

ITEM NUMBER: 5e

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| 21/03837/FUL | Installation of 1No. 17.5m high monopole and 2No. equipment cabinets, together with ancillary apparatus. Existing monopole and cabinet to be removed. | |
| Site Address: | South Side Of Station Road, Station Road, Tring, Herts | |
| Applicant/Agent: | | Mrs Rachel Coulter |
| Case Officer: | Colin Lecart | |
| Parish/Ward: | Tring Town Council | Tring East |
| Referral to Committee: | Objection received from the parish council | |

1. RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be GRANTED.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The proposal seeks to replace an existing mast on a site already used for telecommunications equipment and therefore complies with the NPPF's emphasis on keeping telecommunications sites and mast to a minimum.

2.2 Due to the existing context of station road, where residential dwellings span the northern side of the road and regularly spaced and clearly visible vertical street furniture such as street lights, power poles, and signage on approach, it is considered that the proposal would not result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area overall. The applicants have confirmed that 17.5m height is the minimum height at which the required coverage and technical upgrades can be achieved. As a result, it is considered that the site is suitable for this development with regards to its existing use and the surrounding context.

2.3 Hertfordshire Highways have no objection to the proposal, noting that the location of the proposed equipment is considered to be acceptable and would not interfere with the safe and free functioning of use of the adjacent highway carriageway or footway.

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The application site comprises a grass verge on the southern side of Station Road, Tring and is occupied by an existing 12.5m high mast with a cabinet. Another existing mast is located a short distance to the south west along the same stretch of verge. The site is located between the grounds of Tring Park Cricket Club to the south and residential dwellings to the north.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 Planning permission is sought for the installation of 1No. 17.5m high monopole and 2No. equipment cabinets, together with ancillary apparatus. Existing monopole and cabinet are to be removed.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications:

4/01885/17/TEL. - The installation of 1no. 12.5m elara monopole (coloured light grey) with 3no. Shrouded antennas, 1no. Alifabs hurcules equipment cabinet and ancillary development.

4/01858/11/STU - Installation of high speed broadband cabinet

6. CONSTRAINTS

CIL Zone: CIL2

Parish: Tring CP

RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Green (15.2m)

RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: RAF HALTON: DOTTED BLACK ZONE

Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town Village (Tring)

Parking Standards: New Zone 3

Town: Tring

7. REPRESENTATIONS

Consultation responses

7.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

7.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

8. PLANNING POLICIES

Main Documents:

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)

Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004)

Core Strategy (2013):

NP1 - Supporting Development

CS1 - Distribution of Development

CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages

CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design

CS12 - Quality of Site Design

CS13 – Quality of Public Realm

Local Plan (2004):

Policy 126 – Electronic Communication Apparatus

9. CONSIDERATIONS

Main Issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

- The policy and principle justification for the proposal;
- The quality of design and impact on visual amenity;
- The impact on residential amenity; and
- The impact on highway safety and car parking.

Principle of Development

9.2 Section 10 (paragraphs 114-118) of the NPPF (2021) sets out the approach that local planning authorities should take to the upgrade and expansion of electronic communication networks. It states that “*Planning policies and decisions should support the expansion of electronic communications networks, including next generation mobile technology (such as 5G) and full fibre broadband connections*”

9.3 In the interests of limiting the number of radio and electronic communications masts in area, encouragement is given to re-using existing masts, buildings and other structures, although it is acknowledged that there will at times be a requirement for new sites. Where new sites are required, equipment should be sympathetically designed and, where appropriate, camouflaged.

9.4 Paragraph 117 of the NPPF requires applications for electronic communications to be supported by the information necessary to justify the proposed development:

- The outcome of consultations with organisations with in an interest in the proposed development.
- A statement that self-certifies that, when operational, International Commission guidelines on limiting exposure to electromagnetic fields will be met.
- 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.

9.5 In accordance with paragraph 116, applications must be determined on planning grounds only and should not prevent competition between respective operators, question the need for an electronic communication system or set more stringent health safeguards than those set out in the International Commission guidelines for public exposure.

Consultation

9.6 A document entitled “SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION” was included as part of the supporting documents and outlines the consultation which took place prior to submission of this planning application. Consultation was issued to:

- Tring East Ward Councillor
- Tring Town Council
- MP for South West Hertfordshire
- 41 residential properties across Station Road, Nightingale Close, Beech Grove, The Cedars and Hawkwell Drive
- Tring Cricket Club
- Tring Tennis Courts

9.7 The submission includes a summary of the responses that were received and the applicant’s response to these.

Alternative Sites

9.8 The application does not technically re-use the existing 12.5m mast but is replacing it due to the technical requirements for providing increased 4g coverage as well as new 5g coverage to the area. However, the application makes use of an established telecommunications site. The principle over using this site over others was established under 4/01885/17/TEL.

9.9 Furthermore, Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states that the number of radio and electronic communications masts, and the sites for such installations, should be kept to a minimum. By re-using the existing site which involved the removal of the existing mast and cabinet, there would be no net increase in telecommunications equipment/sites in the surrounding area which complies with

the aims of the NPPF. It is likely that if the LPA were to insist on a new site within the surrounding area, that the existing mast on this site would be retained, resulting in a net increase of masts in the surrounding area.

9.10 When taking into account the NPPF's emphasis on keeping the number of masts and sites for these to a minimum in an area and the proposed use of an existing site under this application, it is considered that alternative site searches are not necessary. Nonetheless, the consultation information the applicant has provided outlined that alternative sites were raised by residents and responses to this are included.

