

Report of the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration

Address LAND AT JUNCTION OF PADDOCK ROAD & FIELD END ROAD RUISLIP

Development: Proposed telecommunications removal and replacement

LBH Ref Nos: 60595/APP/2019/1653

Drawing Nos: HGN009/50688 15 May 2019
50688/HGN009 30 April 2019
002 Site Location Plan Issue I
110 Existing Site Plan Issue I
150 Existing Elevation A Issue I
215 Max Configuration Site Plan Issue I
265 Max Configuration Elevation Issue I
50688/HGN009 - Supplementary Information 15 May 2019
Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)(England) Order 2015 Notice Under Article 13 of Application for Planning Permission
HGN009/50688_Telecoms Site, Highways Land, Field End Road, South Harrow, London: Hillingdon, HA4 0RG 15 May 2019
DCMS MHCLG Collaborating for Digital Connectivity 7th March 2019
MBNL.Supp.Info.New Tech.06.12.19
Declaration of Conformity with ICNIRP Public Exposure Guidelines 2019-03
982011_HGN009_50688_HA0103_M003 Rev C

Date Plans Received: 16/05/2019 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):** 24/05/2019
Date Application Valid: 16/05/2019 17/05/2019

1. SUMMARY

The application seeks planning permission for the proposed telecommunications removal and replacement. The proposed replacement is an upgrade to provide additional coverage and capacity requirements, incorporating 5G technology for EE Limited and Hutchison 3G UK Limited.

The proposed development, by reason of its scale, siting and design, is considered to have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed mast is indicated as 20m high, 5m taller than the existing mast. It would also include 12 antennas and 7 cabinets at ground level. Whilst the proposal is to upgrade and replace the existing apparatus in a similar location, the proposal does present a significant increase in scale which is viewed to have a significant negative impact on the view of the streetscene.

The application is recommended for refusal.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed telecommunications mast installation by reason of its excessive height, scale, design and location would be an incongruous and visually obtrusive form of development, thereby resulting in a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding area. Furthermore, the proposed cabinets, by reason of their size, siting and design would add undue clutter to the detriment of the visual amenity of the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13 and BE37 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by virtue of its size, scale and proximity would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers at 590 Field End Road by reason of visual intrusion. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policy BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

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 Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) as incorporated into the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012) 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.

AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
BE13	New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE19	New development must improve or complement the character of the area.
BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE37	Telecommunications developments - siting and design
NPPF- 10	NPPF-10 2018 - Supporting high quality communications

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located at the junction of Paddock Road and is south-west of Field End Road. The telecommunication equipment is situated on a prominent position on the grass embankment between Paddock and Field End Road. The landscaping along Field End Road, comprises of tall mature trees. The grass verge slopes downwards towards Paddock Road. The existing equipment is installed at an elevated level benefiting from the existing topography. There is an existing set of steps adjacent to the existing installation providing access from Paddock Road to the pedestrian footpath.

The surrounding area comprises mainly of two-storey detached and semi-attached dwellings. Approximately 250 metres north-west to the site is the Field End Infant School and on the north is Roxbourne Primary School. RAF Northolt is located 1.8km from the proposed site.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the proposed telecommunications removal and replacement at Field End Road, South Harrow, London: Hillingdon, HA4 0RG. The purpose of the upgrade to the existing site is to facilitate additional coverage and capacity requirements as well as incorporating 5G technology.

The existing telecommunication equipment to be removed includes a 15 metres high and 4 associate cabinets. One cabinet will be retained. The proposed will be installed 18 metres north-west to the existing equipment and will include a 20m high replacement telecommunication monopole, 7 new associated cabinets and a 1.1 metres high retaining wall. The new telecommunication monopole will consists of a total of 12 antennas and will be wider than the existing apparatus. The proposed monopole is slimmer at the bottom and widens towards the top.

