SITE 55 GREENHOLE PLACE, BRIDGE OF DON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE

ERECTION OF A 20.5M HIGH SLIM-LINE LATTICE TOWER SUPPORTING 6 NO.RADIO ANTENNAS, 2 NO.TRANSMISSION DISHES AND THE INSTALLATION OF 5 NO.GROUND BASED EQUIPMENT CABINETS, 1 NO.ELECTRICAL METER CABINET AND ANCILLARY DEVELOPMENT ALL FOR THE PURPOSE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS

For: Telefonica UK Ltd

Application Ref.: P120983Advert: Section 34 -Proj. Pub.Application Date: 05/07/2012ConcernOfficer: Tommy HartAdvertised on: 18/07/2012Ward: Bridge of Don (M Jaffrey/J Reynolds/SCommittee Date: 23 August 2012Stuart/W Young)Community Council : no response received



RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to conditions

DESCRIPTION

The site is on the northern edge on Bridge of Don Industrial Estate, adjacent to the Parkway. It comprises the north east corner of the yard of Yardbury Engineering & Oilfield Product Ltd.

To the north of the site is the verge of the Parkway which is approximately 18m wide beyond which is the road itself. On the opposite side of the road are mature trees behind which are residential properties on Lochside Place at a distance of some 55m.

To the east, west and south of the site are business and workshop premises within the industrial estate.

HISTORY

Planning reference 110460 for the erection of a 20m tall telecommunications lattice mast and associated equipment was approved conditionally under delegated powers in July 2011. The Council were advised that negotiations with the landowner broke down and a deal to procure the site could not be agreed. Therefore, an alternative site was sought.

PROPOSAL

Full planning permission is sought for the erection of a telecommunications mast which would have an overall height 20.5m.

The mast would be of a lattice design and accommodate six 3G antennas and two transmission dishes (0.3m and 0.6m in diameter). There would be three equipment cabinets at ground level enclosed by a 1.8m high palisade fence creating a 5m x 6m compound.

The mast would be shared by mobile phone operators Vodafone and O^2 .

An ICNIRP certificate has been submitted by the applicant which confirms compliance with health and safety requirements with regards to radio waves.

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO SUB-COMMITTEE

The proposed telecommunications mast is 20.5m tall and is considered as a project of public concern. Therefore, in terms of the Council's Scheme of Delegation, the application must be determined by the Development Management Sub-Committee.

CONSULTATIONS

ROADS SECTION – no comments received ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH – no comments received COMMUNITY COUNCIL – no comments received

REPRESENTATIONS

None received

PLANNING POLICY

The site lies within an area designated for Business and Industry purposes (BI1) in the Aberdeen Local Development Plan (ALDP). The Communications Infrastructure section of the Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) and PAN62 (Radio Telecommunications) are also of relevance.

EVALUATION

Sections 25 and 37(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 require that in determining a planning application, regard must be had to the Development Plan. Determination shall be made in accordance with the Plan unless material planning considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan consists of the Aberdeen City and Shire Structure Plan and the Aberdeen Local Development Plan.

Policies

ALDP policy BI1 (Business and Industry) encourages class 4, 5 and 6 uses within these areas and seeks to ensure that development does not negatively impact on existing uses or potential future uses. It is considered that the proposed telecommunications mast would not have a negative impact on the surrounding land use and therefore is acceptable.

PAN 62 and the Communications Infrastructure section of the SPP all seek to ensure that telecommunications masts, antennae and equipment are sited and designed to minimise visual impact or intrusion. The PAN goes one step further by stating that developments should be concealed and disguised where possible. It is, however, recognised that technical requirements and constraints may limit opportunities for sensitive design and siting. Further, operators should look at mast and site sharing as an option in order to lessen the impact of proposed development. The SPP is clear that planning authorities should support the expansion of telecommunications infrastructure and should take into account the economic and social implications of not having full coverage capacity in areas.