Public Health

9.11 The applicant has certified that the proposed mast would be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency (RF) public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation (ICNIRP). Therefore, in these circumstances the NPPF advises that health safeguards are not something for a decision maker to determine.

9.12 As the required ICNIRP certificate has been received, we cannot consider the health implications of the proposals any further.

9.13 The application is also accompanied by a document on Health and Mobile Phone Base Stations which summarises research reviews on the issue.

9.14 It is also noted that in April 2021 the government released a consultation on a change to permitted development rights surrounding communications development. The information points towards further measures/changes in the legislation to cover the design requirements of 5g masts.

9.15 Due to the above, it is considered that the proposed development in this location is acceptable in principle.

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.16 The approach taken by Saved Policy 126 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004) is for applications for electronic communications apparatus to be assessed with regard to size, colour and appearance; local topography, relationship with adjoining dwellings, the presence of trees in the vicinity and the extent to which they screen the site; the size, form and prominence of other authorised telecommunications apparatus in the vicinity.

9.17 Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy seek to ensure that, amongst other things, development preserves attractive streetscapes and integrates with the streetscape character.

9.18 The application site backs off onto the grounds of Tring Park Cricket Club to the South with residential properties located on the opposite side of the road to the north.

9.19 Station Road is a relatively straight road which features regularly spaced vertical street furniture either side of the road. When traveling towards the site from the west, one would perceive power line poles on one side of the road with street lighting and signage on the other. From longer views, existing vegetation and trees along the boundary with Pound Meadow would assist in partially screening the development. Nonetheless, due to the presence of existing vertical street furniture combined with the nature of the straight road, views towards the mast would be gradual and partially concealed from longer views. Once views open up on approach, the mast would be perceived in a context where existing vertical street furniture already characterises part of the street scene, along with residential dwellings on the opposite side of the road. Existing trees behind the site, within the cricket club grounds, would assist in softening the appearance of the development.

9.20 Views from the north east would largely be the same as above, with the curvature of the road and existing landscaping helping to partially screen and soften long range views of the development. Again, vertical street furniture that is regularly spaced would be clearly visible on approach to the site. There are no Listed Buildings within the immediate vicinity and the site lies outside the Tring Conservation Area.

9.21 There is no doubt that at close range views, the mast would be prominent. However, it is considered that this in itself does not equate to harm to the overall character and appearance of the area when taking into account the context on approach and the existing situation whereby two masts already exist in close proximity to each other combined with the surrounding vertical street furniture on approach. While the road does exhibit an open nature due to landscaping and the location of the cricket club grounds and Pound Meadow to the south and south west, residential dwellings stretch the entire northern side of the road with little interruption on approach to the more urbanised setting of Tring's High Street. In this wider context, it is considered that despite the height of the mast, it would not be a feature completely incongruous to an urban setting within the established boundaries of a town such as Tring.

9.22 It is considered that the mast would not be overtly prominent from southern views (such as Pound Meadow) due to existing tree coverage. A condition will state that the mast and cabinets should be finished in green to assist its assimilation with the tree's located to the rear as much as possible.

9.23 The application initially proposed the retention of the existing cabinet on site (alongside the proposed cabinet) and a highway barrier measuring 12m in length. There were concerns regarding over cluttering of the green verge in this location, especially when considering the other existing mast and cabinets a short distance away from the site. As such, the proposed barrier has been omitted and the existing cabinet would be removed. The barrier was also removed due to concerns from Hertfordshire Highways.

9.24 The applicants have also confirmed that the Network's radio planners have stated that a height lower than 17.5m is not possible as to do this would compromise the technologies offered and limit the service improvements. A lower height of say, 15m, would not offer a suitable upgrade path for the future and would need to be replaced with a taller pole at a later date. Thus there height has been limited to that which is necessary to offer the public benefits of the proposal in the form of increased connectivity.

9.25 As previously stated, the NPPF places an emphasis on keeping mast sites to a minimum and by using an existing site such as this which involves the removal of the existing mast, there would not be a net increase in masts located within the area. However, a number of concerns around siting have been raised and potential alternative sites at Tesco and Pound Meadow have been mentioned.

9.27 Notwithstanding the NPPF's emphasis on using existing sites and keeping new ones to a minimum, the case officer has reviewed Pound Meadow and the roundabout at Tesco on an initial basis regarding potential visual impacts at these locations.

9.28 With regards to the roundabout at Tesco's to the south of the proposed site, from approach from the south west along London Road, vertical street furniture is more sparsely more sparsely and irregularly placed than the situation on Station Road. The street scene also appears more open before one gets to the roundabout at Tescos (due to the lack of built form on approach). Thus, a mast at this height here would be seen more abruptly where as along station road, existing vertical street furniture such as power line poles, street lights and the other existing mast are present and widely perceived on approach to the site location. If a potential mast were to be positioned further east along London Road, it would then be seen more prominently from long range views across Pound Meadow.

9.29 Pound Meadow itself is an open field whereby from within the field, any views of a potential mast here would be perceived out of odds with the area due to lack of any other concentrations of vertical street furniture. It would also be viewed from a wider variety of angles depending on where a mast was positioned on this land.

9.30 Overall, with respect to visual impacts, a mast of this height at either Tesco's or Pound Meadow would be seen more abruptly than on station road due to smaller concentrations of vertical street furniture and lack of built form on approach.

9.31 Due to the above, it is considered that the development would not be harmful to the overall character and appearance of the surrounding area and accords with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policy 126 of the Local Plan (2004). It should be noted that even if harm was to be identified, this would have to be carefully balanced against the public benefit of the proposals and the emphasis of the NPPF for LPA's to support high quality communications.