The size of the 7 new associated cabinets proposed:

- CAB1 - EE Whiltshire, 2000mm (W) x 750mm (D) x 1850mm (H), RAL- Grey, Steel
- CAB2 - EE 3900A, 600mm (W) x 480mm (D) x 1900 (H), RAL - Grey, Steel
- CAB3 - EE Meter Cabinet, 1110mm (W) x 410mm (D) x 1286 (H), RAL - Grey, Steel
- CAB4 - H3G RFC5906, 600mm (W) x 480mm (D) x 1800 (H), RAL - Grey, Steel
- CAB5 - H3G RFC5906, 600mm (W) x 480mm (D) x 1800 (H), RAL - Grey, Steel
- CAB6 - H3G PONODA, 600mm (W) x 480mm (D) x 1800 (H), RAL - Grey, Steel
- CAB7 - H3G AMP5930, 600mm (W) x 480mm (D) x 1200 (H), RAL - Grey, Steel
- CAB8 - H3G Mk5 Link AC, 1200mm (W) x 500mm (D) x 1500 (H), RAL - Grey, Steel
- CAB9 - Diplexer Cabinet, 1600mm (W) x 600mm (D) x 1600 (H), RAL - Grey, Steel

3.3 Relevant Planning History

60595/APP/2005/1205 Land At Junction Of Paddock Road & Field End Road Ruislip
INSTALLATION OF A 12 METRE HIGH IMITATION TELEGRAPH POLE MOBILE PHONE MAS AND EQUIPMENT CABINETS (CONSULTATION UNDER SCHEDULE 2, PART 24 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (GENERAL PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT) ORDER 1995)(AS AMENDED)

Decision: 07-06-2005 Refused

60595/APP/2005/3498 Land At Junction Of Paddock Road & Field End Road Ruislip
INSTALLATION OF A 12 METRE HIGH IMITATION TELEGRAPH POLE MOBILE PHONE MAS AND EQUIPMENT CABINETS (CONSULTATION UNDER SCHEDULE 2, PART 24 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (GENERAL PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT) ORDER 1995)(AS AMENDED).

Decision: 07-02-2006 Refused **Appeal:** 31-08-2006 Allowed

60595/APP/2016/2391 Land At Junction Of Paddock Road & Field End Road Ruislip
Replacement of existing 11.7m high telecommunications monopole with 15m high

telecommunications monopole and installation of two stacked equipment cabinets (measuring 0.60m wide x 0.48m deep x 0.70m high) and associated development (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).

Decision: 03-08-2016 Approved

Comment on Relevant Planning History

A Prior Approval under planning application 60595/APP/2016/2391 was granted on 08-08-16 for the replacement of existing 11.7m high telecommunications monopole with 15m high telecommunications monopole and installation of two stacked equipment cabinets (measuring 0.60m wide x 0.48m deep x 0.70m high) and associated development.

A Prior Approval under planning application 60595/APP/2005/3498 was Appealed and determined Allowed on 31-08-2006 for the installation of a 12 metre high imitation telegraph pole mobile phone mast and equipment cabinets.

A Prior Approval under planning application 60595/APP/2005/1205 was refused on 14-06-05 for the installation of a 12 metre high imitation telegraph pole mobile phone mast and equipment cabinets.

4. Planning Policies and Standards

UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

The following UDP Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

AM7 Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.

BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.

BE19 New development must improve or complement the character of the area.

BE21 Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.

BE37 Telecommunications developments - siting and design

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

5. Advertisement and Site Notice

5.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- **18th June 2019**

5.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

6. Consultations

External Consultees

A public site notice was displayed between 24/5/19 and 18/6/19. A total of 53 neighbouring owners/occupiers and the South Ruislip Residents Association was consulted. No formal comments were received however, there were two telephone enquiries in relations to the concerns of health.

NATS Safeguarding Comments:

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.

Heathrow Aerodrome Safeguarding Comments:

We have now assessed the above application against safeguarding criteria and can confirm that we have no safeguarding objections to the proposed development.

Ministry of Defence Comments:

No comments received.

MoD Safeguard - RAF Northolt Comments:

Thank you for consulting the Ministry of Defence (MOD) on the above proposed development which was received by this office on 23/05/2019. I can confirm that the MOD has no safeguarding objections to this propos:

Internal Consultees

Highways Comments:

As all of the telecom equipment would be contained within the grass verge, there is no highway detriment envisaged. Hence there is no objection.

Landscape Comments:

This site is occupied by a highway verge on the west side of Field End Road. The verge is extensive and already has some telecoms equipment features whose presence is part-screened by roadside trees.

COMMENT The submitted drawings indicate the proposed replacement equipment against a backcloth of trees. According to the plan the equipment will be sited in similar locations to the existing - which should reduce the risk of damage to tree roots.

RECOMMENDATION No objection. If the LPA can impose conditions, we should add COM10.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.01 The principle of the development

Policy BE37 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) states that telecommunications developments will be acceptable in principle provided that

any apparatus is sited and designed so as to minimise its effect on the appearance of the surrounding areas. The Local Planning Authority will only grant permission for large or prominent structures if there is a need for the development in that location, no satisfactory alternative means of telecommunications is available, there is no reasonable possibility of sharing existing facilities, in the case of radio masts there is no reasonable possibility of erecting antennae on an existing building or other structure and the appearance of the townscape or landscape is not seriously harmed.

