

Report of the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration

Address HUME WAY RUISLIP

Development: Installation of a 20m monopole, 12 x antenna apertures, equipment cabinets, the removal of the existing 13.7m monopole, 3 x antennas, redundant equipment cabinets and development ancillary thereto.

LBH Ref Nos: 54873/APP/2020/721

Drawing Nos:

- 405 RF Compliance Existing Elevation Rev. C
- 001 Drawing Register Rev. C
- 400 RF Compliance Existing Plan Rev. C
- 305 Equipment Schedule & Support Structure Details Rev. C
- 304 Max Configuration Antenna Schedule & Line Configuration Rev. C
- 300 Existing Antenna Schedule & Line Configuration Rev. C
- 266 Max Configuration Elevation - Sheet 2 Rev. C
- 265 Max Configuration Elevation - Sheet 1 Rev. C
- 216 Max Configuration Site Plan - Sheet 2 Rev. C
- 215 Max Configuration Site Plan - Sheet 1 Rev. C
- 150 Existing Elevation A Rev. C
- 100 Existing Site Plan Rev. C
- 007 FIXITs & Dependencies Rev. C
- 006 Services Plan Rev. C
- 005 Cherry Picker & Crane Location Rev. C
- 003 Access Plan Rev. C
- 002 Site Location Plan Rev. C
- 411 RF Compliance Max Configuration Plan - Sector A Rev. C
- 412 RF Compliance Max Configuration Plan - Sector B Rev. C
- 413 RF Compliance Max Configuration Plan - Sector C Rev. C
- 451 RF Compliance Max Configuration Elevations Rev. C
- Article 13 Notice
- Mobile UK 5G Health QA Information Paper 201:
- Council's and Connectivity - How local government can help to build mobile Britain September 2018
- MBNL 5G and Future Technology, MBNL.Supp.Info.New Tech.06.12.1
- Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport - Connected Growth Manua
- Matt Warman MP letter on 5G - The Next Mobile Generatio
- INT2019/11842/DC November 2019
- DCMS MHCLG Collaborating for Digital Connectivity 7th March 201:
- HGN032 - 70284 - Supplementary Informatior
- HGN032 - 70284 - Covering Letter 25th February 2020
- HGN032-70284-HUME_WAY-ICNIRP_Certificat
- HGN032 Pre-Con Letter to the LPA

Date Plans Received: 28/02/2020 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):** 03/03/2020

Date Application Valid: 15/04/2020

1. SUMMARY

This application seeks planning permission for a telecommunication installation. The proposal involves a replacement 20 metre high monopole with 12 antennas and

associated equipment cabinets. The existing telecommunication apparatus is proposed to be removed.

There are a total of 8 objections received during the course of public consultation, which was taken into consideration. Concerns of health risks from the neighbouring residents for 5G technology was raised. 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.

The proposed mast is located predominately in a residential area. The increase in height and bulk of the mast in together with the proliferation of associated equipment at street level, by reason of the quantity, design, size, scale and siting are considered to have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Whilst the proposal is to upgrade and replace the existing apparatus in a similar location, the proposal will add undue clutter to the streetscene which will have a significant negative impact on visual amenity. This application is recommended for Refusal.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed installation of the telecommunications monopole, combined with apertures and 8 different equipment cabinets, would increase street clutter along this section of Hume Way resulting in harm the character and appearance of the immediate street scene contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHB 21 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Chapter 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012).

INFORMATIVES

1 I52 Compulsory Informative (1)

The decision to REFUSE details of siting and design 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 details of siting and design 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 (July 2011) and national guidance.

DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 21	Telecommunications
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMAV 1	Safe Operation of Airports
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 Nationa

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 proposed application site is located north of Hume Way, south of no. 1-2 Hale End Close on a narrow grass verge between the pedestrian footpath and highway. The proposed telecommunication equipment directly faces onto the two lane highway and to the north of the site, there is a wide grass area comprising a number of mature, dense foliage trees. There is a telegraph pole that is in close proximity to the proposal, that spans from the north-west grass area of the application site across to the opposite side of the street towards, no. 182 Eastcote Road.

The site is 160 metres north-west of Highgrove Nature Reserve and 146 metres from Highgrove Pool and Fitness Centre and Bishop Ramsey Church of England School. The surrounding area of the site is predominately residential in nature, mainly comprising of two-storey high terraces and three storey high flats, however at the end of Hume way on the south-east is the Highgrove Pool and Fitness Centre and the Bishop Ramsey Church of England School.