Impact on Residential Amenity

9.32 The NPPF outlines the importance of planning in securing good standards of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy, seek to ensure that new development does not result in detrimental impact upon the neighbouring properties and their amenity space.

9.33 It is considered that the development would not have an adverse impact on the nearby residential properties in terms of loss of light or outlook. The profile of the mast is not of a form of massing which would cause overshadowing over large areas throughout the day. While it will be visible to residents, this in itself would not cause significant harm in terms of enclosure to the living spaces of any of the nearby properties. The proposed mast would represent a 5m increase in height above the existing one. However, the properties across the road would be located in excess of 20m away from the site, with landscaping along the front boundaries assisting in partially screening the development. There it is not considered that the development would be significantly overbearing and it should be noted that there is generally no guaranteed 'right to a view' which would form a material planning consideration.

9.34 In terms of noise, the Environmental Health Officer has stated there is no research, documentation, neither established nor hearsay evidence to suggest that the noise emitted by the proposed mast will be any more prevalent at the facades of potential sensitive receptor properties than existing background noise from nearby road networks. Also, in their experience they have only had negative dealings with 4g/5g masts from a noise perspective was when they appeared to be malfunctioning.

9.35 The mast and cabinet would be sited in excess of 20m away from the properties on northern side of the road, which are well set back from the frontage. Like the Environmental Health Officer indicates, it is considered that the cabinet or mast will not produce noise levels above and beyond existing ambient noise from the local road network which would lead to nuisance issues to the residential properties, especially when taking into account the overall distance. The officer has suggested a noise informative which can be attached to the decision notice if the application is granted.

9.36 As previously stated, the applicant has certified that that the proposed mast would be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency (RF) public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation (ICNIRP). Therefore, in these circumstances the NPPF advises that health safeguards are not something for a decision maker to determine.

9.37 Due to the above, it is considered the proposal would not result in adverse impacts on the residential amenity of the surrounding properties.

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.38 Hertfordshire Highway initially raised concern with the proposal regarding the barrier that was to be less than 500mm from the highway boundary. This has now been omitted and as such they no longer have an objection.

9.39 The location of the proposed equipment is considered to be acceptable by HCC as Highway Authority and would not interfere with the safe and free functioning of use of the adjacent highway carriageway or footway.

Other Material Planning Considerations

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.40 There are trees located to the rear of the site, within the grounds of the cricket club. However, these are positioned on the other side of a ditch and an existing hedge. It is considered that due to the distance of the proposed works to these trees, that the trees would not be detrimentally harmed. Furthermore, the existing mast is in a similar position and the presence of this equipment suggests that there are already underground services running beneath the verge in this location.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 The proposal seeks to replace an existing mast on a site already used for telecommunications equipment and therefore complies with the NPPF's emphasis on keeping telecommunications sites and mast to a minimum.

10.2 Due to the existing context of station road, where residential dwellings span the northern side of the road and regularly spaced and clearly visible vertical street furniture such as street lights, power poles, and signage on approach, it is considered that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area overall. The applicants have confirmed that 17.5m height is the minimum height at which the required coverage and technical upgrades can be achieved. As a result, it is considered that the site is suitable for this development with regards to its existing use and the surrounding context.

10.3 Hertfordshire Highways have no objection to the proposal, noting that the location of the proposed equipment is considered to be acceptable and would not interfere with the safe and free functioning of use of the adjacent highway carriageway or footway.

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That planning permission be GRANTED.

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:

201 Rev C
301 Rev C

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. Within one month of installation, the 17.5m monopole and equipment cabinet hereby approved shall be painted dark green.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) and Policy 126 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004).

4. Within three months of commencing this planning permission, the existing 12.5m Hutchinson Engineering Elara Street Pole and existing shown Hercules Equipment Cabinet as shown on drawings 201 Rev C (proposed site plan) and 301 Rev C (proposed site elevation) and shall be removed and the land restored to its original condition.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and to ensure that there is no a proliferation of radio and electronic communication masts, in accordance with Policies CS11, CS12 and CS13 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013), and paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Informatives:

1. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.
2. The plant installed on the proposed development shall be adequately maintained and monitored, ensuring ambient/residual noise from the mast (if any exists) is not capable of causing a detrimental impact on the occupants of residential properties in the locality.
3. Telecommunications equipment: All cabinets/poles should be installed in accordance with the Department for Transport 'Design Manual for Roads & Bridges' (Cabinet Siting and Pole Siting Code of Practice, Section 4.1.2). Where a request is made for a departure from the above standards should be submitted to the Highway Authority via the Local Planning Authority for prior approval.

The applicant is advised that they are not authorised to carry out any work within the Public Highway without a valid permit in accordance with the Permit Scheme. This consent is separate and additional to any planning permission that may be given. Details of the Permit scheme can be found via the County Councils website at:

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/permit-scheme/east-of-england-permit-scheme.aspx> 2015.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

| Consultee | Comments |
|------------------------------|---|
| Hertfordshire Highways (HCC) | <p>Amended Plan submitted Dec 2021 (site plan is drawing number 201 C)</p> <p>Installation of 1No. 17.5m high monopole and 2No. equipment cabinets, together with ancillary apparatus thereto including Armco barrier. Existing monopole to be removed.</p> <p>Decision Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.</p> <p>AN) Telecommunications equipment: All cabinets/poles should be installed in accordance with the Department for Transport 'Design Manual for Roads & Bridges' (Cabinet Siting and Pole Siting Code of Practice, Section 4.1.2). Equipment where a request is made for a departure from the above standards should be submitted to the Highway Authority via the Local Planning Authority for prior approval.</p> <p>The applicant is advised that they are not authorised to carry out any work within the Public Highway without a valid permit in accordance with the Permit Scheme. This consent is separate and additional to any planning permission that may be given. Details of the Permit scheme can be found via the County Councils website at: https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/permit-scheme/east-of-england-permit-scheme.aspx</p> <p>Comments The application comprises of the installation of a telecommunications monopole and associated equipment and works (and removal of existing equipment) on land at Station Road, Tring. Station Road is designated as a classified C local access road, subject to a speed limit of 30mph and is highway maintainable at public expense. The proposed pole and equipment would be located on</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>highway verge to the south side of the carriageway.</p> <p>The amended plan includes the removal of the previously proposed ARMCO barrier, which was deemed to be not acceptable to the highway authority. The amended plan is therefore considered acceptable in this respect. The location of the proposed equipment is considered to be acceptable by HCC as Highway Authority and would not interfere with the safe and free functioning of use of the adjacent highway carriageway or footway.</p> <p>HCC as Highway Authority has no objections on highway grounds to the planning application, subject to the details included in the above informative.</p> |
| <p>Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)</p> | <p>Having reviewed the application submission and the ECP Team records I am able to confirm that there is no objection on the grounds of land contamination. Also, there is no requirement for further contaminated land information to be provided, or for contaminated land planning conditions to be recommended in relation to this application.</p> <p>06.01.2022 (Environmental Health):</p> <p>There is no research, documentation, neither established nor hearsay evidence to suggest that the noise emitted by the proposed mast will be any more prevalent at the facades of potential sensitive receptor properties than existing background noise from nearby road networks.</p> <p>In my experience the only 4G/5G phone masts which I've ever had any negative dealings with, in terms of nuisance, emitted noise only when malfunctioning.</p> <p>Whilst I note concerns raised in objections, I cannot find any established research on the subject of noise nuisance from 5G masts beyond claims made by websites also posing unfounded pseudoscience as fact. This would therefore not be a trusted resource and would be an inappropriate foundation for any objection by this team.</p> <p>You could potentially include an informative as below to appease these concerns, if you are minded to, but I certainly wouldn't insist on it.</p> <p>Noise Informative The plant installed on the proposed development shall be adequately</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| | <p>maintained and monitored, ensuring ambient/residual noise from the mast (if any exists) is not capable of causing a detrimental impact on the occupants of residential properties in the locality.</p> |
| Parish/Town Council | <p>Amended comments:</p> <p>Tring Town Council recommended REFUSAL of this application on the same grounds as the previous application but in addition, there are now safety concerns in respect of the removal of the barrier.</p> <p>Original comments:</p> <p>Tring Town Council recommended REFUSAL of this application on the grounds of over-development (too high, wide and extra equipment), out of keeping in a green rural setting, highway concerns, noise concerns, potentially hazardous. No certainty that other potential and more appropriate sites have been investigated.</p> |
| Hertfordshire Highways (HCC) | <p>Original response:</p> <p>Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority recommends that permission be refused for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. The proposed Armco barrier is not the necessary minimum horizontal distance of 500mm from the edge of the highway carriageway as documented in the Highway Authority's Roads in Hertfordshire: Highway Design Guide (section 4, 1.9).</p> <p>Therefore in order to be acceptable the proposed barrier would either need to be set back to 500mm or removed from the proposals, which is the interest of the safe functioning of the adjacent highway carriageway. HCC as Highway Authority would not have an objection to the remaining proposed equipment, which would be located on the existing highway verge adjacent to existing equipment..</p> |

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

| Neighbour | Contributors | Neutral | Objections | Support |
|-----------|--------------|---------|------------|---------|
|-----------|--------------|---------|------------|---------|

| Consultations | | | | |
|---------------|----|---|----|---|
| 9 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 0 |