The National Planning Policy Framework (2019) stresses the importance of advanced, high quality and reliable communications infrastructures and the role it plays in supporting sustainable economic growth. It goes on to advise that the aim should be to keep the numbers of radio and telecommunications masts and sites to a minimum, consistent with the efficient operation of the network and that existing masts and sites should be used unless there is a demonstrable need for a new site.

Government guidance supports the avoidance of proliferation of sites and the sharing of masts between operators. It is clear from this NPPF guidance that existing buildings and structures should always be considered first. In this case, the proposal is to replace and upgrade the existing telecommunication installation to incorporate 5G technology, for two carriers, H3G (UK) Ltd and EE (UK) Limited.

Whilst the consideration is given that the proposed is an existing site, the replacement telecommunications apparatus is considered to materially alter the visual amenity of the area, and provides greater visual impact to the surrounding areas due to its increased height of 15 metres to 20 metres, which is double the height of adjacent street furniture and trees. The top of the pole would be predominantly visible due to the extra mass and size of the proposed structure. In addition, the large footprint and size of the cabinets would impact the character and appearance of the existing street scene.

It is therefore considered that the proposed would be detrimental to the appearance of the surrounding area in general and would fail to comply with Policy BE37 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

7.02 Density of the proposed development

Not applicable to this application.

7.03 Impact on archaeology/CAs/LBs or Areas of Special Character

Not applicable to this application.

7.04 Airport safeguarding

The National Air Traffic Services (NATS), Heathrow Aerodrome Safeguarding and MoD was consulted however no objections were raised.

7.05 Impact on the green belt

Not applicable to this application.

7.07 Impact on the character & appearance of the area

Policy BE13 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP (November 2012) states that development will not be permitted if the layout and appearance fail to harmonise with the existing street scene or other features of the area which the Local Planning Authority considers it desirable to retain or enhance.

Policy BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP (November 2012) states new development within residential areas should complement or improve the amenity and

character of the area.

The proposal replacement monopole is 20 metres in height, considerably higher than the existing mast and is double the height of the adjacent lamp post and telegraph pole which is estimated to be 10 metres high. Given the location of the monopole, the proposed would appear considerably higher than the existing, and would appear as a utilitarian and incongruous feature in the streetscape. The proposed mast consists of a support pole with antennas set at various levels and towards the top of the mast, the antennas appears wider in size. The extra height will be apparent when viewed from the surrounding area and the slightly wider top would further exacerbate the impact.

The proposed new cabinets will be located in a row parallel to the adjacent pedestrian walkway. The cabinets ranges in height from 1.2 to 1.9 metres with a retaining 1.1 metre high wall behind the cabinets. The size, height, and the number of cabinets proposed requires a larger footprint than the existing and when viewed from the pedestrian pathway, it would appear out of keeping against the green landscapes. The spaces between the retaining walls and cabinets creates potential for littering. Furthermore, the cabinets is considered to add undue clutter to the street and harm the visual character of the area.

All the associate equipment and monopole is proposed to be grey in colour and steel finish. Although the agent confirmed in an email correspondence that the colour of the cabinets can be amended, however it would not reduce the visual impact of the street scene.

It is considered that the proposed installation would have an unacceptable visual impact on the street scene. Its excessive height and design in this location would be clearly visible and the mast would appear as an incongruous addition within the surrounding area. As such, conflicts with the Policy BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP (November 2012).

7.08 Impact on neighbours

Policy BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) states that planning permission will not be granted for new buildings or extensions which by reason of their siting, bulk and proximity, would result in a significant loss of residential amenity.

The closest residential property is number 590 Field End Road which is approximately 11 meters away from the new proposed installation. The property comprises of two habitable windows on first and ground floor that directly overlooks onto the site. The property's front garden comprises of soft landscaping which will reduce the visual impact to the ground floor habitable window however the first level window will be in direct line of site to the monopole and cabinets.

Furthermore, due to the excessive height of the structure and the large footprint of the cabinets, the proposed would be highly visible to the neighbouring dwellings. Therefore, is considered not in accord with Policy BE21 of of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

Not applicable to this application.

