# PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE

# 22 December 2006

Attendance:

Councillor Read (Chairman) (P)

Bennetts (P) Busher (P) Johnston (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

**Councillor Huxstep** 

Officers in attendance:

Mr J Jenkinson: Planning Officer

# 1. <u>FULL PLANNING APPLICATION FROM 02 (UK) LTD – TO EXTEND THE HEIGHT</u> OF THE EXISTING LATTICE STRUCTURE BY 2.5 METRES AND ADD AN <u>ADDITIONAL THREE 3G ANTENNAS (AMENDMENT TO PLANNING</u> <u>PERMISSION W16956/04) - TELECOM MAST AT CROOKED ROW WOOD,</u> <u>RAGLINGTON FARM, BOTLEY ROAD, SHEDFIELD</u> (Report PDC662 refers)

The Sub-Committee met at the application site. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting local residents Mr and Mrs Taylor, Mrs Dunkinson and Mr Perkins together with Mr Henderson (the applicant's agent).

Members noted that the site was 210 metres from the A334 and was generally well screened by trees. The nearest properties, Southside Farm and Cottage were 190 metres away.

Mr Jenkinson explained that a full planning application had been submitted by O2 (UK) Limited for the extension of the existing lattice tower structure by 2.5 metres and to add an additional three antennas. Referring to the permission granted for a similar proposal by the Telecommunications Sub Committee on 7 August 2006 (reference W16956/04), he explained that the proposals were for an amendment to this permission as the plans previously submitted were incorrect. These had shown the height of the existing mast as 20.7 metres instead of 26.04 metres. This was because these plans had not included the additional antennae previously added to the structure to provide part of the Airwave Service for the police.

The Sub-Committee observed that the plans now submitted showed the correct height of the mast at 26.04 metres and that, with the addition of the 2.5 metre extension, the total height of the structure would be 28.54 metres. During discussion, Mr Jenkinson confirmed that the proposed increase in height was to the supporting lattice structure and that the headframe supporting the antennae would sit on top of this.

At the conclusion of his presentation, Mr Jenkinson recommended that the application be approved as it was not considered to be detrimental to the character of the countryside, nor visually intrusive in the landscape.

As a Ward Member, Councillor Huxstep was concerned at the proliferation of telecommunication masts in the area and suggested that some masts in the vicinity could be removed or could potentially share this structure.

This suggestion was discussed and it was noted that although mast sharing was generally to be encouraged, more than one operator sharing a structure required a separation of distance between antennae. As a consequence, a shared mast would have to be considerably higher.

Reference was made to a suggestion at the previous Sub Committee meeting that the tops of the trees be lopped to negate the necessity of extending the mast. However, it was agreed that this would have an undesirable impact to the trees and the landscape.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Taylor (a resident of nearby Southside Farm) explained that the mast could be viewed from his home and that he was concerned at the incremental increase to its height. He suggested that its visual impact be reduced (such as disguising it as a tree) if the site continued to be the most appropriate for the required coverage. Mr Taylor was also concerned at the impact of the proposal on nature conservation including the protection of the trees.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mrs Dunkinson (a local resident) reported that the trees did not currently obscure the existing structure from view and that the visual impact of the mast would be made worse by an increase in its height.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Perkins (a local resident of Hall Court) queried how the trees could attenuate the strength of signal from the antennae.

At the invitation of the Chairman and responding to the points raised, Mr Henderson confirmed that the new structure would be painted an appropriate colour and that the height of the mast was now sufficient for his client's needs. He confirmed that any future increases in height would require a new planning application.

At the conclusion of the meeting, Members agreed to support the officers' recommendation to approve the application, as it was considered that the additional 2.5 metre height would not be detrimental to the character of the countryside, nor visually intrusive in the landscape. It was also agreed that the colour of the equipment would be approved by the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman.

### **RESOLVED**:

That the application be approved, subject to the following 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 or mast extension 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 No development shall take place until details and samples of the colour to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the antennae hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (to be approved by the Director of Development in consultation with the Chairman). Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

03 Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

04 The existing trees shown as being retained on the approved plan shall not be lopped, topped, felled or uprooted without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. The tree canopies and roots shall be protected during building operations by the erection of protective fencing in accordance with BS 5837/2006. If damage occurs remedial tree work or replanting will be required and details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

04 Reason: To retain and protect the trees which form an important part of the amenity of the area.

#### Informatives

01. This permission is granted for the following reasons:

The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.

02. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB3, C1, E11 and TC1 Emerging Development Plan - WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: CE9, DP.3 and DP.14

03. Before any future applications are made to the Local Planning Authority for further extensions to the mast, the applicant is asked to investigate the reduction in height of the adjacent trees first.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 10.10am