own right and should only be refused on the impact of the development which has been deemed to be acceptable.</i></p> <p><i>The impacts to the residential amenities of the adjacent block of flats is considered to not be of significant detriment which would warrant a reason for refusal due to the siting of the mast itself and the relatively narrow nature of the development.</i></p> <p><i>Although it is appreciated other Local Planning Authorities may take a different view to the acceptability of 20m high monopole structures. The current proposal has been assessed on its own merits against Harrow Council’s own Development Plan Policies and relevant allowed appeal decisions for previously refused applications within the borough. It is considered on planning balance, the impact of the proposal would be acceptable.</i></p>
<b>Summary of Comments</b>			
<p><b><u>Character and appearance / Residential Amenities</u></b></p> <p>Proximity to local residences, school and nursing home; Alternative site should be sought; Impact of siting behind trees and within the grass verge would eclipse the tree line and damage to the detriment of the area; Existing telecommunications equipment in the locality is already a detriment to the area erection of further equipment will change character of the street; Excessive height of the proposal; Proposal would block light and outlook; Other LPAs are refusing planning permission.</p> <p><i>Officer response: The proposal has provided documentation which detail the inappropriate nature of other sites in the locality. It is considered the proposed siting of the telecommunications mast would be the most appropriate of the all potential locations due to the screening offered by surrounding trees and the established presence of the existing telecommunications equipment in close proximity. Although the height of the telecommunications would eclipse the tree line, the 20m height of the proposal is the minimum height required to facilitate the required 5G services. It is considered the limited visual intrusion this causes would be significantly outweighed by the public benefit of 5G provision in the area and its siting is in an area considered to cause the least amount of harm to the character and appearance of the locality. The proximity to residential areas and schools and nursing homes would not be a reason for refusal in its own right and should only be refused on the impact of the development which has been deemed to be acceptable.</i></p> <p><i>The impacts to the residential amenities of the adjacent block of flats is considered to not be of significant detriment which would warrant a reason for refusal due to the siting of the mast itself and the relatively narrow nature of the development.</i></p> <p><i>Although it is appreciated other Local Planning Authorities may take a different view to the acceptability of 20m high monopole structures. The current proposal has been assessed on its own merits against Harrow Council’s own Development Plan Policies and relevant allowed appeal decisions for previously refused applications within the borough. It is considered on planning balance, the impact of the proposal would be acceptable.</i></p>			

	<p><u>Other issues:</u> Health Impacts of 5G; Total Health Impacts are still to be ascertained; <b>Proposal has already been erected prior to final decision of the subject application</b></p> <p><i>Officer response: The National Planning Policy Framework (2019) states that Local Planning Authorities should limit their assessment of communication infrastructure to planning grounds only, explicitly they should not set health safeguards different from the International Commission guidelines for public exposure. The NPPF further states that applications for electronic communications development (including applications for prior approval under the General Permitted Development Order) should be supported when a statement is provided that self-certified that, when operational International Commission guidelines will be met. The application has submitted a statement declaring conformity with the International Commission On Non-ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines once operational. It is therefore considered within the scope of the planning process the proposal has provided the relevant declaration to not be considered to have an adverse effect on health.</i></p> <p><b><i>It is also acknowledged one objection has stated the proposal has already been erected and installed. A site visit on the morning of 02/09/2020 has confirmed this has not been implemented prior to the outcome of the decision. There is an existing telecommunications mast and ancillary equipment currently in situ found at the adjacent traffic island which is not part of the subject application.</i></b></p>
--	--

3/01	<p><b><u>Addendum Item 6:</u></b></p> <p>The Local Planning Authority is still awaiting to receive comment from the Greater London Authority under stage 1 of the Mayoral referral process. The committee is therefore requested to delegate authority for the final determination of the application to the Chief Planning Officer, subject to the stage 1 comments of the Greater London Authority.</p> <p>Amend Recommendation:</p> <p>The Planning Committee is asked to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delegate authority to the Chief Planning Officer to determine the application for the reasons set out below, subject to the comments of the Greater London Authority</li> <li>• Refuse the application for the following reasons:</li> </ul>
------	---

**Agenda Item 10 – Representations on Planning Applications**

1 Canons Park Close, Donnefield Avenue, Edgware, HA8 6RJ (P/1277/20)	Objector: Mr K R Chainani (Statement to be read by Chair)
42 Roxeth Hill, Harrow, HA2 0JW (P/1715/20)	Objector: Tina Hussein Applicant: Mallika Vaja

<p>Land Rear of 259 Pinner Road, Harrow, HA1 4HF (P/4355/19)</p>	<p>Objector: Asif Mohammed Applicant: Sarah King</p>
<p>The Hive Football Centre, Prince Edwards Playing Fields, Camrose Avenue, Edgware HA8 6AG (P/1564/20)</p>	<p>Objector: Jitendra Thakorlal Applicant: Sean McGrath</p>
<p>Mallory, Priory Drive, Stanmore, HA7 3HN (P/1463/20)</p>	<p>Objector: Veenay Shah</p>