The original telecommunication site proposed to be decommissioned is located 85.5 metres south-east, adjacent to no. 2 Campbell Close and the zebra crossing.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

This application seeks planning permission for the installation of a 20m monopole, 12 x antenna apertures, equipment cabinets, the removal of the existing 13.7m monopole, 3 x antennas, redundant equipment cabinets and development ancillary thereto.

The proposed monopole would have galvanised finish and the proposed cabinets are steel with grey colour finish. There are four levels of antennas on the monopole, the lower two levels would provide 2G/3G/4G coverage while the upper two levels would provide 5G coverage. The proposed equipment will be shared by two operators, EE and H3G.

Proposed cabinets sizes:

- 2000mm (W) x 750mm (D) x 1850mm (H)
- 600mm (W) x 600mm (D) x 1900mm (H)
- 1200mm (W) x 500mm (D) x 1700mm (H)
- 600mm (W) x 600mm (D) x 1800mm (H)
- 600mm (W) x 600mm (D) x 1800mm (H)
- 1230mm (W) x 400mm (D) x 1032mm (H)
- 600mm (W) x 600mm (D) x 1200mm (H)
- 1600mm (W) x 700mm (D) x 1600mm (H)

The existing telecommunication are used for 2G/3G/4G technologies for EE and 3G/4G for H3G.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

54873/APP/2000/551 Land Adjacent To 1 - 3 Campbell Close Hume Way Ruislip

INSTALLATION OF A GROUND BASED 12 METRE HIGH 'STREETWORKS' MONOPOLE MA WITH ASSOCIATED ANTENNAS, EQUIPMENT CABINET AND ANCILLARY DEVELOPMENT (CONSULTATION UNDER SCHEDULE 2, PART 24 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990) (GENERAL PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT) ORDER 1995)(AS AMENDED)

Decision: 12-10-2001 NFA

Comment on Relevant Planning History

A Prior Approval under planning application ref: 54873/APP/2000/551 was determined with no further action dated 12-10-01 for the installation of a ground based 12 metres high 'streetworks' monopole mast with associated antennas, equipment cabinet and ancillary development. The site is located on land adjacent to 1-3 Campbell Close Hume Way.

It should be noted that the documents submitted indicates that the existing site adjacent to 1-3 Campbell Close is a 13.7m high monopole with four cabinets, however there are no planning records available in regards to the existing monopole.

4. Planning Policies and Standards

London Borough of Hillingdon Development Plan (from 6th April 2020)

1.1 Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

1.2 The Development Plan for the London Borough of Hillingdon currently consists of the following documents:

The Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012)

The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020)

The Local Plan: Part 2 - Site Allocations and Designations (2020)

West London Waste Plan (2015)

The London Plan - Consolidated With Alterations (2016)

1.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) is also a material consideration in planning decisions, as well as relevant supplementary planning documents and guidance.

Emerging Planning Policies

1.4 Paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019 states that 'Local Planning Authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

(a) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);

(b) the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and

(c) the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this

Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

Draft London Plan (Intend to Publish Version, December 2019)

1.5 The GLA consulted upon a draft new London Plan between December 2017 and March 2018 with the intention of replacing the previous versions of the existing London Plan. The Plan was subject to examination hearings from February to May 2019, and a Consolidated Draft Plan with amendments was published in July 2019. The Panel of Inspectors appointed by the Secretary of State issued their report and recommendations to the Mayor on 8th October 2019.

1.6 The Mayor has considered the Inspectors' recommendations and, on 9th December 2019, issued to the Secretary of State his intention to publish the London Plan along with a statement of reasons for the Inspectors' recommendations that the Mayor did not wish to accept. The Secretary of State responded on the 13th March 2020 and stated that he was exercising his powers under section 337 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 to direct that modifications are required. These are set out at Annex 1 of the response, however the letter does also state that if the Mayor can suggest alternative changes to policies that would address the concerns raised, these would also be considered.

1.7 More limited weight should be attached to draft London Plan policies where the Secretary of State has directed modifications or where they relate to concerns raised within the letter. Greater weight may be attached to policies that are not subject to modifications from the Secretary of State or that do not relate to issues raised in the letter.

