

DELEGATED DECISION

- Please select each of the categories that enables this application to be determined under delegated powers
 - Criteria 1 to 5 or criteria 7 to 9 must be addressed for all categories of application, except for applications for Certificates of Lawfulness, etc.

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

Select Option

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| 1. No valid planning application objection in the form of a petition of 20 or more signatures, has been received | ☐ |
| 2. Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds | ☐ |
| 3. There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action | ☐ |
| 4. There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings | ☐ |
| 5. The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below) | ☐ |

REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| 6. Application is contrary to relevant planning policies/standards | ☐ |
| 7. No petition of 20 or more signatures has been received | ☐ |
| 8. Application has not been supported independently by a person/s | ☐ |
| 9. The site is not in Green Belt (but see 11 below) | ☐ |

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| 10. Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of less than 0.5 ha | ☐ |
| 11. Householder application in the Green Belt | ☐ |

COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| 12. Change of use of retail units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000 sq m other than a change involving a loss of A1 uses | ☐ |
| 13. Refusal of change of use from retail class A1 to any other use | ☐ |
| 14. Change of use of industrial units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000sq.m. of floor space other than to a retail use. | ☐ |

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 15. Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development) | ☐ |
| 16. Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development) | ☐ |
| 17. Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development | ☐ |

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 18. ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT (excluding Hoardings) | ☐ |
| 19. PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATION | ☐ |
| 20. OUT-OF-BOROUGH OBSERVATIONS | ☐ |
| 21. CIRCULAR 18/84 APPLICATION | ☐ |
| 22. CORPSEWOOD COVENANT APPLICATION | ☐ |
| 23. APPROVAL OF DETAILS | ☐ |
| 24. ANCILLARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (S.106 or S.278) where Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval | ☐ |
| 25. WORKS TO TREES | ☐ |
| 26. OTHER (please specify) | ☐ |

The delegation powers schedule has been checked. Director of Residents Services can determine this application.

Case Officer

Signature:

Date:

A delegated decision is appropriate and the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and informatives are satisfactory.

Team Manager:

Signature:

Date:

The decision notice for this application can be issued.

Director / Member of Senior Management Team:

Signature:

Date:

NONE OF THE ABOVE DATES SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS TO THE ODPM

Item No.	Report of the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration		
Address	HIGHWAY VERGE NEAR JCT OF BREAKSPEAR ROAD & FINE BUSH LANE BREAKSPEAR ROAD RUISLIP		
Development:	Installation of 20m monopole, 12 antenna apertures, 8 equipment cabinets and development ancillary thereto (Application under Part 16 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 for determination as to whether prior approval is required for siting and appearance)		
LBH Ref Nos:	65930/APP/2020/1831		
Drawing Nos:	266 Max Configuration Elevation - Sheet 2 Issue B (Existing Elevation) 216 Max Configuration Site Plan - Sheet 2 Issue B (Proposed Site Plan) 216 Max Configuration Site Plan - Sheet 2 Issue B (Existing Site Plan) Supplementary Information 5G and Future Technology 5G and Health Collaborating for Digital Connectivity Connected Growth Manual Councils and Connectivity Signed Declaration of Conformity with ICNIRP Public Exposure Guidelines Developers Notice Covering Letter dated 12th June 2020 002 Site Location Plan Issue B 266 Max Configuration Elevation - Sheet 2 Issue B (Proposed Elevation)		
Date Plans received :	25/06/2020	Date(s) of Amendment(s):	17/06/2020
Date Application Valid:	25/06/2020		

1. SUMMARY

This application seeks prior approval for a telecommunications installation under Schedule 2, Part 16 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015. The proposal is for the installation of a 20m monopole, 12 x antenna apertures, equipment cabinets and development ancillary thereto. The new mast is to provide 5G coverage and to support the existing mobile network and is to be shared by EE Limited and H3G (UK) Limited. At present, there is an existing telecommunication site that is located 98 metres south-west to this application site that is also operated and owned by the same operators of this application. The adjacent site is to be retained therefore as described by the applicant, this application is an additional cell.

