

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**12 January 2006**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

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

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

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Quar

---

665. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE**  
(Report PDC609 refers)

The Committee received the minutes of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 19 December 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 19 December 2005 be received.

666. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**  
(Report PDC608 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 Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 8 as he was a member of The City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on this application, and he spoke and voted thereon. Councillor Beveridge also declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of item 10 as he was a member of the Board of Management of The Hampshire Voluntary Housing Society, the housing association which was the applicant, and he withdrew from the room during consideration of this item.

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of items 4, 8 and 9 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 Evans declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 13 as she was a member of Wickham Parish Council, who had objected to the application, but she had taken no part in this decision and she spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Jeffs declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of item 11 as he knew the applicant and was involved in a previous application at The Swan Hotel, Alresford, and he withdrew from the meeting for consideration of this item.

Councillor Johnston declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of items 12 and 14, as in both cases he had had prior discussion with an objector to the respective applications, but he had not personally expressed an opinion on the applications, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Saunders declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 4 as she was an acquaintance of Mrs Budd, who was a party to the application, and she spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Sutton declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 10 as she was a member of the South Downs Joint Committee that had objected to this application, and she spoke and voted thereon.

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

In respect of item 1 – Mill House, 17 Mill Road, Denmead, Mr Keeling and Mr Barham spoke in objection to the application and Mr Jezeph, agent, spoke in support. The Director of Development reported the comments of Denmead Parish Council and also stated that additional conditions relating to an archaeological survey and an ecological survey should be included within any granting of planning permission. Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission as set out, including additional conditions relating to the requirement for archaeological and ecological surveys.

In respect of item 5 – Jhansi Farm, Winchester Road, Waltham Chase, Mr Goss spoke in support of the application. Following debate, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission as set out.

In respect of item 8 – Hampshire Constabulary Police Headquarters, Romsey Road, Winchester, Mrs Mackintosh spoke in objection to the application and Mr Attenborough-Cox (Chairman of the Police Authority) and Mrs D Wells (agent) spoke in support.

In response to Members' questions and points raised by the public speakers, the Director of Development explained that the trees on site would not be affected by the excavation and construction of an underground car park. The relationship of the buildings and the excavation had been very carefully examined by the Council's Arboriculture Officer and he was satisfied.

The Committee considered the applicant's request that a 30% affordable housing provision should be applied to the scheme and not 40% as now supported by the Inspector's report on the Local Plan Review and as endorsed by the City Council at Council on 11 January 2006. The Director of Development commented that it was for the developer to put forward and demonstrate over-riding material considerations as to why a 30% affordable housing provision should apply rather than 40%, which was effectively the current policy requirement in the Winchester town area. It was the officers' view that the request was one of enablement rather than viability, as the applicants were required to find an alternative location for the Police Headquarters building to allow the site to be developed for residential housing. In their presentation to Committee the representatives of the Hampshire Constabulary had stated that the supply of alternative sites for headquarters buildings was limited and these were often being redeveloped for housing, and therefore the capital receipt to the Hampshire Police Authority needed to be maximised to allow a move of the Headquarters building to take place.

Following debate, the Committee supported the inclusion of a 40% affordable housing provision as contained within its affordable housing policies rather than making an exception as requested.

The Director of Development also stated in response to a Member's question that the possibility of incorporating the telecommunications equipment within the new build on the site rather than by a replacement telecommunications tower in the south-west corner of the site would be considered as part of the detailed application. The Director also explained that the types of affordable housing provision would be discussed with the applicant when a detailed application was being prepared and that the inclusion of offices within the detailed scheme might be appropriate in certain circumstances, but the inclusion of speculative office accommodation would not be supported on planning policy grounds.

After debate, the Committee approved the application as set out.

In respect of item 10 – Railway Cottages, Station Road, West Meon, Mr Mills spoke in objection to the application and a representative of West Meon Parish Council and Mr Hole, applicant, spoke in support. Councillor Quar, (Ward Member) spoke in objection to the application.

In summary, Councillor Quar stated that there was support for affordable housing within West Meon, but it should keep with planning policies and be near the village envelope. The application site was detached from the village and had a number of highway safety concerns, including inadequate visibility at the main access from the A32; a record of traffic accidents at the junction; no public transport, therefore residents would be dependent upon car transport; inadequate public footpaths to the site and a steep hill for access which would make it difficult for residents with pushchairs, for example, to gain access, and no drainage on the road. The pathway that would be used to access the village centre was a muddy track crossing fields and was not fit for purpose. The application would have a strong impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and although appreciating the need for affordable housing, the local Member of Parliament and Hampshire County Councillor were also not in favour of this particular location. The site was also

inadequate for those with disabilities. Councillor Quar concluded that alternative sites within the village should be considered.

The Director of Development clarified that the Chairman of West Meon Parish Council rented the site and was not the owner as set out in the report. Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse the application as set out, subject to additional reasons for refusal relating to inadequate visibility splays; impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the inclusion of a reason for refusal relating to the fact that it was development in the countryside and contrary to policy.

