
Borough Green Borough Green And Long Mill	560915 157552	09.11.2005	TM/05/03451/TEPN56
--	----------------------	-------------------	---------------------------

Proposal:	Prior Notification of Telecommunications: Installation of a 12 metre telecommunications column resembling a telegraph pole
Location:	Land Fronting 177 To 199 Fairfield Road Borough Green Sevenoaks Kent
Applicant:	O2 (UK) Limited

1. Description:

- 1.1 The proposed pole would be of metal construction and clad in GRP (glass reinforced plastic) to simulate the appearance of a timber telegraph pole. A photo montage submitted by the applicant shows that the pole would be brown in colour. The installation is required as part of the applicant's 3G mobile telecommunication network. The application documents state that the proposed mast would be an anti-climb type.
- 1.2 The proposed apparatus would be located on the public footway in Fairfield Road, adjacent to a 2m high metal palisade fence forming the southern boundary to the Geographers' A-Z premises.
- 1.3 The proposal is very similar to one that was refused earlier this year (TM/05/02071/TEPA). The principal differences between the two schemes are that the meter cabinet has been omitted from the current proposal and that the mast would now be located 6m further east along Fairfield Road.

2. The Site:

- 2.1 The site lies within the settlement confines of Borough Green on the footway abutting the northern side of Fairfield Road, adjacent to the southern boundary of the Geographers' A-Z Map Company premises. Existing telegraph poles measuring 10m high are located within Fairfield Road, close to the site of the proposed development.

3. Planning History:

- 3.1 TM/05/02071/TEPA Refused 25.08.2005
Installation of 12 metre telecommunications column resembling a telegraph pole, 1 no. equipment cabinet and ancillary development.

4. Consultees:

- 4.1 PC: No response at time of writing this report.
- 4.2 KCC (Highways): No response at time of writing this report.

4.3 DHH: No objections

4.4 Private Reps (including Art 8 Site Notice): 53/0X/0S/1R. The response is from the Borough Green Mast Campaign and objects to this proposal on health grounds, particularly as the site lies less than 200m away from the Borough Green Primary School.

4.5 Any further representations received prior to the Committee meeting will be included in a Supplementary Report.

5. Determining Issues:

5.1 The previous application was refused for the following reason:

“The proposed development, by reason of the siting of the proposed apparatus adjacent to the fence of the business premises in Fairfield Road, would cause a heightened fear of crime for the owner of these premises and would also provide an easier means of access to the premises by criminals and as such is contrary to policy P4/11 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Local Plan 1998.”

5.2 The main determining issue, therefore, is whether the current proposal addresses the previous reason for refusal to such a degree that it should now be permitted.

5.3 The proposed mast has been described as being ‘anti-climb’. However, no information has been put forward to explain how the mast would be treated to be anti-climb. The submitted plans show that there would be no convenient low level horizontal features affixed to the proposed telegraph pole type mast to aid potential climbers. The omission of the meter cabinet from the submission also does away with a feature that would certainly have helped people to climb up and over the adjacent fence surrounding Geographers’ A-Z premises. It should perhaps be pointed out at this time that whilst it is inevitable that some type of meter cabinet will be required in connection with this development, no such details have been provided with this application. It is likely that a cabinet could be provided under permitted development rights contained within Schedule 2, Part 24 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 that would not require any form of approval from the Local Planning Authority.

5.4 In light of the above, I consider that this proposal has satisfactorily addressed the reason given for refusing the previous application (TM/05/02071/TEPA) relating to telecommunications development in this part of Fairfield Road.

5.5 I note the concerns of local residents regarding the health impacts of the proposed development. However, Members may well recall the debate that took place in Committee in connection with the previous application and, arising from that debate, health impacts were not cited as a reason for refusal in respect of that application which concerned the same type of telecommunications development in this part of Fairfield Road. The applicant has also submitted an ICNIRP certificate

stating that the proposed development complies with the international standard regarding radiation emissions. PPG 8 (Telecommunications) advises at paragraph 29 that health considerations can be material considerations in determining applications for prior approval as well as full planning permission. It is also stated at paragraph 30:

“However, it is the Government’s firm view that the planning system is not the place for determining health safeguards. It remains central Government’s responsibility to decide what measures are necessary to protect public health. In the Government’s view, if a proposed mobile phone base station meets the ICNIRP guidelines for public exposure it should not be necessary for a local planning authority, in processing an application for planning permission or prior approval, to consider the health aspects and concerns about them.”

It further states at paragraph 31:

“ In the Government’s view, local planning authorities should not implement their own precautionary policies e.g. by way of imposing a ban or moratorium on new telecommunications development or insisting on minimum distances between new telecommunications development and existing development.”

- 5.6 As with the previous application, the applicant has submitted a list of alternative sites for the proposed development that have been investigated and subsequently discounted. As circumstances have not significantly changed in the locality since the previous application was determined and since that application was refused solely on the grounds of security, I do not consider it necessary to address this issue further in respect of this application.
- 5.7 The proposed mast would be of the same size, design and colour finish as the one the subject of planning permission TM/05/02071/TEPN, which, as Members will recall, was not refused on grounds of its visual impact. Given that the mast is of the same type and size and would be in the same part of Fairfield Road as the previous submission, I do not consider that it would cause any detriment to the visual amenity of the locality.
- 5.8 In light of the above, I would recommend that that the applicant be notified that the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority is required for the siting, design and external appearance of the proposed development, and that the local planning authority approves the siting, design and external appearance of the proposal.

6. Recommendation:

- 6.1 The **Prior Approval** of the Local Planning Authority **is required** to the siting, design and external appearance of the development.
- 6.2 **Grant Prior Approval** as detailed in statement date stamped 09.11.2005 and plan nos. P/36156B-21/GEN/050B, 051B.

Informative:

- 1 If at any time the mast is no longer required for telecommunications purposes it should be removed as soon as is reasonably practical and the land restored to its former condition.(I010*)

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

Contact: Matthew Broome