

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE**11 March 2005**Attendance:

Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
Davies (P)
Johnston (P)Pearson (P)
Read (P)
Sutton(P)Others in attendance

Councillor Saunders (for Minute # only)

Officers in attendance:Mr R Ainslie (Senior Planning Officer)
Miss L Hutchings (Principal Planning Officer)
Mr S Dunbar-Dempsey (Landscape Officer)
Mr H Bone (Assistant City Secretary (Legal)) (for Minute 2 Only)
Mrs C Tetstall (Assistant Solicitor) (for Minute 2 Only)

1. **INSTALLATION OF A 21.35 METRE HIGH MONOPOLE WITH 2 NO. ANTENNAE, 2 NO. DISHES, 1 NO. EQUIPMENT CABINET AND ANCILLARY EQUIPMENT WITHIN A 2.4M HIGH CHAINLINK FENCED COMPOUND - BARTON FARM, ANDOVER ROAD, WINCHESTER**

The Sub-Committee met at the entrance to the footpath (opposite Halls Farm Close) that led across Barton Farm, Andover Road, Winchester. The Sub-Committee observed from this location a demonstration mast that had been raised to the full height of the proposals (21.35 metres). The site of the proposed mast was approximately 900 metres away at the opposite end of the footpath abutting the railway line and 130 metres to the south of Well House Road.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Henderson representing the applicant's agent, Turner and Partners.

Mr Ainslie explained that a full planning application had been received from O2 (UK) Limited for the installation of a 21.35 metre high monopole with 2 no. antennae, 2 no. dishes, 1 no. equipment cabinet and ancillary equipment within a 2.4 metre high chain link fenced compound.

The Sub-Committee noted that proposed compound was to be located 20 metres to the north of an existing 15 metre high mast positioned in the corner of the field.

In observing the demonstration mast from viewpoints from Andover Road and as they proceeded across the field to the application site; the Sub-Committee noted that the

site was in a relatively elevated location. A group of trees and vegetation to the east provided a small element of backdrop to the proposals and also screened them from the Headbourne Worthy area to the south. However, Members noted that the top most portion of the mast would be visible against the skyline.

Mr Ainslie reported that the nearest residential properties to the site were located at Well House Road and were completely screened from the site. Other residential properties at School Lane to the east were over 300 metres away and Courtenay Road to the south east was approximately 600 metres away. The nearest school was Henry Beaufort School, some 900 metres away.

Mr Ainslie advised that 8 additional letters of representation had been received in opposition to the proposals. These detailed concerns of proliferation of masts at this location and impact upon the visual amenity to the area due to lack of screening. The mast would be visible from residential properties, the railway line and the adjacent footpath. Mr Ainslie reported that the City of Winchester Trust had made no comment regarding the application.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Henderson explained that the proposal was intended primarily to extend 3G mobile telecommunications coverage to the railway and secondary coverage to the surrounding residential area of Headbourne Worthy. Mr Henderson also detailed the investigations for alternative siting of the proposals including that for sharing of equipment. These had been all discounted due to not providing the necessary coverage and the fact that two existing masts on the site were tied into a rolling lease break clause. This allowed the landlord to end the lease at any time due to the current uncertainty about the long term development potential of the site. Further to a question, Mr Henderson also confirmed that the proposed equipment cabinet would be no larger than those included in the compound close by.

Mr Dunbar-Dempsey (one of the Council's Landscape Architects) drew the Sub-Committee's attention that although he had no objection to the proposals, he recommended that the any approval of the application should be on condition of the painting the mast and equipment a suitable colour. He suggested that this be 'van-dyke' brown.

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

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

01 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five 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.

02 The mast, antennae, fencing and all ancillary equipment hereby approved shall be painted in a dark green/brown colour, reference BS4800 10 B 29, to a matt finish before the development is completed unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

02 Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the rural area.

03 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, as amended, or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order, no development permitted by Part 24 of Schedule 2 of the Order shall be undertaken without the prior approval, in writing, of the Local Planning Authority.

03 Reason: To improve the appearance of the site in the interests of visual amenity.

04 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.

04 Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

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: C1, T1
Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: C1, C2, C6, EN5, SF4
Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit:
C1, C5, DP3, DP17, NC3

2. (AMENDED PLANS AND DESCRIPTION) PROPOSED 20.4M LATTICE TOWER FOR ORANGE PCS WITH 6 NO. ANTENNA AND 2 NO. 600MM DISH ANTENNA, EQUIPMENT CABIN, METER CABINET ENCLOSED BY 1.1M TIMBER FENCE WITH BARBED WIRE ON TOP - WEEKE DOWN RESERVOIR, LANHAM LANE, WINCHESTER.

