

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**22 June 2005**Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
 Bennetts (P)
 Beveridge (P)
 Davies (P)
 Evans (P)
 Jeffs (P)
 Johnston (P)

Mitchell (P)
 Pearce
 Pearson (P)
 Read (P)
 Saunders (P)
 Sutton (P)

111. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Pearce.

112. **PLANNING APPEALS (EAST) – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS**

(Report PDC557 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted

113. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC555 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 24 May 2005 (attached as appendix A to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 24 May 2005 be received.

114. **NUSIANCE HIGH HEDGES – EXPLANATION OF NEW DUTIES AND EXTRACT OF MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF CABINET HELD ON 1 JUNE 2005**

(Report CAB1085 and PDC567 refers)

The above item had not been noted for inclusion on the agenda within the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept the item onto the agenda as a matter requiring urgent consideration, in order that the recommendations could be made to the next meeting of Council.

The Committee noted that the report had previously been considered at the meeting of Cabinet held on the 1 June 2005 and the detail of the consideration of the item together with the recommended and resolved minutes from that meeting were set out in report PDC567 – extract of minutes of meeting – Cabinet 1 June 2005. The Director of Development explained that the recommendations set out in report CAB1085 had been amended by Cabinet in order that an update report on the new duties be brought back to Cabinet in six months time. The amended recommendation was contained in report PDC567.

Following debate, the Committee supported the recommendations and resolutions as set out in report PDC567.

RESOLVED:

That the resolved Minutes as agreed by Cabinet at its meeting on the 1 June 2005, as set out in report PDC567, be approved and adopted by the Committee and that the recommendations therein be supported by this Committee for endorsement at Council on 29 July 2005.

115. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**

(Report PDC559 refers)

The Schedule of Development Control Decisions arising from the consideration of the above report is circulated separately and forms an appendix to the minutes.

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 8 as he was a Member of the Council of the City of Winchester Trust who had commented on the application and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 8 as he was a Member of the City of Winchester Trust who had commented on the application and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Johnston declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of items 6 and 7, as he was a member of Kings Worthy Parish Council that was currently in negotiations with the applicant to purchase an area of land from the applicant for off site public open space and he left the meeting during consideration of this item.

In the public participation part of the meeting, the following items were discussed:

In respect of item 2 and 3 – 1 Wyndham Cottages, Shoe Lane, Exton, Mr R Buchanan, Agent, spoke in support of the applications and against the Officers' recommendation for refusal. Following debate, the Committee agreed to support the reasons for refusal in respect of both items.

In respect of item 4 – The Pine, Stocks Lane, Meonstoke, Southampton, Mr J Pett representing Corhampton and Meonstoke Parish Council spoke in objection to the application. Following debate, the Committee approved the application as set out.

In respect of item 5 – Railway Station Yard, Station Road, Alresford, Mr Stevens spoke in objection to the application and Mr Partridge, Agent, spoke in support. The Director of Development stated that if the Committee was minded to approve the application an additional condition should be included to state that before development commences full details of levels be submitted to the local planning authority. The Director also explained that since preparing the report the applicant had paid a financial contribution of £28,000 towards highway improvements and therefore this reference should be deleted from the proposed Section 106 agreement.

The Chairman reported that she had received a letter from a Ward Member, Councillor Cook, reiterating the points made in objection to the scheme as set out in the report.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse the application with detailed reasons being delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman to agree based on the principles of the effect of the proposed development on the amenity of 1 to 8 Station Approach due to its bulk and height which would be over bearing, its detrimental effect on the townscape and the lack of amenity provision within the site.

In respect of item 6 – Sarasota Automation Limited (PLC), London Road, Kings Worthy, Winchester, Mr Holmes, applicant, spoke in support of the application. The Director of Development had circulated an addendum to report PDC559 relating to this item and this was taken into consideration in the Committee's consideration of the application. Following debate, the Committee approved the application as set out subject to the delegation of authority to the City Secretary and Solicitor to make the requisite Stopping Up and Diversion Orders for the diversion of the Nunns Walk footpath, which was a public right of way.

