

<p>OTFORD PARISH COUNCIL</p>	<p>Parish Clerk: Sharon Palmer 01959 524808 Email: clerk@otfordpc.co.uk</p>	<p>The School House 21 High Street Otford Sevenoaks Kent TN14 5PG</p>
---	---	---

MINUTES of a MEETING of the OPC PLANNING COMMITTEE at The School House on Wednesday 11 October 2017 from 9:15am

Present: Cllr N Rushby (in the Chair), Cllr J Edwards-Winsor, Mr R Shelton (co-opted).
 Also Present: Mr Gulliver (for the duration of the Public Forum).
 Clerk: Mrs S Palmer

Public Forum. Mr Gulliver attended the Public Forum to speak with Committee Members regarding possible future plans for his current office space. Cllr Edwards-Winsor offered to speak with Planning Officers at SDC regarding planning regulations.

1. Apologies for Absence – Mr M Whitehead.
2. Declarations of interest not previously notified – None.
3. To agree the Minutes of the previous meeting. **RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the previous meeting held on 27 September 2017 were agreed and signed as being an accurate record of the meeting.
- 4 a. New applications. The following applications were considered at the meeting. OPC recommendations will be forwarded to Sevenoaks District Council.

Application reference	Address	Description	OPC Recommendation	SDC Decision
SE/17/02549/FUL	O2 (UK) Ltd, Telecommunication Equip. at Hopgarden Farm, Telston Lane, Otford	Removal of the existing headframe, to be replaced with a Delta headframe, supporting 6 no. relocated antenna, 3 no. additional antenna and 1 no. 0.3 additional dish together with ancillary development thereto. Comments by 12 October 2017.	Objection. (see below for full submission to SDC)	
SE/17/02990/FUL	Little Oast, High Street, Otford	Continued use of property as a single dwelling Comments by 18 October 2017	Support. The application appears to meet planning requirements.	
SE/17/02940/HOUSE	60 Well Road, Otford	Erection of a ground and first floor extension at front and rear, new bay-window at ground floor to match the existing and new rooflights Comments by 17 October 2017	Objection. The extension is not subservient and does not conform to the RESPD. The proposed development does not fit in with the streetscene. The bulk would be excessive.	

SE/17/03019/HOUSE	Summerleaze, 40 Pilgrims Way East, Oxford	Demolition of existing bay window, rear conservatory and front canopy. Erection of a single storey extension to the rear with rooflight and single storey extension to the front. Raising the roof to incorporate a new first floor with dormers to the front and rear and increasing the height of the chimney. Erection of a new canopy to the front. Alterations to fenestrations. Comments by 16 October 2017	Objection. The roof height is excessive and makes the appearance bulky.	
SE/17/02685/HOUSE AMENDED	36 High Street, Oxford	Demolition and replacement of existing conservatory with new lean-to roof. Erection of a two storey rear extension with hipped gable roof. Installation of rooflight. The proposed description has been amended to clarify the works shown on the drawings. The previously described dormer window is shown to be a proposed two storey extension with hipped gable roof. The works previously described as a new conservatory roof appears to include the demolition and replacement of much of the conservatory itself. Comments by 17 October 2017	Objection. The description amendment does not overcome the objection previously recorded on 14 September 2017. <i>'The rear facing glazing (dormer/ conservatory) is out of keeping with the neighbouring Georgian properties in the Conservation Area'.</i>	
SE/17/03081/ CONVAR	6 Tudor Drive, Oxford	Minor material amendment to 17/00164/HOUSE (for erection of a first-floor side extension and a single storey rear extension. A new ramped access to the side of the property. Removal of chimney. Alterations to fenestration and internal alterations. Conversion of garage into habitable room); showing alterations to floor and roof pans by building over the existing porch and elevation. Clad in roof tiles to match existing. Comments by 20 October 2017	Support. The application appears to meet planning requirements. Comment: We object to the black chimney and timber cladding which does not appear to have been addressed as this does not conform with the street scene.	
<p><u>SE/17/02549/FUL – O2 (UK) Ltd Communication Station, Hoggarden Farm, Telston Lane, Oxford. - OPC Recommendation:</u></p> <p>Oxford Parish Council objects to this application in the grounds that the emitted radiation experienced by residents on a neighbouring property appears to be abnormally high because their houses are located on higher ground than the base of the mast.</p> <p>The proposed installation will have a total of 9 antennae and one 300mm dish mounted on a mast with the top of the mast at 17.40m above ground level and the bottom of the installed antennae being 15.40m above ground level.</p> <p>Typically the mast would be located on relatively high ground in order to maximise its coverage and avoid shadows from trees and higher ground in the neighbourhood. However, in this case, it is proposed to modify an existing mast. Its vertical location causes a potential issue for the exposure of inhabitants of the neighbouring houses. It is accepted that CTIL have issued a declaration of ICNIRP compliance for the site. The unresolved question is that transparency of the calculations and measurements which have satisfied CTIL that they can issue that declaration.</p>				

