

## **Appendix 1.1 – Section 5 of the officers Delegated Report – Consultation**

### EXTERNAL responses received:

A site notice was displayed to the adjacent of the site and expired on 15th January 2021. A total of 62 neighbouring owners/occupiers were consulted and no comments have been received.

### HEATHROW AERODROME SAFEGUARDING:

We have now assessed the below application against safeguarding criteria and can confirm that we have no safeguarding objections to the proposed development. However, we would like to make the following observations:

#### 5G Aviation Informative

To demonstrate that 5G capability can be operated safely from the site, the installing/operating organisation should ensure there is compliance with the Ofcom 5G Coordination procedure for air traffic control radar<sup>1</sup>. The operating organisation should be able to demonstrate this to the satisfaction of both the airport and radar operator as well as the telecoms regulator.

#### Cranes

Given the nature of the proposed development it is possible that a crane may be required during installation. We would, therefore, draw the applicant's attention to the requirement within the British Standard Code of Practice for the safe use of Cranes, for crane operators to consult the aerodrome before erecting a crane in close proximity to an aerodrome. This is explained further in Advice Note 4, 'Cranes' (available at <http://www.aoa.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Advice-Note-4-Cranes-2016.pdf>)

#### Further Comments:

#### 5G Aviation Informative

To demonstrate that 5G capability can be operated safely from the site, the installing/operating organisation should ensure there is compliance with the Ofcom 5G Coordination procedure for air

traffic control radar<sup>1</sup>. The operating organisation should be able to demonstrate this to the satisfaction of both the airport and radar operator as well as the telecoms regulator.

[https://www.ofcom.org.uk/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0030/81579/info-memorandum.pdf](https://www.ofcom.org.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0030/81579/info-memorandum.pdf) - Annexe 8

NATS:

I refer to the application for a new installation for a mobile telephony mast (51.504963°, - 0.41123871°) which I understand also includes 5G capability. NATS is raising concerns over the installation of 5G equipment in proximity to its radars. Specifically, NATS has concerns over the lack of assurance received by Mobile Network Operators on the compatibility of 5G with its radar operation. The assurance required is set out in the Ofcom procedures which the MNOs are to follow, and which NATS would normally request sight of.

This specific installation is 5km away from our radar, and therefore NATS considers the potential for interference on its radar located at Heathrow airport, to be very low. Accordingly, it has no objection to the application.

However, as more 5G developments are being rolled out nationwide and with a number of these being installed closer to airport infrastructure, NATS would like to reiterate to mobile phone operators seeking to install 5G equipment close to airports (i.e. within a range of about 3km) that where it has concerns over interference, it will likely request evidence of an assessment having been carried out.

The process to be followed and the radars to be safeguarded can be found in two Ofcom documents, one of which states:

As part of the Award Process for licences in the 2.6 GHz spectrum band, a cross-Government radar remediation programme ensured that ATC radars in the 2.7 GHz band (2700-3100 MHz) were modified to become more resilient to interference from the 3.4 GHz Band (3410 MHz to 3600 MHz). However, the radars have retained some sensitivity to emissions from the 3.4 GHz Band.

[https://www.ofcom.org.uk/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0018/114264/3.4-Radar-Co-ordination.pdf](https://www.ofcom.org.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0018/114264/3.4-Radar-Co-ordination.pdf)

[https://www.ofcom.org.uk/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0020/44921/protected\\_radar.pdf](https://www.ofcom.org.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/44921/protected_radar.pdf)

Please be aware that this response applies specifically to the above consultation and only reflects the position of NATS (that is responsible for the management of en route air traffic) based on the information supplied at the time of this application. This letter does not provide any indication of the position of any other party, whether they be an airport, airspace user or otherwise. It remains the Planning Authority's responsibility to ensure that all the relevant stakeholders are consulted.

If any changes are proposed to the information supplied to NATS in regard to this application which become the basis of a revised, amended or further application for approval, then as a statutory consultee NERL requires that it be further consulted on any such changes prior to any planning permission or any consent being granted.

INTERNAL responses received:

HIGHWAYS OFFICER:

Installation of a monopole and related cabinets on the highway. The provision will be at the back on the footway in line with other service cabinets already in the area. The area has low pedestrian footfall. Footpath access will be maintained. The minimal servicing and maintenance requirements should be easily undertaken due to unrestricted parking on side roads close to the proposed site. There are no highways objections to this proposal.

TREES/LANDSCAPE OFFICER:

Original Comments - This site is a section of highway land (back of footway) on the south side of Pump Lane /east of the junction with Silverdale Road Industrial Estate. The planted boundary of the car park for the PHS Group lies to the south of the back edge of the kerb. There is a street tree, a small-leaved lime (Hillingdon ref.T1030) to the east of an existing BT free-standing cabinet (approximately 6 metres away) and an array of subterranean inspection pits within the footway.

COMMENT - The proposed location of the mast is closer to the tree than is ideal. It is likely to encroach into the RPA (root protection area) of the lime tree. Furthermore the crown of the tree is relatively low and full on the west side - closest to the mast. It is likely to snag the mast either during installation or at a later date. The proposed mast will be close to the free-standing cabinet and additional free-standing cabinets will be lined along the back edge of the footway to the west (towards the junction with Silverdale Road. This location has no sensitive receptors, being primarily industrial / commercial in character, with no adjacent residents. The footway width is sufficient to accommodate the telecom equipment without compromising pedestrian movement or safety.

RECOMMENDATION -The proximity of the mast to this healthy looking street tree (in an area which is relatively devoid of trees) renders this application unacceptable. - If the mast could be re-positioned to the west of the existing cabinet (closer to the junction with Silverdale Road) the objection would be removed.

Further Comments - I refer to the supporting letter from WHP Telecoms and the arboricultural impact assessment by TEP, which I have referred to the Council's Trees & Woodlands Manager.

COMMENT: The report by TEP confirms that in order to safeguard the street tree (a 'B' grade lime), the installations will need to be hand dug, under arboricultural supervision. Until the excavation takes place, the full impact of the proposal on the existing root structure cannot be known. It will also require tree some cutting back of the lime tree on one side to accommodate the installation,

The plan indicates that this will unbalance the crown of the tree and spoil its form. Furthermore, there is every likelihood that the tree will require regular pruning in the future order to control its re-growth towards the mast. The combination of these constraints indicates that the juxtaposition of the mast with the existing street tree is unsustainable with several details which could adversely affect the tree in the medium to long term.

RECOMMENDATION: While there is an acknowledged need for the telecoms installation, this area is dominated by industrial estates and there must be other locations nearby which will not jeopardize the future of an attractive 'B' grade street tree, a public asset. The application fails to safeguard the long-term future of a tree of merit in the public realm and therefore fails to satisfy policies DMHB12, DMHB14 and DMHB21. It should be refused.

ACCESS OFFICER:

An assessment of this proposal for the siting of a communication cabinet and mast has been carried out with reference to policy 7.2 of the London Plan and the Department for Transport guidance document "Inclusive Mobility". With the above equipment in situ, a footway width in excess of 2 m will remain which is considered to be adequate for this location. Conclusion: no accessibility concern is raised.