

Item No.	Report of the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration
Address	LAND REAR OF ALMOND AVENUE PORTERS WAY WEST DRAYTON
Development:	Installation of 18m monopole C/W wraparound cabinet at base, 3 equipment cabinets and associated ancillary works (Application under Part 16 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) for determination as to whether prior approval is required for siting and appearance)
LBH Ref Nos:	75751/APP/2020/2304
Drawing Nos:	Covering letter Site Specific Supplementary Information Declaration of Conformity with ICNIRP Public Exposure Guidelines Letter to Site Provider Developers Notice 002 - Site Location Plan Issue A 100 - Existing Site Plan Issue A 150 - Existing Elevation A Issue A 210 - Proposed H3G Site Plan Issue A 260 - Proposed H3G Elevation Issue A 303 - Proposed H3G Antenna Schedule & Line Configuration Issue A 305 - Equipment Schedule & Support Structure Details Issue A Heathrow Developers Notice and response

Date Plans Recieved: 24/07/2020 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 24/07/2020

1. SUMMARY

This application seeks prior approval for a telecommunications installation under Schedule 2, Part 16 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended). The proposal is for the installation of 18m monopole C/W wraparound cabinet at base, 3 cabinets and associated ancillary works. The new mast is to provide new 5G coverage and to improve existing coverage and capacity for Hutchison 3G UK Limited (H3G).

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

This application is recommended for Refusal.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of the siting in this open prominent position, size, scale and design of the proposed monopole and the size, scale and siting of the equipment cabinets, would create an obtrusive form of development which would add

visual clutter to the detriment of the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHB 21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019).

INFORMATIVES

1 I52 Compulsory Informative (1)

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

2 I53 Compulsory Informative (2)

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

DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 21	Telecommunications
LPP 4.11	(2016) Encouraging a connected economy
NPPF- 10	NPPF-10 2018 - Supporting high quality communications

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

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

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

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The site is located south of Porters Way, close to its junction with Mulberry Parade. The proposed monopole is located on the grass verge, adjacent to a pedestrian crossing, immediately on the west. To the south of the site is a triangular open space and to the east, is the Stockley Park Recreation Ground. There are a row of local shops with flats above and parking to the front just north of the site. Residential dwellings are located to the south and west of the site.

The surrounding area is residential in nature comprising of 2-3 storey high residential flats, terrace housing and semi-detached dwellings.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

This application seeks to install a new 18m monopole C/W wraparound cabinet at base, 3 cabinets and associated ancillary works.

The proposed cabinet dimensions:

- 640mm (W) x 480mm (D) x 1200mm (H)
- 600mm (W) x 520mm (D) x 1585mm (H)
- 1900mm (W) x 600mm (D) x 1752mm (H)
- 1800mm (W) x 750mm (D) x 1600mm (H) with 18m Phase 8 monopole on root foundation (Volume of housing equipment = 5.02 cubic metres)

Material:

Monopole - Phase 8 pole, Galvanised with wraparound cabinet
Equipment Housing - Steel, Grey

3.3 Relevant Planning History

Comment on Relevant Planning History

No planning history relevant to the application.

4. Planning Policies and Standards

Policy DMHB 21 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that telecommunication development will only be permitted where:

- i) it is sited and designed to minimise their visual impact;
- ii) it does not have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the building or the local area;
- iii) it has been demonstrated that there is no possibility for use of alternative sites, mast sharing and the use of existing buildings;
- iv) there is no adverse impact on areas of ecological interest, areas of landscape importance, archaeological sites, Conservation Areas or buildings of architectural or historic interest; and
- v) it includes a Declaration of Conformity with the International Commission on Non Ionizing Radiation.

Chapter 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) stresses the importance of advanced, high quality and reliable communications infrastructure 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.

The aim of this application is to provide 5G network and improve coverage and capacity for one operator, Hutchison 3G UK Limited (H3G) in the area. A cell search has indicated that a total of 10 site has been examined including the site selected.

It is noted that the other sites were discounted due to the following reasons:

- Discounted due to insufficient pavement width to house the equipment
- Discounted due to insufficient space to house the equipment.
- Discounted due to better sites available which do not impact on residential areas to the same extent.
- Discounted due to being located on private land.

A signed Declaration of Conformity has been provided as part of this submission.

Local Plan Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 14 Trees and Landscaping

DMHB 21 Telecommunications

LPP 4.11 (2016) Encouraging a connected economy

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

5. Advertisement and Site Notice

5.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- **20th August 2020**

5.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

6. Consultations

External Consultees

A site notice was displayed adjacent to the application and expires on 20th August 2020. A total of 438 neighbouring owners/occupiers have been consulted. 19 household objections and 1 comment in support of this application has been received. In addition, one of the Directors of Drayton Garden Village have provided comments on behalf of residents.