In respect of item 12 – land to the rear of 114 Lovedon Lane, Kings Worthy, Mr May spoke in objection to the application and Mr Hayward spoke in support. Following debate, the Committee approved the application as set out, subject to the inclusion of a condition that a safety bollard be included within the vehicular turning area to protect the safety of residents at the adjoining property, Rosebank.

In respect of item 13 – land at Wickham Halt, Winchester Road, Wickham, Mr Carter, representing both Wickham Parish Council and Mr Leonard (a neighbour) spoke in objection to the application and Mr Rees, agent, spoke in support. The Director of Development reported that further correspondence had been received from Hampshire Fire and Rescue regarding the ability of Fire and Rescue vehicles to access the site in the case of an emergency. As the applicant had now offered to install a residential fire sprinkler system, it was Fire and Rescue's opinion that a fire could be contained until arrival of the Fire and Rescue Service. In addition, the Director clarified that Home Office guidance stated that a carriageway width of 2.75 metres may be acceptable if kept clear of parked vehicles to cater for a fire appliance, but the detail of such matters was the subject of building control approval rather than planning permission. The objector also referred to a previous Inspector's appeal decision on the site, when permission was refused; however the Director of Development pointed out that there was no provision for a turning circle included in the earlier application. In answer to a Member's question, the Director of Development also explained that service vehicles such as refuse collection would be provided with adequate access to the development. Following debate, the Committee supported the application as set out, subject to the inclusion of a condition that a residential fire sprinkler system be included within the development.

In respect of item 14 – 15 Bull Farm, Lovedon Lane, Kings Worthy, Mr Hughes spoke in support of the application and Mr Gilbert spoke in objection. Following debate, the Committee resolved to grant planning permission as set out.

The Committee considered the following applications, which were not subject to public participation.

Item 4 – Rosemary Holt, Edward Road, Winchester, was deferred for consideration at the Committee's next meeting as two significant pieces of information had recently been received by the City Council which required detailed assessment by the officers.

Item 2 – 1 Quarry Wood Cottages, West Street, Hambledon; item 3 – Homefield, Chidden Holt, Hambledon; item 6 – 25 Sunnydown Road, Oliver's

Battery, Winchester; item 7 – 28 Mallard Close, Bishops Waltham and item 9 – Arrows Mark, 165a Romsey Road, Winchester, were granted planning permission as set out.

In respect of item 11 – land adjacent to The Swan Hotel car park, Station Road, Alresford, the Committee resolved to refuse the application for the reasons pertaining to the previous refusal of an application on the site dated 1 August 2005 (excluding the reason for refusal relating to the car park) and to include an additional reason for refusal relating to the loss of the significant sycamore tree on the site (subject to inspection by the Council's Arboriculturist), with the content of detailed reasons for refusal being delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman.

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 4 – Rosemary Holt, Edward Road, Winchester, the application be deferred for consideration at the Committee's next meeting.
3. That in respect of item 11 – land adjacent to the Swan Hotel car park, Station Road, Alresford, the application be refused, with detailed reasons for refusal being delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman.

The meeting commenced at 9.30 am, adjourned for lunch at 1.15 pm, recommenced at 2.15 pm and concluded at 5.00 pm.

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE19 December 2005Attendance:

## Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Johnston (P)  
Mitchell (P)

Read (P)

Officers in attendance:

Mr S Avery (Planning Officer)

Others in attendance:

Councillor Verney

667. INSTALLATION OF RADIO BASE STATION: COMPRISING MONOPOLE SUPPORTING ANTENNAE (OVERALL HEIGHT 16.7 METRES), EQUIPMENT CABINETS AND ASSOCIATED COMPOUND WORKS - LAND AT LANE END DOWN, LONGWOOD, OWSLEBURY.

The Sub-Committee met at the application site at Lane End Down, Longwood, Owslebury. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mrs Scott from Cheriton Parish Council, Mr Whetman from Beauworth Parish Meeting, Mr Button representing Winchester Ramblers and Mr Smith and Ms Marsden from AWA (representing the applicant "3"), Mr Walton from the Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) and Mr Wilson as an agent for the landowner. Also present were approximately ten members of the public.

Mr Avery reported that a full planning application had been received from Hutchinson 3G UK Limited ("3") for a 16.7 metre high slimline monopole comprising of 3 flat panel flush-mounted antennas at the top and a 300 millimetre transmission dish below. An equipment cabin measuring 0.7 by 1.96 metres and 1.49 metres tall was also to be sited together with three small cabinets. The site was to be enclosed by a 1.2 metre high post and rail fencing. A certificate of ICNIRP compliance had been provided by the applicant.