The proposal is considered to be an obtrusive form of development which would add visual clutter to the street scene. The proposal would not harmonise with the character of the area and would be detrimental to local visual amenities and the adjacent Green Belt. As such, fails to comply with Policy DMHB 11 and DMHB 21 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

This application is recommended for Refusal.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of the siting adjacent to the designated Green Belt, size, scale and height of the proposed monopole and the quantity, size, scale and siting of the equipment cabinets, would create an obtrusive form of development which would add visual clutter to the detriment of the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene, which is characterised by only two storey buildings and open space. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHB 21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (2020) and the NPPF.

INFORMATIVES

1 I52 Compulsory Informative (1)

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

2 I53 Compulsory Informative (2)

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including The London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 (2016) and national guidance.

DMEI 6	Development in Green Edge Locations
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 21	Telecommunications
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
LPP 4.11	(2016) Encouraging a connected economy
NPPF- 10	NPPF-10 2018 - Supporting high quality communications

3 I71 LBH worked applicant in a positive & proactive (Refusing)

In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies from the Local Plan Part 1, Local Plan Part 2, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service.

We have however been unable to seek solutions to problems arising from the application as the principal of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located at the junction of Breakspear Road and Fine Bush Lane on the eastern side. The equipment is proposed to be installed on the grass verge between the pedestrian footpath and the neighbouring residential properties boundary fence, no. 16 and 18 Stowe Crescent. The site is located to the south-east of the pedestrian footpath on the grass verge. Directly south-west of the site is a bus stop and to the north-east is the Woodman Public House.

The surrounding area mainly comprises of residential dwellings along the immediate east of Breakspear Road and on the west is the Green Belt, consisting of open space and dense greenery. North and north east of the site is the Ruislip Woods, site of special scientific interest.

It is noted that directly 98 metres south-west of this proposal is an existing 13.7 metre high telecommunication site.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

This application seeks to install a 20m monopole, 12 x antenna apertures, equipment cabinets and development ancillary thereto.

The equipment are proposed to be installed on the grass area between the boundary fence of residential properties on the east and the pedestrian footpath the west.

The proposed cabinets dimensions:

- 1200mm (W) x 480mm (D) x 1700mm (H)
- 600mm (W) x 600mm (D) x 1900mm (H)
- 2000mm (W) x 760mm (D) x 1800mm (H)
- 1880mm (W) x 660mm (D) x 1760mm (H)
- 600mm (W) x 600mm (D) x 1200mm (H)
- 1230mm (W) x 400mm (D) x 1032mm (H)

Base of monopole: 1600mm (W) x 700mm (D) x 1600mm (H) = 1.792 cubic metres, overall height of monopole is 20m from ground level, monopole is 530mm thick

No specification of colour or materials have been provided however it is noted in documents that if the officer/LPA deem necessary the applicant would be willing to change the colour of the additional cell and associated equipment any colour that the LPA deem fit to further camouflage into the surroundings.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

65930/APP/2009/915 Highway Verge Near Jct Of Breakspear Road & Fine Bush Lane Brea

INSTALLATION OF A 11.5M HIGH IMITATION TELEGRAPH POLE MOBILE PHONE MAST AND ANCILLARY EQUIPMENT CABINET (CONSULTATION UNDER SCHEDULE 2, PART 24 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (GENERAL PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT) ORDER 1995 (AS AMENDED)

Decision: 05-06-2009 PRQ

65930/APP/2015/2660 Highway Verge Near Jct Of Breakspear Road & Fine Bush Lane Brea

Removal of existing 12 metre high monopole and installation of a 13.7 metre high monopole with wrap around diplexor cabinet at base, installation of a pogona cabinet measuring 1230 x 400 x 1032mm located at ground level and associated development (application under Part 16 of schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 for determination as to whether prior approval is required for siting and appearance)

Decision: 03-09-2015 Approved

Comment on Planning History

There is no planning history for this site.

Approximately 98 meters to the south-west of the application site, there is an existing 13.7 metres high monopole with associated cabinets. This scheme was approved under Ref: 65930/APP/2015/2660 dated 03-09-15.

4. Advertisement and Site Notice

4.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 23rd July 2020

4.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

5. Comments on Public Consultation

EXTERNAL

A site notice was displayed and a total of 32 neighbouring owners/occupiers was consulted. There were 18 objections including the Ruislip Residents Association has been received. One councillor has been notified and this proposal has gained recognition on the social media platform.

A valid petition with 86 signatures was received with the desired outcome to not to have the installation of the proposed application.

