

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 then 10 dewlling 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. Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm 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 Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm
Address	TELECOMMUNICATIONS SITE VICTORIA ROAD STREETWORKS VICTORIA ROAD RUISLIP
Development:	Proposed telecommunications installation: Proposed H3G 20m street pole and additional equipment cabinets (Application under Class A, Part 16 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for determination as to whether prior approval is required for siting and appearance).
LBH Ref Nos:	77647/APP/2022/3328
Drawing Nos:	HGN21152_HGN353_88765_HA0506_GA_REV A Issue: A (001 Drawing Register) Proposed 5G Telecommunications Installation for CK Hutchison Networks (UK) Ltd Notification letter dated 31st October to A.J.A. Taylor & Company Limited by DOT Surveying HGN21152_HGN353_88765_HA0506_GA_REV A Issue: A (Title 002 Site Location Plan) HGN21152_HGN353_88765_HA0506_GA_REV A Issue: A (215 Proposed Site Plan) HGN21152_HGN353_88765_HA0506_GA_REV A Issue: A (265 Proposed Site Elevation) Mobile UK Briefing Note: 5G and Health 5G Site Specific Supplementary Information and Planning Justification Statement Prepared by Dot Surveying Collaborating for digital connectivity dated 7th March 2019 Declaration of Conformity with International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection Public Exposure Guidelines Proposed 5G Telecommunications Installation for CK Hutchison Networks (UK) Ltd Notification letter dated 31st October to Hillingdon Council by DOT Surveying

Date Plans received : 31/10/2022

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 31/10/2022

1. SUMMARY

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION:

It is acknowledged that the proposal would result in some public benefit from the installation of 5G coverage. However, by virtue of the application site's prominent position, coupled with the siting, height, scale, size and bulk of the proposed monopole and associated equipment, it is considered that the proposal would be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the area and the setting of the Grade II Listed Building the Roman Catholic Church of St. Gregory the Great & Church Hall. The proposal would also have a detrimental impact to the visual amenity, including the views and outlook from neighbouring residential properties.

It is considered that insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that other more suitable and less harmful sites do not exist. Also, the applicant has not fully engaged with the Council with respect to discussing possible, alternative sites, through the Council's chargeable pre-application advice service.

It should be noted that the site is designated with the RAF Northolt 3km Buffer Zone. The Ministry of Defence has objected to the development on the grounds that the proposed telecommunication structure would infringe the Obstacle Limitation Surfaces encompassing RAF Northolt. The proposal therefore fails to demonstrate that no adverse affect would be caused to aviation safety.

On balance, it is considered that the public benefits of the proposal would not outweigh its significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and the setting of the Grade II Listed Building at the Roman Catholic Church of St. Gregory the Great & Church Hall, and its detrimental impact to the visual amenity of the area (including views from neighbouring residential properties) and its harm to aviation safety.

The prior approval of the Local Planning Authority is therefore required and is refused.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 PAR Prior Approval - Refusal

The proposed telecommunications street pole and associated equipment would, by virtue of their siting, size, scale, bulk and height, represent prominent and incongruous features in the street scene that would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the street scene, the wider area, and the setting of the Grade II Listed Building at Roman Catholic Church of St. Gregory & Church Hall. Furthermore, the proposed telecommunications street pole and associated equipment would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenities of the area, which includes views from neighbouring residential properties. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to paragraphs 115, 130 c) and 195 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), Policies D4, D8, HC1 and SI6 of the London Plan (2021), Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 2, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHB 21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

2 PAR Prior Approval - Refusal

The Local Planning Authority considers that the applicants have failed to provide robust evidence to demonstrate that other more suitable and less harmful sites do not exist, and that they have actively explored the possibility of erecting the proposed telecommunications equipment on existing buildings, masts or other structures. The development would therefore be contrary to paragraphs 115 and 117 c) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), and Policy DMHB 21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020).

3 PAR Prior Approval - Refusal

The proposed telecommunication street pole and associated equipment, would infringe the Ministry of Defence height safeguarding criteria by approximately 7.7 metres, and would therefore disrupt airspace protected for visual manoeuvring prior to landing. Insufficient evidence has been submitted by the applicant to demonstrate otherwise. The proposed development would therefore adversely affect aviation safety, contrary to Policy DMAV 1 (Safe Operation of Airports) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) and paragraph 116(a) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

INFORMATIVES

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site is situated in a prominent location on Victoria Road, opposite the junction with Angus Drive. It comprises an open parcel of grassed verge, which is in proximity to street trees and street lighting. The immediate setting of the site is predominately residential in nature, although it is noted that there is a petrol station to the north-east. St

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks prior approval under Part 16 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) for the installation of a proposed H3G 20m street pole and additional equipment cabinets. The proposed cabinet units would include 1 x Commscope bowler cabinet ; 1 x Ericsson 6130 Equipment Cabinet; and 1 x AC Transmission Cabinet. Five 600 by 450mm paving slabs would be installed in front of the proposed cabinets.