The ICNIRP Guidance starts with a caveat that “these guidelines so not directly address product performance standards, which are intended to limit EMF emissions under specified test conditions, nor does the document deal with the techniques used to measure any of the physical quantities that characterize electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields.” It is for the manufacturer or installer to make the measurements in order to satisfy themselves that the guidance exposures are not being exceeded. The documentation provided in support of the application does not include any of this information – only the oft-repeated statement that CTIL have made a declaration. The question therefore rests on how those measurements were made and on what calculations the exposure was determined. It is clear that someone must have done their work, otherwise CTIL would be acting recklessly in issuing their declaration.

Given that there are 9 antennae in the array we can assume that, as in the existing installation, they are arranged to give 360 degree coverage and that they will be arranged at different elevations to the horizontal to ensure that the areas of low coverage are minimised. We are not concerned about the dish antennae which radiates a relatively narrow beam to another transmitter/receiver dish.

Each antenna radiates power in a series of ‘lobes’ with the highest radiation in the centre of each lobe. The main lobe will be approximately horizontal so that it can receive and transmit more effectively to distant mobile phones. As illustrated in the figure which shows the radiated power in the vertical plane, the radiation decreases significantly at 45 degrees down, that is at about 16.40 metres from the base of the mast. The radiation decreases according to a square law at double the distance there is only 25% of the power. At 100m the exposure has fallen to less than 3%. Normally, with a high mast position, houses that are close to the horizontal beam are protected from high exposure levels by their distance from the mast. However, in this case, we have houses that are approximately level with the centre line or top of the mast and will therefore experience abnormally high radiated power.

In order to determine that the installation meets the ICNIRP guidelines, the calculation must take into account the relative positions of the antenna installation and the houses. In the absence of the measurements and calculations, it is not clear that this has been done.

It should be noted that CTIL’s General Background Information (2013) asserts that “When measured, field strengths are typically hundreds to thousands of times lower than the precautionary ICNIRP general public guidelines.

Oxford Parish Council cannot approve this application until there is evidence that the appropriate calculations have been carried out, taking the local geography into account. Calculations based on the assumption of a flat field are insufficient. Specifically there needs to be confirmation that the field strength at the houses in question will be below the ICNIRP guidelines.

4.b Results

SE/17/02407/MMA	83A Pilgrims Way West, Oxford	Minor material amendment to application SE/16/02221/HOUSE for the demolition of existing conservatory. Raising of the roof to incorporate a new first floor, conversion of the garage into a habitable space, two storey side and single storey rear and side extensions to show the reduction of rear gable and internal alterations.	Support. The application appears to meet planning requirements.	Granted
SE/17/02607/FUL	The Crown Inn, 10 High Street Oxford	Erection of a single storey rear glass seating area extension.	Support	Granted

SE/17/02186/HOUSE	Martins, Shoreham Road, Oxford	Proposed single storey side extension and external alterations.	Support	Granted
<p><u>5. District Councillor's Report</u> Sevenoaks District Council has reported a 33% response to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation.</p> <p><u>6. Neighbourhood Plan</u> It was agreed that a village meeting will be held at the end of November to explain the purpose of a Neighbourhood Plan, get suggestions from residents and to ask for volunteers.</p> <p><u>7. Other</u> Date of next meeting: 25 October 2017 at 9:15am in The School House. The meeting closed at 11:10am.</p>				