Mr Avery explained that the site was situated within the East Hampshire Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the proposed South Downs National Park and was located to the south of the A272, immediately to the east of the crossroads at Lane End Down. The site was on relatively high ground with levels dropping towards the north-east and south-east. Two existing masts were adjacent to the site although these were situated the

north-east side of small banks of oak trees. Mr Avery explained that although the application was for a higher structure and would be more visible from the crossroads, he was satisfied that it would be partially obscured by the trees when viewed from long-distances. He reported that the Council's Landscape Officer had no objection to the application subject to conditions of painting of the equipment and of planting around the fence with a mixed native hedge.

It was reported that a further six letters of representation had been received in addition to the 10 originally reported to Members. In summary, there was concern regarding proliferation of masts at the site and their visual intrusion in the AONB. Mr Avery confirmed that no comments regarding the proposals had been received from the AONB Board.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Ms Marsden and Mr Smith answered a number of questions. It was confirmed that the proposals could not be located immediately adjacent to the other masts due to necessary horizontal separation to prevent interference. Furthermore, the additional height over and above 15 metres required by the operator (compared to the adjacent masts) was mainly due to the surrounding undulating topography and trees. Ms Marsden explained that the alternative sites (including on an electricity pylon to the north-west of the site) investigated by the applicant had been discounted as would not gain the range of required coverage. It was also considered that utilising the pylon sited close to the A272 would result in the equipment cabins being much more visually intrusive. Finally, it was confirmed that sharing of an existing mast would result in a substantially larger and more visually intrusive mast. There would also be problems of access for maintenance.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Verney addressed the meeting as the Ward Member. He asked a number of questions regarding alternative siting of the proposals.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mrs Scott from Cheriton Parish Council addressed the meeting. Following approval of the previous two masts, she was of the opinion that Members should not support further applications in such a visually sensitive area.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Whetman from Beauworth Parish Meeting addressed the meeting. He suggested that there would be better locations for the mast to maximise coverage of the A272 and also for domestic use. He also expressed concern that approval of the proposals may set a precedent of taller masts in the vicinity. He also suggested that the application in this area was at odds with the Council's Landscape Assessment document.

Further to discussion of the proposals, Mr Avery acknowledged that although the proposals would be fairly prominent from the crossroads, he was satisfied that the mast would not be too visible from the important wider views.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Walton from the CPRE addressed the meeting and suggested that the application represented development of the area 'by stealth'.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Button from Winchester Ramblers reminded the meeting that the actual structure would be much more substantial than the slim demonstration mast.

At the invitation of the Chairman, several members of the public addressed the meeting.

Mr Techer-Jones reported that the intended coverage of the A272 may encourage illegal use of mobile telephones by drivers and had suggested that the opinions of the emergency services should have been sought regarding this matter. Furthermore, he suggested that previous assurances had been given that liaison would take place between the Council and appropriate representatives of Hampshire County Council regarding concerns that the electricity sub-station at the crossroads (and supplying necessary power to the masts) presented a traffic hazard. Finally, he requested that should the application be approved, construction should not take place during the bird nesting season as so to avoid disturbance of rare species seen in the vicinity. Ms Marsden indicated that this would probably be acceptable.

The Chairman reported that although he appreciated that there had been concerns regarding the electricity sub-station compound, he reminded the meeting that this was not part of the planning application under consideration. However, the Chairman undertook to informally discuss issues raised by Mr Techer-Jones with the Portfolio Holder for Planning.

Mrs Stanley sought clarification as to whether extensions to the mast would require planning permission and also whether there were immediate intentions of the operator for additional masts in the area.

In conclusion, Members agreed to support the application as it was considered that the proposals were unlikely to have additional impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding area. It was agreed that the mast should be painted a suitable matt colour and that that appropriate native planting take place around the perimeter of the compound and that the finalisation of the details of this be delegated to the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman of the Sub-Committee. Furthermore, the applicant was requested to not commence construction during the bird nesting season. Members also agreed that officers investigate the possibility of placing preservation orders on the oak trees on site as it was considered that these were integral to the mitigation of the intrusiveness of the masts in this visually sensitive area.

**RESOLVED:**

That permission be granted subject to conditions:

1 Conditions/Reasons

01 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

01 Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).



02 In the event that the development hereby approved becomes redundant or otherwise not required for the purpose permitted, the mast and all associated equipment and enclosures shall be dismantled and permanently removed from the site, which shall be restored to its former condition.

02 Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

03 All cabinets, pole and antennae attachments be painted BS381C – 224 Deep Bronze Green.

03 Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

04 A plan be submitted for our approval before the mast is installed showing a mixed native hedge planted around and outside the compound, comprising a double staggered row of 60-90cm high Blackthorn, Hawthorn and Holly, (in the ratio 40:40:20) 450mm from the fence. All plants to be at 450mm spacing and mulched. The scheme approved shall be carried out in the first planting season following the completion of the development. If within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, any plants die, are removed or, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, become seriously damaged or defective, others of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, in the next planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

04 Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

05 No development shall take place on the site within the bird nesting season (from February to May).

05 Reason: In the interests of the preservation of wildlife.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 10.35am

Chairman