Summary of comments:

Health/Safety

- Would you please share detailed report(data)regarding its impacts on human & animal health? most importantly have you got any clearance with regard to human, animal and environmental safety from any recognized agencies? I have below additional questions in that regard. Are their radiation levels safe? As the pulsing waves from the masts interfere with electrical signals in the body, damaging the immune system; is it safe and have you got any clearance? How would it affect the environment? What kind of radiation it will emit? How about radiation regarding 4G & 5G?

- The long-term effects of the technology on the human health are still to be confirmed.

- This new application is a breach to our right to the peaceful enjoyment of our property. The size, height & location of this monopole/mast would cause visual harm. This mast would make a big visual difference in the area. Such a mast would cause a significant detriment to the local appearance. If you know the area well, then you would know this is the worst location in West Drayton to have a monopole/mast.

- The proposed citing is totally inappropriate overlooking residential properties, an old people's care home, childcare centre & a school West Drayton Academy.

- Loss of amenity is a very valid planning issue and it is clear that worrying about the implications to one's health from mobile phone masts, especially if the mast is clearly visible from one's home, is going to affect the person's quality of life - thus leading to a loss of amenity.

- If it causes more radiation in the area then we are against it, we already have enough pollution in the area. The

youngsters have suffered enough. I have children and grandchildren nearby.

- I'm strongly against this investment and don't agree for 5G tower. It will affect health of myself and my little kids. It's too close to the residential area. We can't sacrifice our health for technology!!!

- We worry about any associated health risks of a telephone mast being so close to our home and to other homes. We would prefer it is located in a field further away from our homes.
- To close to our residential area, radiation might cause potential hazards to our social living, risk of potential lighting hazards during thunderstorms and rains.
- I would like to draw attention to a seemingly contradictory element in the detail of comments relating to public safety. Namely within the paragraph at the foot of Page 7 of the SSSI document. '4. Technical Information' "ICNIRP Declaration attached. ICNIRP public compliance is determined by mathematical calculation and implemented by careful location of antennas, access restrictions and/or barriers and signage as necessary. (AND VERY SPECIFICALLY I DRAW ATTENTION TO THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE) **Members of the public cannot unknowingly enter areas close to the antennas where exposure may exceed the relevant guidelines**. When determining compliance.. etc..etc" I am at a loss to understand how this is at all possible when the structures are closely adjacent to a public footpath leading to a children's play area & a pedestrian crossing - with no indication in the plans of barriers or fencing (which would probably be pointless and void anyway given the close proximity of the public thoroughfares).

Case Officer's Comments:

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

Site/Appearance:

- I don't think a residential area is the best place to install such a tall tower. It'd be an out of place element in the area.
- With the height of the mast it will be visually intrusive, towering over a lot of properties.
- We don't want to have this huge mast opposite our windows in a densely residential area.
- This is too close to our office.
- It's close to our housing community.

Case Officer's Comments:

Concerns in relations to appearance and impact of the neighbours is addressed in the main body of this report.

Other:

- There is a potential of decrease in the value of the properties close to the tower.
- As the consultation is being carried out while the local academy/school is closed for the summer holidays, so parents of the concerned children should also be consulted once the school opens. Otherwise the consultation is flawed as it misses a key group who will be affected if this mast is installed.
- We were not informed about this directly and we only found about this through neighbourhood. Our residents relatives will not be happy about this being installed.
- Not required, there is adequate coverage in the area. Too disruptive in highly dense residential area.
- 5G have possible invented "Covid-19" or spread the work about Covid as why on Earth everything is shut down in UK during the pandemic and 5G installation started and continued at the whole time with no social measures or similar? Surely 5G is not that important that could not wait to be installed after pandemic? Also, there are many reasons to believe that 5G is not safe for human being and the nature - the radiation's is above normal coming from 5G signal

Case Officer's Comments:

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

DIRECTOR OF DRAYTON GARDEN VILLAGE:

I wanted to convey the comments of some of our near 800 units, especially Hampstead House which is situated alongside the proposed location. While many residents support the technology,

they are concerned that the proposed location is a densely populated residential area and the mast itself will be an obtrusive eyesore not only for the community (and the recreational area alongside) but also the nearby estates due to the sheer size and stature of it. Such a conspicuous, obtrusive construction (visible from not only from the roads but also apartment balconies) would be better placed in an industrial/commercial area or perhaps next to the dual carriageway near Stockley Road where it would easier blend in with the surroundings.