The mast would undoubtedly be prominent when travelling both ways along the Parkway due to the openness of the area to the south of the Parkway. However when considered in the context of the other tall structures and telecoms equipment along the length of the Parkway, it is apparent that a tall structure such as that proposed would not be unusual. For example the GE (former Vetco Gray) workshop building at the eastern end of the Parkway is several storeys high, Arqiva operate a 42m high telecoms mast at the south end of Valentine Drive and there at least two smaller masts along the length of the Parkway. These structures, although not in the immediate vicinity, do set a context within which to assess this proposal as they are all situated along the Parkway corridor, which is the context that the mast would be viewed in.

The site is on the edge of an industrial estate where telecommunications masts of this type are more common and an accepted piece of the urban environment. This is preferable to locating masts within residential areas where they would likely be located close to homes or located on residential streets. The nearest residential property are approximately 55m away to the north behind trees and therefore the mast would not affect the amenity of enjoyment of these properties. The mast would also be visible from Greenhole Place which is a cul-de-sac within the industrial estate. It is not considered it would be particularly obtrusive from here.

Several site owners in the area were approached but most are not interested in accommodating such equipment within their property. Other sites were discounted in favour of the current site. In view of the above it is acknowledged that there are limited sites within the area where a new mast can satisfactorily be accommodated and this has been taken into account in coming to the recommendation.

The mast would accommodate nine antennae for two mobile phone operators whereas most existing masts accommodate only three antennae for one operator. Therefore due to the site sharing solution proposed this mast would negate the requirement for separate masts to accommodate the same level of equipment. The approval, and subsequent erection of the mast, would mean that the existing site at Jewson's would be removed. Unfortunately the other masts within a mile of the application site which are occupied by the operators '3', 'T-mobile', 'Orange' and 'Airwave' would remain as they do not have site sharing agreements with O2 and Vodaphone. In the context of the immediate area this is not seen as an issue.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve subject to conditions

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

Although the mast would be a prominent addition to the landscape along the Parkway, it is not considered that it would be such an alien feature as to significantly affect the visual amenity of the area. There are already several tall structures and communications installations along the Parkway which provides a context for the mast. The applicant has demonstrated that there are few other sites in the area which are capable of installing such equipment and that the mast would be operated on a site share basis, reducing the requirement for additional masts in the area.

it is recommended that approval is granted with the following condition(s):

(1) in the event that any part of this equipment becomes obsolete or redundant, it must be removed within 6 months of such event. In the event that all of this equipment is removed, the site shall be made good, in accordance with a scheme to be submitted and approved in writing by the Planning Authority, within 1 month of such removal – to minimise the level of visual intrusion and ensure the reinstatement of the site to a satisfactory condition.

(2) that no development shall take place unless it is carried out in full accordance with a scheme to deal with contamination on the site that has been approved in writing by the planning authority.

The scheme shall follow the procedures outlined in Planning Advice Note 33 Development of Contaminated Land and shall be conducted by a suitably qualified person in accordance with best practice as detailed in BS10175 Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites - Code of Practice and other best practice guidance and shall include:

1. an investigation to determine the nature and extent of contamination,

2. a site-specific risk assessment,

3. a remediation plan to address any significant risks and ensure the site is fit for the use proposed.

No building(s) on the development site shall be occupied unless 1. any long term monitoring and reporting that may be required by the approved scheme of contamination or remediation plan or that otherwise has been required in writing by the planning authority is being undertaken and 2. a report specifically relating to the building(s) has been submitted and approved in writing by the planning authority that remedial works to fully address contamination issues related to the building(s) have been carried out, unless the planning authority has given written consent for a variation.

The final building on the application site shall not be occupied unless a report has been submitted and approved in writing by the planning authority that verifies that completion of the remedial works for the entire application site, unless the planning authority has given written consent for a variation.

- reason: in order to ensure that the site is fit for human occupation

(3) That within 6 months of the mast hereby granted permission becoming operational, the existing masts and all equipment shall be removed from the site at 'Jewsons' on The Parkway and the site made good in accordance with a scheme to be submitted and approved in writing by the Planning Authority – in order to minimise the level of visual intrusion and to ensure the reinstatement of the site to a satisfactory condition

Dr Margaret Bochel

Head of Planning and Sustainable Development.