Neighbour Responses

| Address | Comments |
|---|--|
| 6 Hawkwell Drive Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NN | <p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>We write to object to plans to remove the existing 12.5m mobile phone mast and build a new, much higher 17.5m mast. The current mast is already an eye sore and completely not in keeping with the market town that is Tring. We note that the new 17.5m mast will have 6 antennae also, so will look even more out of place compared to the current mast, as well as emitting 4G and 5G.</p> <p>The current mast is clearly visible from our back bedroom already and this new, higher one will be the same height as the surrounding trees, so even more of an eye sore. We are not happy about this.</p> <p>More importantly however, we have two children. We note that whilst there is no evidence that these telephone masts cause cancer or other health conditions, the jury is still out and there is further research ongoing into the health effects of such masts (the World Health Organisation is currently investigating and is yet to report its findings). We are concerned that this newly proposed mast will be very close to our property and emit far more RF waves than the current mast. We note that there is a report called the Stewart report that recommends such masts are not located near to schools for this reason. I am sure you can understand how worrying this for parents of two children.</p> <p>We would like to know what other suitable locations there are for this mast and whether these have been fully considered and explored? Surely there are other sites that are not located so close to residential properties, sites where the mast could be more effectively concealed from view.</p> <p>We understand many of our neighbours also feel the same and we hope you understand and listen to our concerns.</p> |
| 10 Hawkwell Drive Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NN | <p>The proposed new mast will be 17.5m so 5m higher than the existing one which will be very unsightly. Also it will emit 5G which has only been tested since 2019 and the jury is still out on side effects this may cause.</p> <p>With it being so close to properties this could well de value them according to a local estate agent.</p> <p>Seems a sensible idea would be to look for another site where it doesn't impact on peoples property and views.</p> |
| 3 Hawkwell Drive Tring Hertfordshire | <p>This proposal is located on a high prominent position in Tring on Station Road and will ruin the character and appearance of the road affecting adjacent properties and amenity spaces. Also concerned as to the use</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| HP23 5NN | <p>of the mast in emitting 5G which has only been subject to testing since 2019 with WHO publication due in 2022. This proposed 17.50m high mast will be within close proximity to adjoining properties, community play space, Schools, Cricket Club and Children's Nursery with potential dangers to Health.</p> |
| <p>8 Hawkwell Drive Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NN</p> | <p>We strongly object to this application to remove the existing 12.5m mast and replace with a new much higher 17.5m mast 5m closer to our property. This is simply not an appropriate location to place such a high and unsightly structure, with 6 visible antennae. It is far too close to residential properties and will ruin the character and appearance of so many properties and the lovely leafy street scene on Station Road and Hawkwell Drive. Cornerstone even say in their application that Station Road has a 'green rural feel' which will be ruined by this huge piece of equipment.</p> <p>It cannot be right that just because we have one 12.5m high mast (which is only slightly higher than street light height) we now all have to endure a considerably higher, more unsightly mast that towers over and blights residential properties and worries residents about the health effects of 5G.</p> <p>Firstly this proposed much higher mast will significantly reduce the amenity of our property, 8 Hawkwell Drive. Due to its 5m higher and 5m closer position to our property it will completely dominate the skyline view from our master bedroom window. It will also be clearly visible from our back garden and ruin the skyline there. We cannot see the current 12.5m mast at all from our garden so this will be a huge and very detrimental change for us. We find this very distressing as we see our back garden as our place to relax and retreat. We will not be able to relax in our garden if our skyline is overshadowed by this very high and unsightly telephone mast (especially due to the health concerns that we have as set out below). This is very upsetting and stressful for us as I am sure you can understand.</p> <p>Cornerstone have stated that the new proposed phone mast will have a similar 'slim line appearance' to the existing mast. We do not agree due to the fact that 6 antennae will be visible rather than it being enclosed in a case like the current installation. This structure will look completely different and be 5m higher and 5m closer to us therefore it will be significantly more overbearing and unsightly.</p> <p>Most importantly however, we have two very small children (a baby aged 6 months and a toddler aged 2 years old). The World Health Organisation (WHO) have stated that the RF radiation emitted from such masts is possibly carcinogenic and there is further research ongoing into the health effects of such radiation. We note that studies into the new 5G technology, which emits RF waves from these phone masts at a higher frequency, has only been ongoing since 2019.</p> <p>The WHO state: 'WHO is conducting a health risk assessment from exposure to radiofrequencies, covering the entire radiofrequency range, including 5G, to be published by 2022. WHO will review scientific evidence related to potential health risks from 5G exposure as the new technology is deployed, and as more</p> |

public health-related data become available.'

We are deeply concerned that this newly proposed mast will be very close to our property (within 30 or so metres) and emit far more RF waves (and 5G) than the current mast. This makes us and our two small children guinea pigs in this 'ongoing further research' experiment which is very distressing. The thought of this is seriously affecting our emotional and physical wellbeing. We note that there is a report called the Stewart report that recommends such masts are not located near to schools for this reason. I am sure that you can understand how worrying this is for a mother of two little children.

Also what happens if the WHO's report that is published in 2022 states that these phone masts are health hazards? Who will buy our house then? We will be stuck in a property that is putting our whole family's lives at risk.

We have sought the advice of an estate agent who has stated that he believes the height, proximity and health concerns of this new phone mast will put some potential buyers off buying our property if we were ever to sell, and in his own words it will make the properties on Station Road opposite the new mast very difficult to sell. He even used the words 'unsaleable.' They will be totally blighted. This is clearly unacceptable.

In addition if this new mast is erected as proposed it will surely set a precedent so that in 5 years or so, when the next technology comes out (we assume 6G) we will have to endure even higher, more unsightly masts that may be even more detrimental to our health and well-being.

We also understand that the installation of the previous mast caused lots of issues with TV signal in our neighbours' properties and this again highlights how this is an unsuitable location for such a mast as it is so close to lots of residential properties.

We strongly suggest that this new phone mast is moved to a site that is not located so closely to residential properties. One such location is Pound Meadow which is situated only 15 metres or so from the existing phone mast. Alternatively we suggest the grass verge area by the roundabout outside Tring Tesco which is not overlooked by anyone.

Pound Meadow is a patch of grass with a skate park, tennis court, derelict building and a concrete path to Tesco. Pound Meadow is not overlooked by anyone on the Tesco side. If the new telephone mast is moved to the Tesco side of Pound Meadow (perhaps behind the derelict building which has a line of trees behind it to further shield it from visibility) it will not affect anyone's amenity, outlook or emotional or physical well-being.

Cornerstone have stated that they believe Pound Meadow and the grass verge in front of Tesco is Greenbelt Land. We understand from Cornerstone that the test for being able to build this mast on Greenbelt is if there is no other suitable location to build. As we have stated the

site on Station Road is not suitable for this 17.5m high structure and therefore if there are no other sites in Tring available then this meets the test so that it can be built on this patch of Greenbelt. Also we cannot see how a grass verge by a roundabout in front of Tesco can be considered as Greenbelt? We believe that this cannot be correct.