3.3 Relevant Planning History Comment on Planning History

There is no relevant planning history attached to this site.

4. Advertisement and Site Notice

4.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 7th December 2022

4.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

5. Comments on Public Consultation

EXTERNAL CONSULTEES:

60 neighbouring properties were consulted on 7th November 2022. A site notice was erected on 8th November 2022. The consultation period expired on 29th November 2022. Four objections were received, and their comments are summarised as follows:

- Why should we have this outside our homes? It is unsightly
- This monstrosity will be outside people homes
- There is an alternative vacant site that has not been used for years 100 yards away
- It will make Victoria Road look even worse
- May cause problems for the RAF Planes
- Potential impact on people's reception of electrical equipment and tv satellite
- Concerned about the height of the monopole and possibly being blown down during a storm
- Traffic impact
- Concerns about radiation to residents and passer-byes
- It should be located elsewhere

Planning Officer Response: Material considerations will be covered in the main body of this report.

South Ruislip Residents Association: No comments received.

Ministry of Defence:

Thank you for consulting the Ministry of Defence (MOD) on the above proposed development.

The Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) Safeguarding Team represents the Ministry of Defence (MOD) as a consultee in UK planning and energy consenting systems to ensure that development does not compromise or degrade the operation of defence sites such as aerodromes, explosives storage sites, air weapon ranges, and technical sites or training resources such as the Military Low Flying System.

The applicant is seeking prior approval for the installation of a H3G 20m high street pole and additional equipment cabinets in proximity to RAF Northolt, an operational military aerodrome.

The proposed development site is approximately 0.83 km from the threshold and beneath the approach to runway 25 and occupies statutory aerodrome height safeguarding consultation zones surrounding RAF Northolt in which the MOD needs to be consulted upon all forms of development.

The aerodrome height safeguarding zones relate to Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLSs) that contain the critical airspace encompassing the aerodrome which needs to be kept clear of obstructions to ensure aircraft using the aerodrome can safely undertake landing or take-off procedures or circuit the aerodrome.

Having reviewed the plans submitted with this application, it has been identified the proposed telecoms mast at a height of 20m above ground level (AGL) will infringe the OLS that contains the approach to runway 25 by approximately 7.7m. The proposed development is therefore not compatible with statutory aerodrome safeguarding requirements.

In summary, it has been identified the proposed telecoms street pole structure infringes the aerodrome obstacle limitation surfaces encompassing RAF Northolt and therefore the MOD objects to prior approval being granted for this development to proceed using permitted development rights. A full planning application is considered necessary to ensure the statutory aerodrome safeguarding requirements for RAF Northolt are fully considered.

The MOD must emphasise that the advice provided within this letter is in response to the data and information detailed within application ref. 77647/APP/2022/3328 dated 07/11/2022.

In accordance with the requirements of Part 16, sub paragraph (7) (b) of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), the MOD respectfully requests that Hillingdon Borough Council determine this application taking account of the advice that we have provided above.

National Air Traffic Services:

The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.

However, 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 your responsibility to ensure that all the appropriate consultees are properly 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.

Met Officer: No comments received.

INTERNAL CONSULTEES:

Council's Highways Officer: There are no highways objections to this proposal.

Council's Digital Connectivity Officer: This mast should be considered as there is no other 3 5G mast in the area. Also, there is a petrol station opposite the site so harm and appearance should not be questioned. and i am assuming it is a 24hr station as well.

Planning Officer Response: Whilst it is noted that there is a petrol station on the opposite side of Victoria Road, the immediate context of the site is nevertheless predominately residential in character. Furthermore, the site is in proximity to the the Roman Catholic Church of St. Gregory the Great & Church Hall, which is a Grade II Listed Building. The application site's prominent position, coupled with the siting, height, scale, size and bulk of the proposed monopole and associated equipment would have a detrimental impact to the character and appearance of the area, and fails to preserve the setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed Building. The MOD are also objecting to the siting of the proposed development. Refer to Section 7.2 of the report for further details.

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

PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 1 Heritage Assets

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 2 Listed Buildings

DMHB 21 Telecommunications

LPP D4 (2021) Delivering good design

LPP D8 (2021) Public realm

LPP HC1 (2021) Heritage conservation and growth

LPP SI6 (2021) Digital connectivity infrastructure

NPPF10 NPPF 2021 - Supporting high quality communications

NPPF16 NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

NPPF9 NPPF 2021 - Promoting sustainable transport

In addition: Not applicable to this application.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

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

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon 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.

It is considered that the proposed 18-metre-high monopole and associated equipment would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the surrounding residential properties on Victoria Road, by virtue of its siting, height, scale, size and bulk. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), in this respect.

