

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

7 September 2005

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

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

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

Deputy Members:

Councillor Lipscomb (Standing Deputy for Councillor Chapman)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Berry, Coates and Verney

264. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Chapman.

265. **MEMBERSHIP OF SUB-COMMITTEES**

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Pearce replace Councillor Beveridge as a member of the Planning Development Control (Learning Resources Centre, Peter Symonds' College, Winchester) Sub-Committee at its meeting to be held on 15 September 2005.

266. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC581 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control Telecommunications Sub-Committee held on 2 August 2005 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes).

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 2 August 2005 be received.

267. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**

(Report PDC582 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 items 6 and 7 as he was a member of the Council of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on these applications, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of items 6 and 7 as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on these applications, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Saunders declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 7 as she had been involved with residents making representation on this application, and she addressed the Committee as a Ward Member and did not vote on this item.

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

In respect of item 1, Catherine Fenez, 15 Broad Street, Alresford, Mr Jones spoke in support of the application. The Director of Development stated that since the report was published, one additional letter of objection had been received which reiterated points made by other objectors as set out in the report. Following debate, the Committee agreed to approve the application as set out.

In respect of item 2 – Fairfield House, East Street, Hambledon, Councillor Coates, a Ward Member, spoke on this item at the invitation of the Chairman. In summary, Councillor Coates commented on the positioning of the telecommunications pole in relation to Fairfield House, which was a Grade II listed building, and to the brick and flint walls at the edge of the carriageway. The Committee supported comments made by Councillor Coates on the sensitivity of the positioning of the telecommunications pole in relation to the listed building and the flint wall and also its effect on the East Hampshire Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, together with its positioning in relation to existing trees. Therefore, following debate, the Committee agreed to delegate authority to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman to agree a suitable position for the telecommunications pole as part of the approval of the planning application.

In respect of item 5 –Derry House, Kilmeston Road, Kilmeston, Alresford, Mr Smailes, applicant, spoke in support of the application and, at the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Verney, a Ward Member, also spoke in support of the application. In summary, Councillor Verney stated that Kilmeston Parish Council also supported the application. The amount of hedge loss to create the new entrance may not be as great as 9 metres as mentioned in the report and there would be gain to the village by part of the village green being stopped-up from being used as a vehicular access to Derry House. The entrance would be 12 metres away from The Wayfarers Walk and not 6 metres as stated in the report, and the positioning of the new entrance had been discussed with officers of Hampshire County Council's Highways Department. In addition, a further existing access to the cottage was in the opinion of the applicant unsafe as it entered into a narrow road with a high traffic density. Councillor Verney asked that the application be deferred for further consultation or that the authority be delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman to approve.

The Director of Development added that since the report was published, East Hampshire AONB had submitted a strong objection stating that the proposals would increase the visibility of electricity cables and spoil the rural feel of the area, and in addition The Ramblers Association had objected on similar grounds. A recent inspection of the hedgerow had also revealed that it presented an important amenity and had also eight indigenous species present, including hedgerow oak, which would be lost if a bell mouth opening were provided. The hedgerow was classified as an important hedgerow and should be retained on these grounds.

Following debate, the Committee supported the officers' recommendation to refuse the application as set out.

In respect of item 7 – The Chimneys, 1 Burnett Close, Winchester, Mr Wareham and Mr Knappett spoke in objection to the application and Mr McFarland, agent, spoke in support. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Berry, a Ward Member, spoke on this application. In summary, she provided background to the details of the application, stating that the area of Stockbridge Road presented an ancient and beautiful entrance to the City which would not be enhanced by the appearance of the proposed Aldi store on the site of the former Chimneys public house in Burnett Close. The additional cars accessing the car park and the increased hazard for pedestrians that this would cause and the associated air pollution were of concern. The facility would also encourage custom from a wider area rather than just satisfying local need, and from her canvass of opinion it was not desired by the majority of local residents. Also, at the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Saunders addressed the Committee as a Ward Member, sitting apart from the Committee and not voting on this item. Councillor Saunders supported the refusal of the application, stating that from a canvass of local opinion, the loss of the former Chimneys public house was regretted and that it should be replaced with an amenity centre which would provide a facility to draw local people together. The former public house was also made of good quality materials which enhanced the local area. She identified a gap in planning policy that the former Chimneys public house was lost to the local community and that the Council should contemplate policies to provide local listing in order that important local amenities were retained.

In answer to Members' questions, the Director of Development explained that Mr McFarland, representing Aldi, had referred to guidance given by the City Council that a contemporary design would be encouraged for the development, but the proposal put forward, although modern in appearance, did not meet the Council's requirements. In addition, under planning policy, the proposed development of 1,300 square metres was classified as a size to serve the local community only and therefore a policy objection was not included as a reason for refusal.

Although a number of Members made reference to the vacant adjacent site that was previously occupied by a petrol filling station, the Director of Development stated that under current planning policies the City Council was unable to insist that a single development brief was undertaken for the application site and the adjacent vacant site. The Director continued that it might be possible for the applicant to overcome highway objections, but insufficient information had been submitted by the applicant to allow a reasoned judgement to be made. Following debate, the Committee agreed the reasons for refusal as set out.

In respect of item 8 – Green Ridge, 31 Downs Road, South Wonston, Mr Hardy spoke in objection to the application and Mr Davies, applicant, spoke in support. Following debate, the Committee approved the application as set out and agreed that an informative be added that advice should be taken by the applicant on the height of the proposed chimney in relation to the Velux windows in the roof.