In practice of the law we note that the Courts and adversarial bodies always seek to balance the interests of the parties when seeking to resolve a conflict. Here we see that on the one hand we have our right (and our neighbours rights) to enjoyment of our properties free from being blighted and overlooked by an unsightly telephone mast and the serious concerns that we have to our families health verses a possible slight inconvenience and small cost to a telephone company with very deep pockets in moving the installation a few metres away to Pound Meadow or the Tesco verge. We cannot see how the huge upset this will cause to us and our neighbours should be endured so that a huge telephone company can save a little time and money. We would argue that as the proposed structure is already to be moved 5m away from the existing 12.5m monopole a new hole will have to be drilled into the ground anyway and they will need new ducts and cabinets to support the new structure. A more suitable location less close to residential properties will also allow a higher more powerful mast in the future if this is deemed necessary.

Due to the strong nature of our concerns we respectfully request that this application is called in for a committee hearing and we would very much like to attend the same in person.

We look forward to hearing from you.

I am sure that you are now aware that the councillors of Tring Town Council voted unanimously on Monday 25th October to reject the planning permission for the 17.5m telephone mast on Station Road in Tring. I believe the ball is now in your court, as you are the case officer, regarding whether this is the end of this matter. We so hope that you agree with us all that permission for this mast should be rejected.

We are now aware of the legal grounds that you are bound by in order to refuse the planning permission. We therefore wanted to make you aware of a few further pieces of information that will bolster our arguments in line with these legal grounds.

1) Overdevelopment:

In summary, and as we have already set out to you, this 17.5m mast is a huge piece of equipment that will tower over beautiful Victorian houses on a lovely leafy green road in Tring. Waldron Telecom (We've called them Cornerstone in our previous correspondence) even describe the road as having a 'green rural feel' in their application. These sorts of industrial sized masts are normally situated on roundabouts/by very busy roads or in industrial areas and the proposed 17.5m high structure is completely out of character of a beautiful green residential road. It will totally ruin the amenity of many properties, the road and the character and appearance of the area. It will also, as we have already set out, greatly reduce the amenity of our property and of

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>a great deal of our neighbours' properties.</p> <p>One thing we wanted to make you aware of is the fact that when the existing 12.5m mast was erected on Station Road another site, opposite the fire station in Tring was considered. Very near to this 'fire station site' is a small industrial area and it is very close to the Shell petrol station. This 'fire station site' was rejected on grounds that it would be 'visually intrusive on the surroundings'. We are firmly of the belief that placing a 5 metre higher mast with 6 visible antennae on a green rural residential street will be far more visually intrusive on the surroundings than the site that was rejected by a fire station and a petrol station.</p> <p>We have already set out a few more appropriate sites in email correspondence with you. One such site is the grass verge by the roundabout and entrance to Tring Tesco. As we have already explained the grass verge by Tring Tesco is not Greenbelt and it is not overlooked by any residential properties, therefore it is the perfect place for such a construction.</p> <p>2) It impacts on highway safety: We note that Hertfordshire County Council recommend that planning permission is refused for this mast because the Armco Barrier that Waldon Telecom wish to place in front of the mast, to protect vehicles, is not the necessary 500mm from the edge of the highway carriageway. We will argue that if the Armco Barrier is removed from the application plans then this is a serious danger to road users. We attach a photograph of the grass verge (this is emailed directly to you Colin) where this new mast is proposed to be sited. You will see that it is a very skinny piece of grass with a ditch behind it. Therefore any metal boxes, other equipment and the base of the mast will be situated very close to the road which could cause a serious or fatal collision if a motor vehicle were to collide with any of the equipment proposed.</p> <p>In light of all of the above and all our other arguments that we have already set out to you (in addition to Tring Town Council and our neighbours requests to reject) we respectfully request that you reject this planning application.</p> <p>We are very happy to discuss further with you over the telephone or in person should you wish to do so.</p> |
| 13 Hawkwell Drive Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NN | Ruins character and appearance of the road It may affect people's properties Unnecessary to be so high The last mast knocked out our neighbours TV signal / aerial |
| 17 Station Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NG | Thanks for he opportunity to comment on the above proposal: 1. Planning Permission The current proposal differs from the decision in 2017 to approve the existing 12.5m 4G mast (Dacorum ref 4/01885/17/TEL) in the important |

respect that in that being over 15m in height it needs full planning permission. Many reservations over the previous proposal could not be properly scrutinised due to it being 'permitted development' but in this case Dacorum BC can do a proper evaluation of the merits of the case, and it must do so.

Cornerstone, in their 'consultation', have acknowledged numerous objections without any real attempt to answer them, and it is clear that they regard this as a box ticking exercise in the belief that because they were able to bulldoze through their previous proposal then this one will go through 'on the nod' as well. But this request requires planning permission and should be judged on its own merits, which are clearly lacking. We, the residents, demand that the full scrutiny we were denied previously be carried out in this case.

If approval is granted, it will in effect provide a free hand for the developer to come back again next time with a 20, 25, 30m mast, using this decision as a precedent. If approval is declined, on the other hand, the developer will be forced to do a proper assessment of the appropriate position for the mast, rather than the shoddy paper-based review it carried out last time.

2. Choice of Site

The proposal is to place the new mast close to the existing one as the location, in Cornerstone's words, "was deemed acceptable by the Local Planning Authority" (Cornerstone submission p4). This is an extremely disingenuous comment - in fact residents objected strongly to the siting, as did Tring Town Council, and we understand that there were also serious reservations within Dacorum Planning Department, but there were felt to be insufficient grounds to override the 'permitted development' status of the proposal. I do not believe any local people or representatives were happy with the decision as Cornerstone's comments imply.

Cornerstone are positioning the new mast as merely an 'upgrade' to the current installation, and as such have confirmed in their submission that no alternative sites have been investigated (Cornerstone p20). This is patently not a mere upgrade being more than a 40% bigger installation, and this is reflected in the need for full planning permission.