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE SURROUNDING AREA, INCLUDING VISUAL AMENITY:

Paragraph 115 of the NPPF (2021) states that where new sites are required (such as for new 5G networks, or for connected transport and smart city applications), equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate. Paragraph 130 c) of the NPPF (2021) seeks to ensure development proposals are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Paragraph 195 of the NPPF (2021) states that local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by the proposal. This is consistent with Policies D1, D4, D8, HC1 and SI6 of the London Plan (2021) which seeks high quality development, and for development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should conserve their significance.

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) seeks a quality of design in all new development that enhances and contributes to the area in terms of form, scale and materials; is appropriate to the identity and context of the townscape; and would improve the quality of the public realm and respect local character. Policy HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) states that the Council will conserve and enhance Hillingdon's distinct and varied environment, its settings and the wider historic landscape.

Policy DMHB 2 of the Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that the Planning permission will not be granted for proposals which are considered detrimental to the setting of a Listed Building. Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) requires all development to be designed to the highest quality standards, harmonising with the local context by taking into account the surrounding scale of development, height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures, views both from and to the site, and impact on open spaces and environment. Policy DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) requires development to be well integrated with the surrounding area and accessible.

With regards to telecommunications, Policy DMHB 21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states development will only be permitted where it is sited and designed to minimise visual impact and does not have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity, character or appearance the building or the local area. It also requires that there is no possibility for use of alternative sites, mast sharing and the use of existing buildings.

With a height of 20 metres, the proposed monopole would be significantly taller than the

adjacent lamppost and street trees. It is also noted that the height of the monopole would be substantially higher than the neighbouring three-storey block of flats at Nos. 442 to 496 Victoria Road and the Petrol totem sign on the opposite side of Victoria Road . It is therefore considered that the height, scale and bulk of the proposed monopole would be out of keeping with its immediate context.

The proposed monopole would be sited in a relatively open parcel of grassed verge and prominent location, in proximity to the junctions with Angus Drive. It is also worth noting that the Roman Catholic Church of St. Gregory the Great & Church Hall is a statutory Grade II Listed Building located to the North of the site, where it would appear as an incongruous and visually obtrusive form of development. Furthermore, direct and long views of the proposed monopole would be available from the windows of neighbouring residential properties and by various road users on Victoria Road.

It is therefore considered that the siting and appearance of the proposed monopole would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area. It is noted that there is a petrol station on the opposite side of Victoria Road. Notwithstanding this context, the proposed monopole would nonetheless be visually intrusive as its considerable vertical height at 20 metres would represent a stark contrast to the low horizontal overhead canopy of the petrol station. It is considered that the finishing colour of the proposed monopole and nearby street furniture would not mitigate the impact the proposal would have to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in terms of its height, scale, siting, size and bulk.

Page 4 of the Planning Justification Statement states that "The proposed site option is considered the best available compromise between extending 5G service across the target 'coverage hole' with the selected street works pole height and associated antenna and ground-based cabinets restricted to the minimum height which is capable of providing the required essential coverage." It is noted that 6 alternative sites were discounted, of which two were discounted due to visibility splays and 1 due to its location in front of residential housing. However, when reviewing the Site Search Map on Page 9, the proximity of the application site to neighbouring properties and junctions do not appear dissimilar to the alternative sites that were discounted on this basis. Furthermore, no quantitative evidence has been submitted to demonstrate otherwise. It is therefore considered that the explanation provided by the applicant as to why the alternative sites were discounted lacks any clear and technical details.

Furthermore, it is unclear as to whether the option of mast sharing, or the use of existing buildings had been fully explored by the applicant which is a requirement of Policy DMHB 21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020). It is therefore considered that the submitted evidence fails to demonstrate that other more suitable and less harmful sites do not exist. The submitted Planning Justification Statement mentions the sequential approach, included mast and site sharing and existing building structures. However, fails to provide any clear or precise details on whether these alternative options were actively explored.

It is questioned why the applicant has not fully engaged with the Council with respect to discussing possible, alternative sites, through pre-application advice. Whilst an email was sent to the planning mailbox to inform the Council that an application would be submitted and for any comments to be provided within 14 days of the email, it did not include a completed 'request for pre-application advice' form. Neither was any pre-application fee paid. This adds further weight to the Council's position that alternative locations have not been adequately explored. This limits the weight that should be given to the consideration of the alternative sites put forward by the applicant, which in turn means, that it does not

outweigh the harm identified as resulting from the proposal.