Summary of comments:

Site and Appearance:

1. Blight to the landscape and such scale not with keeping with the local area.
2. The size of planned installation is big (12 x antenna, 20 meter high).
3. Major visual intrusion to the local conservative/residential area.
4. Apart from it being an eyesore at almost 6 storeys high
5. Lockdown has highlighted the need for open air spaces and natural beauty. We have already lost so much of this to HS2, it would be disappointing to have radiowaves and an unsightly 20m pole spoiling it further.
6. The plans state that the trees hide the pole; however it is taller than the tree line and in winter there will be no leaves on the surrounding trees to block the view.
7. This proposal would create an obtrusive form of development and certainly not harmonise with the character of the area.
8. It's proposed siting is even closer to residential property than the existing one shown within the plans, this would appear that a lack of consideration has been given for the residents.
9. This is going to be aesthetically unpleasant for all residents in this area.
10. This proposal will be a blot on the landscape.
11. Better place further into open woods/field, away from residential streets.
12. Please put it somewhere else. I don't want to live near this.

13. Too near residential properties in Stowe Crescent and surrounding properties. We cannot understand why it has to be so close to us residents when we are surrounded by open fields and verges.

14. This monopole is considerably greater in height than the existing one and unlike the statement detailed " the applicant would like to highlight that the dwelling situated on Stowe Crescent, namely number 16 and 18 are orientated in such a way that any views from the fenestration on the facade of these dwellings would mean that the additional cell would only be seen at an oblique view" this would not be correct and the 20m monopole would be in view of many residents from the front, rear gardens and from window view. You also like to state " Furthermore, the existing mature tree foliage located on the same grass verge and existing high level fencing (6 feet) would further mitigate and harmful views. You use the word harmful so believe this to be the case. Mature trees are not a permanent feature unlike this proposed metallic fixed unit. Mature trees are susceptible like all plants to disease, loss of foliage (Seasonal an example), and these most certainly would not block the residents view from such a monstrosity.

15. The application fails to demonstrate for and long term retention of trees.

16. Any such proposed installation should be away from residential property and not in such close proximity as this proposal, adjoining green belt.

17. The siting and design of the proposed mast will detract from, and adversely affect the amenity of the locality.

18. Such a structure is more than double a streetlamps height and literally dominates the skyline towering above a family dwelling giving total dominance over the landscape.

19. The real scales of cabinets and height proving this is not good fit for the neighbourhood from an aesthetic perspective and from the high level of street clutter at such a narrow point on a road with only one path (The opposite side of the carriageway has none on Breakspear Road). Such an installation creates a high level of street clutter in an area that abuts green belt, resulting in a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the immediate street scene and the nature conservation value of the landscape.

20. The Picture in the MBNL Document is a depiction not accurate in many ways as an example the cabinets size are wholly different on the application elevations and is only a depiction of what a 4g Tower may look like alongside a 5g Tower real dimensions are skilfully omitted.

21. There is no comment in relation to the copious amount of infrastructure required some seven cabinets including the base station cabinet that based on scales would be the equivalent of roughly 18 Council Street Waste bins.

22. The Photography has been remarkably deceptive in its presentation to yourselves and not only obfuscated views from the adjacent pub but also views from Stowe Crescent and the Surroundings.

23. The Monopole is well over twice the height of a Streetlight which has craftily been omitted from elevation drawing featuring the bus stop and cabinets as previously shown from the applicants.

24. The proposed Monopole will tower above local residencies and will not only become a focal point far and wide but due to the industrial design does not fit in with the Semi-Rural nature of the vicinity.

25. Not only would this become an eyesore for many residents the high probability of property value and therefore rateable value would have a detrimental effect upon council income in the longer term.

26. The height in reality dwarfs the existing mast and will literally become a beacon to the entire neighbourhood as an all-seeing sentinel that cannot be ignored.

27. It is highly telling Beacon Communications have not only obfuscated the reality of what a Structure such of this will really bring to the local landscape but they have in my opinion tried to outwit and mislead the planning committee in omitting all view as well as failing to show the street light in drawings of the installations.

28. Whilst we all agree improved infrastructure is paramount there must be consideration given to the residents that this may impact in terms of design and implementation.

Case Officer's Comments:

Concerns in relations to appearance and impact of the neighbours is addressed in the main body of this report. Although the drawings does not include dimensions of the cabinets, however this can be measured on the plans. For clarity, the cabinet dimensions are included in paragraph 3.2 of this report.