In their 2017 submission, the developer supposedly considered alternatives - for example Tring Fire Station, London Road sites etc, but rejected them on their own account - effectively marking their own homework. Their proposal for Station Road was presented as a fait accompli to the Council which did not have the grounds to refuse due to 'permitted development'. In fact, both residents and Tring Town Council have made several suggestions that would meet the developer's needs and not affect residents, and should this proposal be rejected - and it should - Cornerstone will have to do a more thorough job at site selection.

Since this proposal is for a replacement rather than an additional mast, any decision to refuse and site elsewhere should also result in the

removal of the current 12.5m 4G mast which has blighted our road for long enough.

3. Overdevelopment

The location in Cornerstone's words is as follows: "This stretch of Station Road has a pleasant feel.... The houses... work with the hedgerow and trees on the south side to create a green, rural feel." However, in their previous submission of 2017, when asked why Tring Fire Station - an industrial site unlikely to win any architectural awards - had not been considered, the developer said that it would be "visually intrusive on the surroundings". Surely, the combination of visually intrusive equipment on an area with a green, rural feel is the very definition of overdevelopment.

As noted below, Hertfordshire Highways have objected to the armco in the design as it cannot be the required 500mm from the edge of the carriageway. Since this is an integral part of the design, this by definition confirms that the configuration is too large for the location proposed.

Just looking at the plans should be enough to show how inappropriate this proposal is for the suggested location, but some specifics:

- * The current 12.5m pole overtops the local streetlights by approximately 30% and the new proposal at 17.5m or 57 feet would be double their height. There is nothing remotely on this scale anywhere in the area, and it is completely inappropriate for a residential road.
- * As well as being higher, there will be a proportionately bigger circumference of pole to support the additional weight. This is a considerably larger piece of equipment than the current installation, which in itself is far too large.
- * There are six external aerials instead of a single housing as on the current mast. This is a very ugly piece of equipment
- * There will be two cabinets instead of one. As has been noted by Dacorum Environmental Health inspectors, both the 12.5m mast and the 10.4m mast located nearby routinely exceed permitted noise levels, especially in summer. The additional cabinets will presumably create more noise pollution, and it seems that once permission is granted, the developer can walk away from its obligations to keep with agreed standards.

4. Hazard

Since Hertfordshire Highways have already raised an objection to the proposed Armco barrier, this will mean a major unprotected piece of hard infrastructure on a residential road. There is no concrete kerb on this side, so if a vehicle was to veer onto the verge it is likely that any collision would be serious and possibly fatal.

In case it is thought that such an incident is unlikely, we have had an example of a car mounting the verge and damaging BT cabinets 400m down the road only in the last year. This is an unacceptable risk.

5. Summary

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>What is being proposed is completely inappropriate for a residential road, being more suited to an industrial site. It is large, ugly, noisy and demonstrably creates a hazard. It is sited in a place that affects residents where there are better alternatives that do not. Since planning permission is needed, the Council should consider this on its stand-alone merits, where it demonstrably fails.</p> <p>This proposal should be rejected out of hand. We note the resubmission of the above proposal to site a 17.5m 5G mast on Station Road, Tring.</p> <p>As you are aware, many residents and TTC raised serious objections. In my previous comments, I raised the key areas of Inappropriate Location, Overdevelopment, Design and Safety.</p> <p>The only difference between the resubmission and the original is the removal of the protective Armco barrier, in response to the official objection of Hertfordshire Highways.</p> <p>Hertfordshire Highways' objection was that the Armco was not set back 500mm from the carriageway. Cornerstone could not achieve this given the space available, hence the removal. By definition, removal of an original design element in this way proves that the configuration is too large for the location proposed, supporting our objections on the grounds of overdevelopment and location.</p> <p>The Armco barrier is designed to protect the equipment in the case of a collision and, of course, any vehicle and passengers. The effect of the barrier's removal is to leave a major piece of unprotected hard infrastructure along a road with no kerb, likely making any collision serious and potentially fatal. As such, this makes the proposal less safe than the original, thus supporting our objections on the grounds of safety.</p> <p>The resubmission makes no concession to any of the objections raised either by the residents or Tring Town Council, and if anything are worse than the original submission. Tring Town Council (TTC) has reiterated their recommendation to refuse the application.</p> <p>We recommend that Dacorum Borough Council refuse this application.</p> |
| <p>The Croft 18 Station Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NG</p> | <p>We strongly object to this monstrosity of a 17.50m monopole in its expected location. The existing pole is already an eyesore to those of us who live opposite, both visually as well as the constant humming that can be clearly heard. We can only assume the new pole will definitely be uglier and in all probability louder.</p> <p>Where will it stop, as technology improves will we need even bigger monopoles?</p> <p>Surely the answer lies in moving the poles to an area which is not overlooked by so many and where the constant humming would not be</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>so much of an issue. To this end there are numerous places within a short space, Pound Meadow is a large park with plenty of space, an aerial behind the clubhouse would be an obvious place, unseen and unheard.</p> <p>Alternatively there a large verges coming into Tring from the bypass roundabout towards Tesco.</p> <p>I would not like to think it comes down to money, how much they are willing to pay for the site and where fits that criteria? If it means them paying more for an alternative site then make them pay more!</p> <p>As per my previous comments we still strongly object to this application, nothing appears to have changed from the previous application.</p> <p>It will have a severe impact, both visually and the constant humming that comes from these units.</p> <p>The jury is still out on the possible health implications from these masts.</p> <p>There are far more suitable locations within a 5 minute walk yet away from households and which would not be a blight on the landscape.</p> <p>If the previous 12.5m mast is deemed obsolete after 3 years what chance of a larger mast being required in the future?</p> <p>No one in their right mind would want to have these within any distance of their house, let alone being directly in front of ones house.</p> <p>This has to be stopped now if common sense was to prevail.</p> |
| <p>The Laurels 14 Station Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NG</p> | <p>Dear Sir</p> <p>We have received a letter from Dacorum Borough Council planning department dated 11th October detailing planning application, App21/03837/FUL.</p> <p>My wife and I would like to object on the following grounds</p> <p>The application does not take into consideration that its location is adjacent to the frequently used (daily) existing cricket ground entrance. Over the last few years, an increased activity especially for children's sport has occurred. We support this use but are concerned that children cross through the gates unsupervised and cannot be seen as the cabinets obstruct them from oncoming traffic. In addition, the proposed will create an additional visual obstruction to on coming traffic which is used increasingly for larger events (County Cricket, fun runs, local events, fire works and other events) . The mast and the cabinets will create a hazard in terms of visibility given there are already large boxes and antennas restricting drivers and pedestrians accessing the cricket ground. This is an existing accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>The height of the mast will create an adverse visual impact on the street scene.</p> <p>The noise of the existing equipment cabinets is already disruptive to us and our neighbours sleep because of the noise of the fans</p> |