UDP / LDF 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:

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 21 Telecommunications

DMHB 14 Trees and Landscaping

DMT 2 Highways Impacts

DMAV 1 Safe Operation of Airports

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

5. Advertisement and Site Notice

5.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable

5.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- **6th April 2020**

6. Consultations

External Consultees

A total of 108 neighbouring owners/occupiers, Ruislip Residents Association and Eastcote Residents Association was consulted. A total of 8 objections has been received via public consultation.

Summary of the objections:

- Very close to residential dwelling
- Proposed is higher than existing structure and additional equipment
- Health and safety concerns of 5G including radiation impacts, long term damage, exposure time lead to health risk to bodily organ, how much heat will these waves create and what heat (temperature) is considered unsafe, noise level emitted, impact on wildlife, increase cancer risk, cellular stress, increase in harmful free radicals, genetic damages, structural and functional changes of the reproductive system, learning and memory deficits, neurological disorders, memory loss, eye damage and negative impacts on general well-being in humans
- Insufficient safety data/evidence provided on EMF waves relating to health risk/cancer
- Uncertain impact of significantly increased mobile data usage
- Proposed will be very disruptive
- Is there consideration being made to how health of residents might be safeguarded from the side effects of this new installation?
- Very unsightly, especially at the start of Hume Way
- Prefer 5G technology not to be build less than 100m from residential property
- Technology no proven to be safe or long term exposures and many studies on 2G, 3G and 4G show their detrimental effects on humans and animals
- 5G is absolutely NOT safe at all, strongly urge the council not to install such devices in the borough
- Do not want one build less than 100 metres away from residential properties

Case Officer's Comments:

The agent has provided a signed Declaration of Conformity with the ICNIRP. The proposed equipment is compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines.

NATS:

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.

NORTHOLT SAFEGUARDING:

No comments received at the time this report was submitted to committee.

Internal Consultees

HIGHWAYS OFFICER:

Original Comments - As telecom provisions are already in place on the grass verge at this location without prejudice to the adjacent foot-way, the proposal does not give rise for further comment.

Revised Comments - As the footway adjacent to the proposed apparatus at both locations in Hume Way is to remain unimpeded, there are no envisaged highway usage/safety implications identified

with this application. There are no further observations.

TREES/LANDSCAPE OFFICER:

This site is located within a narrow grass verge between a pedestrian crossing and the junction with Campbell Close. The verge already houses a monopole and associated telecoms cabinets. There is a wide area of open space (mow grass) with mature trees and other vegetation on the far side of the foot way. This contributes to the character and appearance of the area and to some extent distracts attention away from the unsightly street clutter of the telecoms furniture. This area is not affected by TPO or Conservation Area designation. COMMENT No trees or other landscape features of merit will be affected by the replacement of the existing telecoms paraphernalia. The proposal complies with policy DMHB 14 and must also comply with policy DMHB 21. RECOMMENDATION No objection and no need for landscape conditions.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.01 The principle of the development

The application has been assessed principally against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Policy DMHB 21 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020).

The NPPF stresses the importance of advance, high quality and reliable communications. It states infrastructure is essential for economic growth and social well-being. The number of radio and electronic communications masts, and the sites for such installations, should be kept to a minimum consistent with the needs of consumers, the efficient operation of the network and providing reasonable capacity for future expansion.

Policy DMHB 21 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) 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 structures 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;
- v) 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
- vi) it includes a Declaration of Conformity with the International Commission on Non Ionizing Radiation.

A signed Declaration of Conformity with the ICNIRP has been included in the submission. The proposal is for the replacement of an existing mast that provides coverage, for both EE Ltd and H3G Ltd, to the surrounding area. Government guidance encourages the sharing of sites between operators and the use of existing site, therefore the principle of a replacement mast and associated equipment is considered acceptable subject to other material considerations outlined in this report.

7.02 Density of the proposed development

Not applicable to the consideration of this application.

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

Not applicable to the consideration of this application.

7.04 Airport safeguarding

Policy DMAV 1 of the Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that proposals that may be hazard to aircraft safety will not be permitted.

The application site is situated 2.18km from Northolt Aerodrome. NATS was consulted and no objections were raised, however no comments were received by RAF Northolt at the time that this report was submitted to committee.

7.05 Impact on the green belt

Not applicable to the consideration of this application, this site is not located within the Green Belt.