Health:

29. The proposed installation of a 20m monopole disrupts the serenity of Fine Bush Lane and poses a danger to the residents of Stowe Crescent with its powerful wifi transmission (what with the possible danger that wifi imperils to one's long-term health - and although this theory it is not proven, until it is proven, monopoles should not be near residents).

30. The current mast can be seen from our kitchen and back garden and the second mast will be installed close by to this. The risks to residents, especially those nearby to the mast, will be doubled. Furthermore, research states that the mast should be at least 500m away from a home, office, etc. Having looked into our land registry, the current one is recorded as being less than 100m away from our home which raises questions about this mast, let alone a new one.

31. Potentially a public health risk - radio radiation concern.

32. Although we know that Masts are not proven to cause cancer, there have been seven (and maybe more) deaths within 100 metres of the existing mast in Stowe Crescent. We do not want to take anymore risks with yet another larger mast with 12 x antenna apertures.

33. The close proximity of such installation is unsettling locals mind, people are talking about the number of death caused by cancers since the 3UK mast being put up, the number of disabled children born in the nearby streets. I wonder if the site is within 400m direct distance from local nursery school even.

34. There is a strong correlation between radiowaves and cancer.

35. I will not feel comfortable with a tower emitting radio frequency being built until there is more concrete evidence that it will not put our health at risk.

36. Arguing that no evidence has been found to date of adverse health issue is not the same as saying there is no potential impact, there is sufficient uncertainty in the scientific literature to cast doubt on the safety of these installations, particularly when close to residential and school areas.

37. There are a large number of conflicting academic reports on the dangers of irradiation emitted from base stations. I urge you to follow the recommendation of the Stewart Report (<https://www.qub.ac.uk/research-centres/nicr/FileStore/PDF/NIrelandReports/Filetoupload,532188,en.pdf>) and adopt a precautionary approach in deciding applications for telecommunication base stations. This approach as you will be aware is enshrined within the national planning policy structure of the UK, as well as European legislation. The Stewart Report recommended that exclusion zones should be placed around all base stations, and indeed some countries already have exclusion zones. This recommendation indicates that there is a potential for concern in placing masts close to sensitive locations such as schools, hospitals and residential areas. This has been recognised to some extent by the courts, I would, in particular, refer you to the words of His Honour Mr Justice Richards at paragraph 41 of Phillips v First Secretary of State & Ors [2003] EWHC 2415 (Admin) (22 October 2003) where he compares the criteria that might be taken into account when there are two potential sites one close to sensitive locations and the other not.

38. I am very concerned that the biological effects and irradiation emitted from the proposed development may affect not only my health, but that of my family, and those visiting my home. As such I urge you to considerable weight to the fear that the majority of residents have concerning this proposed development. These fears and concerns are, and will in my submission affect the quality of local life, and therefore have a detrimental effect upon the amenity of the area.

Case Officer's Comments:

The applicant has submitted a signed Declaration of Conformity with ICNIRP Public Exposure Guidelines therefore acknowledging the proposed would be in full compliance with the requirement of the Radio Frequency (RF) Public Exposure.

Alternative Site:

39. To say there was no other alternative site within this area that would not be suitable that would achieve any such practical requirements away from such a residential area is ridiculous, Show myself and the residents what areas you have viewed, you must have documented such data.

40. It is to my understanding that this has been refused permission once before and I am confused as to why the planning has been started again?

41. One mast already in close proximity to proposed one, have reported noise being emitted and faults on several occasions, an additional mast presents major health and safety concern. Fears over insufficient research into 5G. Stowe Crescent already is affected by radiation from existing mast, a research should be carried out into the high proportion of cancers and cancer related deaths in this area.

42. Against the planning application for a 5g phone mast because there is already a phone mast in close proximity which is already an eyesore for residents.

43. Why do we need a 3rd device in our local area.

44. The pre-existing Monopole is on the opposite side of the carriageway some way down the road and would not be an appropriate location due to the infrastructure required.

Case Officer's Comments:

There is an adjacent site that is located 98 metres of the proposed which is operated by the same telecommunications operators. The applicant has noted that the new mast is to provide 5G coverage and to support the existing mobile network.