HEATHROW AERODROME SAFEGUARDING:

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

However, we would like to make the following observation:

Cranes

Given the nature of the proposed development it is possible that a crane may be required during its construction. We would, therefore, draw the applicant's attention to the requirement within the British Standard Code of Practice for the safe use of Cranes, for crane operators to consult the aerodrome before erecting a crane in close proximity to an aerodrome. This is explained further in Advice Note 4, 'Cranes and Other Construction Issues' (available at <http://www.aoa.org.uk/policy-campaigns/operations-safety/>)

NATS:

No comments received at the time this report was written.

Internal Consultees

HIGHWAYS OFFICER:

This is an application for the installation of a monopole and related equipment on highway grass verge. The proposed site at the corner of Porters Way and Mulberry Parade has a mix of restricted and non restricted highway. The equipment will be located on grass verge not impacting on footway or pedestrian desire lines. The limited servicing and maintenance requirements can be undertaken from the nearby highway. There are no highways objections to this proposal.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.01 The principle of the development

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

Permitted development

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

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

Development not permitted: ground-based apparatus

A.1 - (1) Development consisting of the installation, alteration or replacement of electronic

communications apparatus (other than on a building) is not permitted by Class A(a) if:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Case Officer's Comments:

The proposed monopole is 18m and is not located within article 2(3) land or land which is on highway. 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).

Development not permitted: radio equipment housing

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

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

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

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

Case Officer's Comments:

The total accumulative radio equipment housing would be 5.02 cubic metres, therefore the proposal is in accord with Condition A.1 - (9)(b) of Schedule 2, Part 16 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

7.02 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

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 located in a NATS height restriction area of 15m. Heathrow Aerodrome Safeguarding has been consulted and no objection raised. No response from NATS have been received at the time this report was written.

7.05 Impact on the green belt

Not applicable to this application.

7.07 Impact on the character & appearance of the area

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

Policy DMHB 12 of the The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development should be well integrated with the surrounding area and accessible. It should: i) improve legibility and promote routes and wayfinding between the development and local amenities; ii) ensure public realm design takes account of the established townscape character and quality of the surrounding area; iii) include landscaping treatment that is suitable for the location, serves a purpose, contributes to local green infrastructure, the appearance of the area and ease of movement through the space; iv) provide safe and direct pedestrian and cycle movement through the space; v) incorporate appropriate and robust hard landscaping, using good quality materials, undertaken to a high standard; vi) where appropriate, include the installation of public art; and vii) deliver proposals which incorporate the principles of inclusive design. Proposals for gated developments will be resisted.

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

The proposed new mast is 18 metres high with 3 cabinets located alongside the grass verge adjacent to the highway. The cabinets range in height from 1.2 to 1.75 metres and has an overall footprint of 5.02 cubic metres.

The site is set back from the highway, however it remains fairly exposed and is therefore highly visible when viewed from the immediate street scene and the surrounding area. The proposed 18m high telecommunications mast would appear as a prominent feature on Porters Way and would have a detrimental impact on the openness, character and appearance of the street scene. In addition, due to the open nature and high visibility of the site, the proposed telecommunications installation would appear as an incongruous

addition to the neighbourhood.

There is currently no street furniture of this size and height. When compared to the adjacent 8m high light pole, surrounding roof levels and the streetscene, the 18m high monopole will appear unduly dominant and intrusive. The overall height would be significantly over and above the surrounding area that consists generally of 2-3 storeys high residential flats/dwellings.

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

7.08 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 closest neighbouring dwelling is 18m away. Although no. 36 South Road is located closest to the apparatus, there is a row of existing soft landscaping along the rear hence, the proposal would unlikely impact on the amenity of the neighbouring dwelling.

However, the front windows to no. 5-6 Mulberry Parade will have a direct line of sight to the monopole. Due to its proximity, size and overall height of the equipment, the proposal would be highly visible and intrusive to the immediate adjacent residents on the north of Porters Way and the surrounding area in general. As such, the proposal would severely impact the outlook of the existing residents and therefore 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 this application.

7.10 Traffic impact, Car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

The Council's Highways Officer has commented on this application and no objections has been raised. The site is located on the grass verge therefore will not impact on the footpath, pedestrian or highways safety.

7.11 Urban design, access and security

Refer to Section 7.07 of this report.

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

Not applicable to this application.

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

Refer to Section 6.1 of this report.

7.20 Planning obligations

Not applicable to this application.

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 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. 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 prior approval for the installation of a ground-base apparatus consisting of a new 18m monopole C/W wraparound cabinet at base, 3 cabinets and associated ancillary works under Schedule 2, Part 16 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended)

The siting of the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact on visual amenity particularly to the adjacent residential dwellings, and the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it 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).

It is recommended that prior approval be required and that permission be refused.

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

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:

**Land Rear of
 Almond Avenue/Porters Way**

Planning Application Ref:
75751/APP/2020/2304

Planning Committee:
Central & South

Scale:
1:1,250

Date:
Sept 2020

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

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



HILLINGDON
 LONDON