7.10 Traffic impact, car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

Policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP (November 2012) considers whether the traffic generated by proposed development is acceptable in terms of the

capacity and functions of existing and committed principal roads only, and will wholly discount any potential which local distributor and access roads may have for carrying through traffic.

The Council's Highways Officer was consulted and no objections raised. The proposed would be located adjacent to the existing footpath within an open grass verge area and would therefore not impinge on the footpath itself. In addition, the monopole would not have any adverse impact to users of the main road.

It is therefore considered that the proposed pole and cabinet complies with Policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

7.11 Urban design, access and security

Refer to 'Impact on the character and appearance of the area'.

7.12 Disabled access

Not applicable to this application.

7.13 Provision of affordable & special needs housing

Not applicable to this application.

7.14 Trees, Landscaping and Ecology

The Council's Landscape officer was consulted and no objections is raised.

7.15 Sustainable waste management

Not applicable to this application.

7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

Not applicable to this application.

7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues

Not applicable to this application.

7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

Not applicable to this application.

7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

No comments were received during public consultation.

7.20 Planning Obligations

7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

Not applicable to this application.

7.22 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. Observations of the Borough Solicitor

General

Members must determine planning applications having due regard to the provisions of the development plan so far as material to the application, any local finance considerations so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations (including regional

and national policy and guidance). Members must also determine applications in accordance with all relevant primary and secondary legislation.

Material considerations are those which are relevant to regulating the development and use of land in the public interest. The considerations must fairly and reasonably relate to the application concerned.

Members should also ensure that their involvement in the determination of planning applications adheres to the Members Code of Conduct as adopted by Full Council and also the guidance contained in Probity in Planning, 2009.

Planning Conditions

Members may decide to grant planning consent subject to conditions. Planning consent should not be refused where planning conditions can overcome a reason for refusal. Planning conditions should only be imposed where Members are satisfied that imposing the conditions are necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. Where conditions are imposed, the Council is required to provide full reasons for imposing those conditions.

Planning Obligations

Members must be satisfied that any planning obligations to be secured by way of an agreement or undertaking pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. The obligations must be directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related to the scale and kind to the development (Regulation 122 of Community Infrastructure Levy 2010).

Equalities and Human Rights

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010, requires the Council, in considering planning applications to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunities and foster good relations between people who have different protected characteristics. The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

The requirement to have due regard to the above goals means that members should consider whether persons with particular protected characteristics would be affected by a proposal when compared to persons who do not share that protected characteristic. Where equalities issues arise, members should weigh up the equalities impact of the proposals against the other material considerations relating to the planning application. Equalities impacts are not necessarily decisive, but the objective of advancing equalities must be taken into account in weighing up the merits of an application. The weight to be given to any equalities issues is a matter for the decision maker to determine in all of the circumstances

Members should also consider whether a planning decision would affect human rights, in particular the right to a fair hearing, the right to respect for private and family life, the protection of property and the prohibition of discrimination. Any decision must be proportionate and achieve a fair balance between private interests and the public interest.

9. Observations of the Director of Finance

Not applicable to this application.

10. CONCLUSION

The application seeks planning permission to remove and replace the existing telecommunication equipment at the junction of Field End Road and Paddock Road. The existing apparatus is 15 metres and will be replaced with a 20 metres high structure with associated cabinets to provide additional coverage and incorporate 5G technology to the surrounding area.

The proposed telecommunication equipment will be shared amongst two carriers, which is encouraged under the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and Policy BE37 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012). However, excessive height and siting of the apparatus proposed would be an incongruous and visually obtrusive form of development which is considered to have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. In addition to the large footprint of the associated cabinets, it would add undue clutter to the street scene. As such, it fails to comply with Policy BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP (November 2012).

The application is recommended for refusal.

11. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012)
Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)
The London Plan (2016)
National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

Contact Officer: Rebecca Lo

Telephone No: 01895 250230



Notes:

 Site boundary

For identification purposes only.
 This copy has been made by or with the authority of the Head of Committee Services pursuant to section 47 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (the Act).
 Unless the Act provides a relevant exception to copyright.
 © Crown copyright and database rights 2018 Ordnance Survey 100019283

Site Address:

**Land at Junction of
 Paddock Road and Field End Road**

**LONDON BOROUGH
 OF HILLINGDON**
 Residents Services
 Planning Section
 Civic Centre, Uxbridge, Middx. UB8 1UW
 Telephone No.: Uxbridge 250111

Planning Application Ref:
60595/APP/2019/1653

Scale:
1:700

Planning Committee:
North

Date:
July 2019