Highways:

45. It is considered by many to be sited at an incredibly dangerous position this being at an almost direct line from Fine Bush Lane into Breakspear Road (a blind corner for part).

46. The pathway is narrow in this area and the addition of multiple cabinets will not only inhibit the view of those with disability but cause let or hindrance to those trying to use the path those with disability seeking cover from foul weather will most likely find their view of any bus inhibited by such equipment.

47. From a safety perspective children and others who may inadvertently try to cross the road may have limited vision based on reduced clarity in their field of view.

48. Location dangerous - regular accidents and countless near misses due to already reduced visibility at the junction. The road is frequently used by emergency services vehicles travelling at high speed, reducing visibility further would increase the risk of accidents. Bus stops, bend in the road, incline, public house and football club car parks are all existing hazards in close proximity to the proposed site, the proposed mast on the verge would increase the risk of accidents further.

49. Impact on the aesthetics of this already dangerous junction. Try improving the roads and not keep cluttering up the verges with distractions. Is this why the trees recently were being cut in preparation for the work to be carried out. Why can't we have trees cut that are dangerous and / or having an impacting our daily lives?

Case Officer's Comments:

The Council's Highways Officer has assessed this application and considers that there are no impact on safety. The proposal is located on the grass verge east to the existing pedestrian footpath which will be set back from the highway.

Consultation:

50. I do not want any more radio masts in my area, why is this being done on the quiet, I only heard about this when a neighbour told me

51. As I live close to this site why did I have to hear about this by word of mouth? Have

the council got something to hide?

52. Stowe crescent residents have not been properly informed of this planning application. No letters or correspondence sent to our address. Please don't approve this application. There are other sites available which the mast can be installed just not near residents houses. Ruining countryside views.

Case Officer's Comment:

Surrounding owners/occupiers to the site has been notified by mail and a site notice has been displayed in accordance to the GDPO requirements.

Others:

53. Why does the proposed monopole require at least 25% greater height? This is hardly negligible or similar.

54. This land has been tended by the council as an adopted green beyond the Woodman Public houses boundary therefore I assert that it is protected under the Inclosure Act 1857 and the Commons Act 1876.

55. The application site is incredibly close to flood zone 3 and as such is located in an area with a high risk of flooding.

56. I believe Beacon Communications have attempted to hoodwink councillors with some of their documentation & Photographic Evidence.

57. Will adversely affect local property prices.

58. I have seen no element in this that shows a rental offer or otherwise to the council for use of Local land I am further interested to learn if LB Hillingdon are receiving Business rate income for such telecommunications equipment.

59. Within this application it is referenced that a school is not in close proximity, why this need to refer to schools if not considered a concern. Does it reference that children train on the Middlesex Stadium? (no it doesn't,).

60. In the plans, it fails to mention the popular nursery down Fine Bush Lane, as well as Whiteheath school, both of which are fed into from children on these streets. Are we being pre-emptive in erecting this pole as the government is banning Huawei's involvement in the 5G Network, possibly meaning the pole does not need to be so high.

61. If you feel it 100% safe, feel free to put one at the end of your garden. I think I speak on behalf of all the residents who signed the petition that we would all feel a lot safer if the monopole was erected away from the residents, preferably somewhere in the surrounding fields.

Case Officer's Comment:

This application is a prior approval application. Each application is assessed based on its own merits against the GDPO criteria.

RUISLIP RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION:

Whilst we understand the Council has limited powers in respect of such proposals we note that it is in close proximity to the properties in Stowe Crescent and the Woodman Public House. We assume the owners have been informed of the proposal and that (regardless of any lack of response from them) due account will be taken of the impact on those properties and the surrounding area.

We also note the number of cabinets required to support this installation which will certainly not enhance the street scene.

CADENT GAS:

Due to the presence of Cadent and/or National Grid apparatus in proximity to the specified area, the contractor should contact Plant Protection before any works are carried out to ensure the apparatus is not affected by any of the proposed works.

Case Officer's Comments:

Comments received from Cadent Gas has been forwarded to the agent on 27.7.20.

INTERNAL

TREES/LANDSCAPE OFFICER:

This site is occupied by an area of highway verge, backed by hedging, on the east side of Breakspear Road. The proposed site is immediately to the north of a bus stop shelter and the junction with Fine Bush Lane. There is an existing telecoms mast (with cabinets) situated on the west side of Breakspear Road, to the south of the Fine Bush Lane junction. Breakspear Road defines the boundary between residential suburbs and the open countryside to the west. There are no TPO's or Conservation Area designations affecting the site.