In terms of the advice provided by Dacorum Planning the "material planning considerations" are as follows:-

1. Noise and disturbance resulting from use - there is historic evidence provided by residents that the noise emitted by the existing cooling units are excessive and disturbs sleep. This is far worse in the summer at night. This will make the matters worse. The current situation has NOT been addressed in the last 15 years there is no reason to believe this will be addressed by any words provided by O2

2. Visual intrusion - the proposed mast is INDUSTRIAL in scale and has a significant impact visually for all close by to the proposed mast. This type of mast if used should not be in residential areas but adjacent to existing business parks in the area or adjacent to the A41 away from the centre of Tring

3. Design appearance and materials - the mast will be 17.5 m high far higher than any other man made object in the area with antennae on the top

We recognise the need for masts to enable better reception for mobile phone, but technology is changing quickly and the planning process needs to take into account how these changes impact planning policy. The proposed mast is but the next step in development and their location needs to be better considered. Large wind farms are not placed in the middle of residential areas nor should these excessively high structures.

We object strongly to this proposal the existing mast was only positioned two years ago and already it needs to be replaced by a mast 5m higher. Can we expect another application asking for a new mast another 5m high in two years time ? At what point do Dacorum take the objections of residents seriously ?

Yours sincerely

Colin and Beverley Paterson

The Laurels 14 Station Road Tring HP23 5NG

We have received a letter dated 7th December, setting out details of the planning application 21/03837/FUL, for the installation of a 17.5m high monopole.

Following our objections of the 17th October, O2 clearly feel they can plough ahead and not listen to any comments given to date. The application now sets out the benefits of 5G, the health implications of using high radio frequencies and why the government supports the development of a 5G network. The installation remains unchanged.

These documents add very little to the concerns of ourselves or our neighbours. The key issues have not in our view been addressed

1. The noise and disturbance from use. The noise emitted from the

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>equipment is excessive and does disturb sleep</p> <p>2. Visual intrusion - the mast is INDUSTRIAL in scale and fundamentally changes the nature of the local environment. Further more, the size of the mast now impacts the street scene approaching the town centre where the town church spire use to dominate and will now be dwarfed by telecom equipment.</p> <p>3, The design and materials are not sympathetic to the surrounding properties, recreational areas and vegetation</p> <p>We have previously raised the impact on visibility both for pedestrians and car users if the monopole and cabinets are installed, and thus the increased likely hood of an accident from children or adults entering or leaving the cricket ground or crossing to Pound meadow. This has not been addressed at all</p> <p>We remain strongly against the approval of this application</p> |
| <p>2 Hawkwell Drive Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NN</p> | <p>I object to the above proposal because it may well carry a health risk and will be extremely unsightly.</p> <p>Why is a mast of seventeen and a half metres even being considered in a residential area? We already have a high mast which was put up without any consultation or thought for the residents, and when it was put up I was unable to get a television signal and had to pay £100 to have a booster installed. Please make the installers take it down and do not let them put up an even higher one in a residential area such as ours. If the radiation issue affects us it may well affect dogs being walked and other animals too, and the wider ecology.</p> |
| <p>16 Hawkwell Drive Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NN</p> | <p>The proposed mast will be significantly taller than the current one and will be an eyesore, towering several meters above the tree line. As such, it may also result in the devaluation of neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Currently, there is no specific research on the safety of 5G masts; surely it would be prudent to await the WHO's report, expected next year, before considering such an application?</p> <p>The position of the mast is very close to Pound Meadow, a regular cut through to Tesco and used by numerous Tring School students on a daily basis in term time. Pound Meadow is also used for a variety of recreational activities and, as such, it is totally inappropriate for a mast to be positioned in the vicinity.</p> <p>I believe the mast would be better sited near the bypass, well away from the community and trust the application will not be determined by the potential rental income for the landowner - our children's health must be the priority and I ask you to reject the application.</p> |
| <p>11 Hawkwell Drive</p> | <p>I wish to place an objection to the application proposing to erect one</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NN</p> | <p>17.5m high monopole and 2 No.equipment cabinets, together with ancillary apparatus thereto including Armco barrier. It is entirely unsuitable for erecting in a residential road being too near houses ,traffic and a near by school. It will be an eyesore spoiling the area near to it. It may pose a danger particularly to children..</p> |
|---|--|