In respect of item 7 – Peek PLC, London Road, Headbourne Worthy, Winchester, Mr Holmes, applicant, spoke in support of the application. The Director of Development stated that since preparing the report the legal agreement relating to the public open space had now been completed. This included a payment to the public open space fund to secure the purchase of the off site public open space and an additional payment of £35,000 to Kings Worthy Parish Council for its future maintenance and to provide a children's play area in the eastern part of the green at the Parish Council's discretion. The developer would carry out the landscaping of the public open space area at its own expense. The Director of Development also explained that sites 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 21, 23 and 24 of the development would be provided as affordable housing with a housing mix of three 2 bedroom properties, one 3 bedroom property and four 1 bedroom properties.

The Committee noted that the section 106 and 278 agreements included a financial contribution of £20,000 towards the Winchester movement and access plan which would be supplemented by a financial contribution of £30,000 towards the same plan from the adjoining Sarasota Automation Limited (PLC), London Road, Kings Worthy, application giving a total contribution of £50,000 towards the Winchester movement and access plan.

In considering the application, certain Members raised issues regarding the arrangements for provision of affordable homes within the site. It was noted that the affordable units would be available for key workers as identified in the Council's Key Worker Housing Strategy. These properties would be available for the purchaser to buy a 75% share with 25% of the equity being retained with no rental charge to the owner. There was the opportunity for the purchaser to buy the remaining 25% equity from the housing association (Merlion Housing) to secure full ownership. Merlion Housing had stated in writing that it would reinvest 50% of any released equity into the Winchester District schemes to make them more affordable and had also stated that their long term aim was to make it possible for the cost of purchasing one of their shared equity properties to be equivalent to that of renting a council or housing association property.

It was stated by certain Members that if a resident purchased 100% equity in a property then under this formula only 12 ½ % of the capital value would be reinvested into future Winchester District schemes for the provision of affordable housing. Following debate, it was agreed that this issue should be further debated at Cabinet following preliminary discussions between the Portfolio Holder for Planning and the Portfolio Holder for Housing.

The Committee agreed that the use of high quality materials included clay and slate for roofing and a good quality stock brick was essential for the success of the scheme due to the site's sensitivity being on the edge of the Conservation Area and adjacent to public open space. The Director of Development stated that a pallet of materials had been given preliminary inspection and appeared to be satisfactory, but the principle of the use of high quality materials needed to be adhered to.

The Committee requested the Director of Development to reconfirm with the Council's Archaeological Section that its obligations for site investigation had been fully discharged without the need to impose a condition.

Following debate, the Committee agreed to delegate authority to the City Secretary and Solicitor to make the requisite Stopping Up and Diversion Orders to secure the diversion of the Nunns Walk footpath, which was a public right of way.

In respect of items not subject to public participation, the Director of Development stated that in respect of item 1 – The Garden House, Haig Road, Alresford, Councillor Cook, a Ward Member, had now withdrawn his letter of objection to the application. Following debate the Committee agreed to grant planning permission on this application as set out.

In respect of item 8 – 165 Romsey Road, Winchester, Mr Harris, agent spoke in support of the application. Following debate, the Committee approved the application as set out.

RESOLVED:

1. That the decisions taken on the Development Control Applications, as set out in the Schedule which forms an Appendix to the minutes, be agreed.

2. That in respect of item 5 – Railway Station Yard, Station Road, Alresford, the application be refused with detailed reasons being delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman to agree based on the principles of the effect of the proposed development on the amenity of 1 to 8 Station Approach due to its bulk and height which would be over bearing, its detrimental effect on the townscape and the lack of amenity provision within the site.
3. That in respect of item 6 – Sarasota Automation Limited (PLC), London Road, Kings Worthy, Winchester, and item 7 – Peek PLC, London Road, Headbourne Worthy, Winchester, authority be delegated to the City Secretary and Solicitor to make the requisite Stopping Up and Diversion Orders for the diversion of the Nunn's Walk footpath.