The proposal also involves the installation of three cabinets of various sizes. The submitted Planning Justification Statement suggest that, independently, the cabinets are permitted development. However, no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the cabinets would be installed without the proposed monopole. It is therefore considered that very limited weight should be afforded to the argument that the cabinets could be installed under permitted development rights. Instead, it is considered by Officers that the proposed cabinets forms part of the operative development being proposed and should be assessed as such. Cumulatively, the proposed cabinets, in conjunction with the proposed monopole, the existing inspection chambers, and street furniture including street trees and lamp posts, would result in cluttered street paraphernalia which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and the Grade II Listed Building at Roman Catholic Church of St. Gregory & Church Hall, and adversely impact on the visual amenities of the area. It would therefore be contrary to paragraphs 115, 130 c) and 195 of the NPPF (2021), Policies D4, D8, HC1 and SI6 of the London Plan (2021), Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One- Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 2, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHB 21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020).

7.3 Traffic Impact / Pedestrian Safety

The proposed street pole and associated equipment would be sited on stretch of the grass verge adjacent to the highway on Victoria Road. Given its location, it is considered that the proposed monopole and associated equipment would not obstruct passing pedestrians or cyclists from general usage. It is recognised that the equipment will require a level of maintenance. However, there is unrestricted street parking in proximity to the site that could be used by service delivery vehicles to undertake maintenance works. On this basis, it is considered that the siting of the telecommunications equipment would not have an unacceptably harmful impact on the highway and pedestrian environment, in accordance with paragraph 111 of the NPPF (2021). However, this does not outweigh the issues raised in regards to the harmful impact the proposal would have to the character and appearance of the area and upon neighbouring residential amenity.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

Not applicable to this application.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

Not applicable to this application.

7.6 Other Issues

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 18 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) 30 metres above ground level on unprotected land; or

(ii) 25 metres above ground level on article 2(3) land or land which is on a highway

(d) in the case of the alteration or replacement of a mast, the height of the mast, excluding any antenna, would when altered or replaced exceed the greater of the height of the existing mast or a height of-

(i) 30 metres above ground level on unprotected land; or

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

(e) in the case of the alteration or replacement of a mast-

(i) the mast is on any land which is, or is within, a site of special scientific interest; and

(ii) the mast would, when altered or replaced, exceed the original width of the mast by more than one third.

PLANNING OFFICER COMMENT: The proposed monopole is 20 metres and is not located within article 2(3) land. As such, it is in accordance 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).

(7) Development consisting of the installation, alteration or replacement of any electronic communications apparatus other than-

(a) a mast;

(b) an antenna;

(d) any apparatus which does not project above the level of the surface of the ground; or

(e) radio equipment housing,

is not permitted by Class A(a) if the ground or base area of the structure would exceed 1.5 square metres.

PLANNING OFFICER COMMENT: The submitted plans demonstrates that the proposed electronic communications apparatus would not exceed 1.5 sqm.

Paragraph A.2(5a) states except in case of emergency, Class A development which consists of the installation, alteration or replacement of a mast on a civil safeguarding area or a defence safeguarding area is permitted

subject (in addition to any other condition imposed by this paragraph) to the conditions that-

(a) the developer notifies in writing-

(i) the Civil Aviation Authority, in respect of development on a civil safeguarding area;

(ii) the Secretary of State for Defence, in respect of development on a defence safeguarding area;

(iii) the operator of the civil safeguarding area (if the operator is not the Civil Aviation Authority) or defence safeguarding area (if the operator is not the Secretary of State for

Defence); and

(b) the development does not begin until the end of 28 days after the day the last notification required by paragraph (a) is given.

Paragraph A.3(2)(5) of the GPDO states that the application must be accompanied by:

(c) evidence that the requirements of sub-paragraph (1) have been satisfied where applicable; and

(d) where the condition in paragraph A.2(5A) applies, evidence that the Civil Aviation Authority, the Secretary of State for Defence or the operator of the civil safeguarding area or defence safeguarding area, as the case may be, has been notified of the proposal.

PLANNING OFFICER RESPONSE:

The site is designated within RAF Northolt 3km buffer. Page 3 of the submitted Planning Statement states that the applicant has notified the Civil Aviation Authority, Secretary of State for Defence and the Aerodrome Operator.

The Ministry of Defence (MOD) has objected to the development on the grounds of the proposed telecommunication structure infringing the obstacle limitation surfaces encompassing RAF Northolt (refer to Section 5 of this report for the full response from the MOD). Insufficient evidence has been submitted with the application to demonstrate otherwise. It is therefore considered that the application has failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not adversely affect aviation safety, contrary to Policy DMAV 1 (Safe Operation of Airports) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) and paragraph 116(a) of the NPPF, which requires infrastructure not to interfere with air traffic services.

HEALTH:

In terms of potential health concerns, the applicant has confirmed that the proposed installation complies with the ICNIRP (International Commission 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

The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

The London Plan (2021)

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012)

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020)

Contact Officer: Nesha Burnham

Telephone No: 01895 250230