7.07 Impact on the character & appearance of the area

Policy DMHB 11 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) ensures all development to harmonise with the local context by harmonising with the local context by taking into account the surrounding; scale of development, considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; building plot sizes and widths, plot coverage and established street patterns; building lines and setbacks, rooflines, streetscape rhythm, for example, gaps between structures and other streetscape elements, such as degree of enclosure; architectural composition and quality of detailing; local topography, views both from and to the site; and impact on neighbouring open spaces and their environment.

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.

The proposed replacement monopole is 20m high, which is 6.3 metres taller than the existing (an increase of 46% in height). When viewed from the street, the base of the mast is much bulkier than the existing and is akin to the provision of an extra cabinet at this level. Allied to this, the proposed mast is larger and higher, such that it would be much more prominent than any of the street lighting columns.

The proposed new cabinets will be located in a row along the narrow grass verge. The cabinets range in height from 1 to 1.9 metres. The size, height, and the number of cabinets proposed requires a considerable larger footprint than the existing and the number of cabinets at a height of 1.8m or above totals 4, with a further 4 being just below, where currently there are no cabinets of this size and scale. Thus, the proposed mast and the proposed associated cabinets, by reason of the quantity, size, scale and siting are considered to have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Whilst the proposal is to upgrade and replace the existing apparatus in a similar location, the proposal will add undue clutter to the streetscene which will have a significant negative impact on visual amenity. 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).

7.08 Impact on neighbours

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 nearest neighbours are 13 metres away, no. 1 and 2 Hale End Close is located on the north-east which has two habitable windows on the first floor level that faces directly onto

Hume Way and no. 182 Eastcote Road, located just south across the highway.

Based on the location of the proposed telecommunication equipment, the habitable window to no. 1 Hale End Close will be obscured by its Ground Floor level slanted roof and the existing vertical features/trees on the grass area. However, the habitable window to no. 2 Hale End Close will have a directly line of sight of the proposed equipment and must therefore the proposal would impact on the outlook of the existing residents and this proposal fails to accord with Policy DMHB 11 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020).

7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

Not applicable to the consideration of this application.

7.10 Traffic impact, car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

Policy DMT 2 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals must ensure that they do not contribute to the deterioration of air quality, noise or local amenity or safety of all road users and residents and 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 proposal is located on the grass verge in close proximity to the public highway and is set back at least 12 metres from the junction of Eastcote Road and Hume Way. The Council's Highways Officer has viewed the proposal and concluded that there is no envisaged highway safety implications identified with this application. The proposal is considered to comply with Policy DMT 2 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020).

7.11 Urban design, access and security

Please see the 'Impact on the character & appearance of the area' section of the report.

7.12 Disabled access

Not applicable to the consideration of this application.

7.13 Provision of affordable & special needs housing

Not applicable to the consideration of this application.

7.14 Trees, Landscaping and Ecology

Policy DMHB 14 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all developments will be expected to retain or enhance existing landscaping, trees, biodiversity or other natural features of merit.

The proposed telecommunication equipment and monopole is to be located on the grass verge between the pedestrian footpath and highway. Despite the dense foliage from neighbouring trees, the proposal would not be impacted. The Council's Trees/Landscape Officer has assessed this application and no objections are raised. As such, the proposal is considered to comply with Policy DMHB 14 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020).

7.15 Sustainable waste management

Not applicable to the consideration of this application.

7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

Not applicable to the consideration of this application.

7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues

Not applicable to the consideration of this application.

7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

Not applicable to the consideration of this application.

7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

Comments received to this application have been addressed within the main body of the report.

7.20 Planning Obligations

None.

7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

None.

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.

10. CONCLUSION

This application seeks planning permission for a telecommunication installation. The proposal involves a replacement 20 metre high monopole with 12 antennas and associated equipment cabinets and the removal of existing telecommunication apparatus.

The proposed telecommunications monopole, combined with the apertures and equipment cabinets, would increase street visual clutter which would result in a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the immediate street scene, the surrounding area. For the reasons set out within this report, this application is recommended for Refusal.

11. 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

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 2020 Ordnance Survey 100019283

Site Address:

**Hume Way
Ruislip**

**LONDON BOROUGH
OF HILLINGDON**
Residents Services
Planning Section

Civic Centre, Uxbridge, Middx. UB8 1UW
 Telephone No.: Uxbridge 01895 250111

Planning Application Ref:
54873/APP/2020/721

Scale:
1:1,250

Planning Committee:
North

Date:
June 2020



HILLINGDON
LONDON