COMMENT: No trees will be affected by the proposal.

RECOMMENDATION: No objection and no need for landscape conditions, assuming that it has been demonstrated that there is no possibility of alternative siting, mast sharing or the use of existing buildings (DMHB 21 (iii)).

HIGHWAYS OFFICER:

This is an application for the installation of a monopole and related cabinets on highway grass verge. Breakspear Road is a high traffic route with traffic calming measures. There is a bus stop and rumble strips on the carriageway by the application. The site is close to a public house with a large unrestricted car park. The proposed location would not impact pedestrian footway or desire lines. The sight lines for vehicles will not be impacted. Although servicing and maintenance could not be undertaken from the road due to the bus stop restriction, there is some limited parking just up from the proposed location which could be utilised. There are no highway objections to this application.

6. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

The following Local Plan Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

DMEI 6 Development in Green Edge Locations

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 14 Trees and Landscaping

DMHB 21 Telecommunications

DMT 2 Highways Impacts

LPP 4.11 (2016) Encouraging a connected economy

NPPF- 10 NPPF-10 2018 - Supporting high quality communications

In addition: Schedule 2, Part 16 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) states:

Permitted development

A. Development by or on behalf of an electronic communications code operator for the purpose of the operator's electronic communications network in, on, over or under land controlled by that operator or in accordance with the electronic communications code, consisting of -

- (a) the installation, alteration or replacement of any electronic communications apparatus,
- (b) the use of land in an emergency for a period not exceeding 6 months to station and operate moveable electronic communications apparatus required for the replacement of unserviceable electronic communications apparatus, including the provision of moveable structures on the land for the purposes of that use, or
- (c) development ancillary to radio equipment housing.

Development not permitted: ground-based apparatus

A.1 - (1) Development consisting of the installation, alteration or replacement of electronic communications apparatus (other than on a building) is not permitted by Class A(a) if:

(a) in the case of the installation of electronic communications apparatus (other than a mast), the apparatus, excluding any antenna, would exceed a height of 15 metres above ground level;

(b) in the case of the alteration or replacement of electronic communications apparatus (other than a mast) that is already installed, the apparatus, excluding any antenna, would when altered or replaced exceed the height of the existing apparatus or a height of 15 metres above ground level, whichever is the greater;

(c) in the case of the installation of a mast, the mast, excluding any antenna, would exceed a height of:

- (i) 25 metres above ground level on unprotected land; or
- (ii) 20 metres above ground level on article 2(3) land or land which is on a highway; or

(d) in the case of the alteration or replacement of a mast, the mast, excluding any antenna, would when altered or replaced;

(i) exceed the greater of the height of the existing mast or a height of;

(aa) 25 metres above ground level on unprotected land; or

(bb) 20 metres above ground level on article 2(3) land or land which is on a highway; or

(ii) together with any antenna support structures on the mast, exceed the width of the existing mast and any antenna support structures on it by more than one third, at any given height.

Case Officer's Comments:

The proposed monopole is 20m and is not located within article 2(3) land or land which is on highway. As such, is in accord with Condition A.1 - (1)(c)(i) of Schedule 2, Part 16 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

Development not permitted: radio equipment housing

(9) Development consisting of the installation, alteration or replacement of radio equipment housing is not permitted by Class A(a) if:

(a) the development is not ancillary to the use of any other electronic communications apparatus;

(b) the cumulative volume of such development would exceed 90 cubic metres or, if located on the roof of a building, the cumulative volume of such development would exceed 30 cubic metres; or

(c) on any article 2(3) land, or on any land which is, or is within, a site of special scientific interest, any single development would exceed 2.5 cubic metres, unless the development is carried out in an emergency.

Case Officer's Comments:

The total accumulative radio equipment housing would be 7.52 cubic metres, therefore the proposal is in accord with Condition A.1 - (9)(b) of Schedule 2, Part 16 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.1 Impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties

Policy DMHB 11 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) seeks to ensure that developments do not adversely impact on the amenity of adjacent properties, and seeks to protect outlook for residents, defined as the visual amenity enjoyed by occupants when looking out of their windows.