In respect of item 10 – 1 Church Cottages, Kilmeston Road, Kilmeston, Alresford, Mr Fox, applicant, spoke in support of the application. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Verney, Ward Member, spoke on this item. In summary, Councillor Verney stated that Kilmeston Parish Council objected to the application and the owner/occupier of the neighbouring property also strongly objected. He stated that there was a National Trust covenant that the property should not be extended and the proposals would surround No 2 Church Cottages, leading to overlooking. The proposals would also make these relatively small cottages within the village being made more unaffordable. In reply, Mr Fox, the applicant, stated that there was no covenant restricting development of the application property and that he had the consent of the National Trust to extend the property. Following debate, the Committee approved the application as set out.

In respect of items not subject to public participation, the Director of Development confirmed that item 9, which was submitted by an officer, had been processed normally and that item 11, Greenways Farm Shop, Stockbridge Road, Sutton Scotney, had been withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

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 2, Fairfield House, East Street, Hambledon, authority be delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman to agree the siting of the telecommunications pole and to approve appropriate conditions.

The meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and concluded at 5.50 pm.

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE**2 August 2005**Attendance:

Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Davies (P)
Johnston (P)
Pearson (P)Read (P)
Sutton (P)Officers in attendance:Ms J Pinnock (Senior Planning Officer)
Ms L Booth (Planning Officer)

268. INSTALLATION OF 2 YAGI ANTENNAE, EQUIPMENT CABINET AND ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENT AT MAST SITE, BRIDGE AT UPPER HIGH STREET, WINCHESTER

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

The Sub-Committee met at the application site at the railway bridge at Upper High Street, Winchester.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Ms J Meskell, Mr G Smith and Mr A Essa (representing the applicant, O2) and two members of the public.

The full planning application proposed two antennae, to be placed either side of the Upper High Street railway bridge. The antennae were similar in size and appearance to a domestic external television aerial and would be mounted 5.5 metres above the track level, protruding from one of the three railway arches. Due to the steepness of the embankment and vegetation, these aerials would be difficult to view from Upper High Street, although they would be visible in the distance from Winchester station platform, some 200 metres to the north.

The Sub-Committee noted that the YAGI antennae would have a very directional beam and were sought to improve 2G mobile phone coverage for O2 customers using the railway and that there would also be some improvement in signal above the embankment.

The associated equipment cabinet was proposed at the top of the embankment on Newburgh Street. The single cabinet was 1.36m x 0.35m x 1.43m high and Mr Smith confirmed that this was the smallest possible cabinet that could house both the necessary equipment and its power supply.

Mrs Pinnock confirmed that the applicant had investigated the possibility of mast sharing and alternative locations, but that these options did not provide the required coverage in the limited search area.

Mrs Pinnock stated that the principle of the development was acceptable, that it was in accordance with national and local planning policies and that the proposal was ICNIRP compliant. She also suggested that the visual effect of the proposals would not be intrusive and therefore recommended the application's approval.

Mrs Pinnock reported that the City of Winchester Trust had commented on the application and had raised concerns regarding the proliferation of street furniture in the area and had requested that alternative sites be investigated.

Mrs Pinnock also stated that three letters of representation had been received from local residents. A letter of objection had also been received from an officer of the Council who did not attend the meeting. In summary, these representations raised concerns regarding the application's inappropriate siting vis-à-vis the Conservation Area, the need to retain the character of the historic bridge and health issues. The representations also suggested that alternative sites should be further investigated and these concerns were echoed by members of the public that attended the meeting.

In response to public comments concerning the proliferation of street furniture in the area, the Sub-Committee discussed the location of the proposed equipment cabinet off Newburgh Street. Mrs Pinnock explained that the Landscape Architect had commented on the need to protect a young beech tree at the top of the embankment. Although the tree was not protected by a Tree Preservation Order, it was protected as it fell within, and contributed to, the character of the Conservation Area. Members considered the possible damage the 400mm deep foundation of the cabinet could cause to the roots of the tree and Mr Essa confirmed that the applicant could consider piled foundations to minimise root damage, although this would incur additional costs.

It was also noted that the siting of the equipment cabinet was limited because the cabinet had to be accessible from the highway for maintenance. Mr Smith explained that if the cabinet was positioned in such a way that it could only be maintained from Network Rail's land, this would require additional health and safety training for O2's engineers and contractors which was impractical. For this and other technical reasons, Mr Smith stated that it was not practical to relocate the equipment cabinet further than 50m from the antennae (such as on the station platform) or the east side of the tracks nor rotate the cabinet in or near its proposed location.

Members noted that the applicant intended to break the line of railings separating Newburgh Street and the embankment and, following discussion, the Sub-Committee agreed that although it was acceptable that the railing could be hinged, the visual effect of the proposals on the railings should be minimal. It was agreed that details of the hinge mechanism to retain the existing railings be covered by condition.

During its discussion on the siting of the equipment cabinet, Ms Meskell stated that, due to their internal re-organisation, Network Rail had not yet approved the siting of O2's equipment cabinet on their land and Members noted the need to ensure the stability of the embankment.

At the conclusion of the meeting, it was agreed to grant delegated authority to the Director of Development, in consultation with the Chairman, to approve the detailed siting of the equipment cabinet to ensure minimum visual intrusion to the Upper High Street, and minimum damage to the roots of the tree and to ensure the safety of the embankment. Members also agreed to delegate to the Director authority to impose conditions requiring that the colour of the cabinet and antennae should be painted a suitable colour to blend into the surrounding street furniture and to condition required details of the hinge mechanism to the existing railings.

RESOLVED:

That the Director of Development, in consultation with the Chairman, be granted delegated authority to approve the application, subject to the satisfactory re-location of the equipment cabinet and the following conditions:-

- 01 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.
Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 02 The antennae and equipment cabins shall be painted a suitable dark colour to be agreed in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area.
- 03 Prior to the commencement of development details of the hinge mechanism to the existing railings to provide access to the equipment cabin shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 11.10am.

Chairman