The meeting commenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 5.30pm

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE24 May 2005Attendance:

Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Davies (P)
Johnston (P)
Pearson (P)Read (P)
Sutton(P)Officers in attendance:Miss A Fettes (Senior Planning Officer)
Mrs V Fifield (Principal Landscape Architect)**116. INSTALLATION OF 17.34 METRE WOODEN MONOPOLE WITH 2 NO. ANTENNAE AND 1 NO. DISH; EQUIPMENT CABINET AND ANCILLARY EQUIPMENT WITHIN FENCED COMPOUND - BOROUGH FARM, SLOE LANE, MICHELDEVER, WINCHESTER, HAMPSHIRE**

The Sub-Committee met at the application site at Borough Farm, Sloe Lane, Micheldever, Winchester, Hampshire.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Henderson and Mr Higgins from Turner and Partners on behalf of the applicant, O2 (UK) Ltd. Also present were two residents and farm workers from Borough Farm (Mr Dockray and Mr Pettit) and a resident from Micheldever village, Mrs Lee. There was no Ward Member or Parish Council representative present.

Miss Fettes explained that a full planning application had been received from O2 (UK) Ltd for the erection of a 17.34 metre high wooden monopole with 2 antennae and 1 dish together with an equipment cabinet and ancillary equipment within a fenced compound.

The Sub-Committee observed that a demonstration mast had been raised to the height of the proposals. This had been positioned approximately where the structure was to be sited.

Miss Fettes explained that the proposals were prominent when viewed from many directions due to the lack of high vegetation cover in the vicinity. These included from views southward from the Micheldever-Stoke Charity Road and the Northbrook-Weston Colley Road. The structure would also be visible from the Micheldever Station Road and from within the Micheldever Conservation Area. Members were informed that visual impact would be particularly severe from an adjacent public footpath.

Miss Fettes stated that 2 letters of representations had been received from local residents. These set out objections to the proposals as they would be sited near residential properties and were visually intrusive. Micheldever Parish Council had not submitted any representation regarding the application.

Following consultations with landscape officers of the Council, a number of objections had been made. In summary, Mrs Fifield explained that the proposed monopole would be in an elevated and prominent position with uninterrupted views in an area considered to be of high scenic quality. Therefore officers were recommending refusal of the proposals as they would have serious impact on visual amenity in such a sensitive area.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Henderson and Mr Higgins responded to a number of questions from Members. Mr Henderson explained that the proposals were required for completion of the third generation mobile telecommunications coverage by O2 (UK) Ltd along the Winchester to Basingstoke railway line located to the south-east of the application site. Any gaps in coverage along the railway line may result in calls being 'dropped'.

Members noted that the application site was situated some distance from the railway line. In acknowledging the open-ness of this site, Mr Henderson explained the difficulties in finding alternative siting and why the site proposed was the best for both functionality and visual impact. Mr Higgins answered questions regarding the coverage and strength of signal and also confirmed that the sharing of a lattice mast in the vicinity would not have been sufficient to provide the coverage required.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a resident and farmer, Mr Dockray addressed the Sub-Committee. Mr Dockray suggested that alternative and more acceptable siting could be achieved on the farm beyond the existing electricity supply and therefore at additional cost to the applicant. Also at the invitation of the Chairman, a resident of Micheldever village, Mrs Lee stated that the visual impact of the proposals as viewed from the village were unacceptable.

In conclusion, The Sub-Committee unanimously agreed to support the officers' recommendations and therefore refused the application as the proposals were unacceptable in terms of its impact on the visual amenity of area.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

The proposed mast, by reason of its siting and design, will be visually intrusive in the landscape, an area defined in the Winchester District Landscape Character Assessment 2004 as having a high quality and distinctive character. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies TC1 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan, FS4, EN5 and EN7 of the Winchester District Local Plan and DP3, DP17 and DP5 of the Emerging Winchester District Local Plan Review and Revised Deposit.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 10.25am.

Chairman