The application site is located 4 metres from the nearest residential dwellings rear boundary fence, no. 18 Stowe Crescent and is in the direct line of sight to the rear/side habitable windows to no. 16-20 Stowe Crescent. Although it is acknowledged that there is soft landscaping to the rear of the neighbouring fence that may partially obscure the equipment, due to its proximity, size and overall height, the proposal would be highly visible and intrusive to the immediate adjacent residents and surrounding area in general. As such, the proposal would severely impact on the outlook of the existing residents, therefore fails to accord with Policy DMHB 11 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020).

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

Policy DMHB 11 of the The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all development, will be required to be designed to the highest quality standards and, incorporate principles of good design including: harmonising with the local context by taking into account the surrounding scale of development, considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; local topography, views both from and to the site; impact on neighbouring open spaces and their environment; and ensuring the use of high quality building materials and finishes.

Policy DMHB 21 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that Telecommunication development will only be permitted where: i) it is sited and designed to minimise their visual impact; ii) it does not have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the building or the local area; iii) it has been demonstrated that there is no possibility for use of alternative sites, mast sharing and the use of existing buildings; iv) there is no adverse impact on areas of ecological interest, areas of landscape importance, archaeological sites, Conservation Areas or buildings of architectural or historic interest; and v) it includes a Declaration of Conformity with the International Commission on Non Ionizing Radiation.

The proposed new mast is 20 metres high with 8 cabinets located in a row alongside the

existing grass verge on Breakspear Road adjacent to the bus stop. The cabinets range in height from 1 to 1.9 metres. Although, the applicant has stated in the supporting document that the proposed cabinets are similar in size to those within the area (typically 1.5 metres high), however the plans provided indicate that 4 of the cabinets are above 1.7 metres high. Therefore, the size, height, and the quantity of cabinets proposed is considered larger than those within the area, where currently there are no cabinets of this size and scale. The monopole spans to 20 metres high above the existing tree lines and vertical street furniture including light poles, therefore, despite the agent being open to a proposed finish of the choice of the LPA, the monopole will appear highly visible, unduly dominant and intrusive.

The mast would be 6.3 higher than the adjacent telecommunication site that is located 98 metres south-west of the applicant site along Breakspear Road. The proposed site is set slightly back from the footpath onto the grass verge. The application site is exposed and is therefore highly visible when viewed from the immediate street scene and the surrounding area. The proposed 20m high telecommunications mast would appear as a prominent feature at the junction of Breakspear Road and Fine Bush Lane and would have a detrimental impact on the openness, character and appearance of the street scene. In addition, due to the open nature and high visibility of the site, the proposed telecommunications installation would appear as an incongruous addition on the edge of the Green Belt.

The topography of the neighbouring residential street, Stowe Crescent slopes down towards Wyteleaf Close. Due to the existing gradient, when viewed from Stowe Crescent, it could be argued that the appearance of the mast would be very prominent due to its overall height that is over and above the surrounding area that consists only of 2 storeys high residential dwellings and semi-rural soft landscaping.

Whilst the proposal of the additional mast to the existing neighbouring telecommunication is to provide 5G services and to support the existing network, the proposal will add undue clutter to the streetscene which will have a significant negative impact on visual amenity to its adjacent residents and to the area in general. It would harm the character and appearance of the street scene and as such, the proposal is contrary to Policy BE1 of The Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHB 21 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020).

7.3 Traffic Impact / Pedestrian Safety

The application site is located on the grass verge adjacent to the pedestrian footpath close to the site boundary of adjacent residential dwellings. Therefore the equipment are setback from the public highway. The Council's Highways Officer has been consulted, there are no objections raised. The proposal would not impact on the sight lines for vehicles or pedestrian safety.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

Not applicable to the consideration of this application.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

Refer to "Impact on Street Scene"

7.6 Other Issues

HEALTH:

In terms of potential health concerns, the applicant has confirmed that the proposed installation complies with the ICNIRP (International Commissions for Non Ionising Radiation Protection) guidelines. Accordingly, in terms of Government policy advice, there is not considered to be any direct health impact. Therefore, further detailed technical

information about the proposed installation is not considered relevant to the Council's determination of this application.

8. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012)
Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020)
The London Plan (2016)
National Planning Policy Framework
The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015
(as amended)

Contact Officer: Rebecca Lo

Telephone No: 01895 250230