The Sub-Committee met adjacent to the application site at land at Weeke Down Reservoir, Lanham Lane, Winchester

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting approximately 12 members of the public including a nearby resident, Mr Tolley. Also present was a Ward Member for St Barnabas, Councillor Saunders. There were no representatives of the applicant or their agent present as they were unable to attend at short notice due to other commitments and apologies were forwarded via the planning officer to Members.

Miss Hutchings advised that the Sub Committee was being asked to consider minor variations to the existing consent for the installation of telecommunications equipment and also to consider amended plan details clarifying the contextual detail shown on the original approved plans and therefore consider if the implementation of the proposals was being undertaken in accordance with the original consent.

The Sub-Committee noted that the site was located on the Southern Water reservoir that had its south-eastern boundary along the extent of Lanham Lane. The boundary on this side comprised of a bank of trees between 10 and 18 metres in height and a low post and barbed wire fence. This fence continued around the south-western boundary of the reservoir. The site was comprised of varying land levels that rose towards the south-west and fell away across the site towards the north-west.

Miss Hutchings reported that the Sub-Committee was being asked to consider minor amendments to the application that had been granted permission on 5 September 2002 and also to clarify site references on existing and recently submitted plans specifically relating to levels of the land. Miss Hutchings advised that it had been suggested that the development was not being implemented in accordance with the approved plans and that the compound should be at a level 1.6 metres lower than the top of the reservoir (130 metres above sea level) as measured from the approved plan.

Miss Hutchings reminded Members that the original consent comprised a 20.4 metre high lattice tower for Orange PCS Limited with 6 antenna and 2 600mm dish antenna, equipment cabin, meter cabinet enclosed by a 1.1 metre high timber fence with barbed wire on top. The proposed variation was for the replacement of the approved 2.75 metre high equipment cabin with 10 no. 1.9 metre high cabinets on the same footprint. There was also to be a minor change to headframe design with 1 dish antennae instead of 2 (no change to number of panel antennas or orientation). There was also to be squaring of compound to the northern corner and clarification of the appearance of the elevation in reference to top of the reservoir. There was also proposed to be additional under storey planting along the south-eastern boundary.

Mr Dunbar-Dempsey (one of the Council's Landscape Architects) reported that he was satisfied with the amendments and clarifications to the previous consent. He advised that excavations to lower the compound would have damaged tree roots that currently screened the site from Lanham Lane. He considered that the implementation of the approved plans had been undertaken with respect the landscape and that it was unlikely that this could have been undertaken in a better way given the constraints of the site.

Further to questions from members of the public and Councillor Saunders, Mr Bone (Assistant City Secretary (Legal)) confirmed that the principle of development was not in question as permission has been granted for the compound and equipment. However, the Sub-Committee was being requested to confirm whether it was satisfied that the implementation of the consent had been undertaken in accordance with the approved plans (as clarified by those recently submitted) particularly in terms of levels of the land at this location and reference points used. In cases where it becomes apparent that reference points are inaccurate it would be usual practice to seek amendments clarifying their detail.

A member of the public suggested that the plans should have indicated heights 'above ordnance datum' as this would have assisted in the determination of the mast's actual height in relation to the reservoir and levels of the surrounding land.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Tolley advised that the site compound should be set down lower than the top of the reservoir by 1.6 metres as the reservoir was detailed on an elevation drawing showing the cabin behind it. Following commencement of construction by Orange, it had been observed that the concrete base had been levelled and was therefore actually higher than this point. Mr Tolley therefore reported that the resulting height of the mast would be approximately 2 metres higher than what was originally approved.

Several of the Members pointed out that they had been on the previous site visit when the application was originally approved. Members acknowledged that the relationship between the compound and the reservoir top was not a material factor in determining the original application and that the plan only provided indicative detail of this. Therefore this detail could not be considered alone when assessing compliance and Members noted that this was now more accurately portrayed in the amended plans. Members also took into account the uneven levels on the site and the need for a level compound when considering the height demonstrated by the demonstration mast when originally assessing the application. It was apparent that any intention to set the site down for the base 1.6 metres below the level of reservoir in the southern corner would have entailed cutting into the site considerably to achieve this. This would have resulted in the level of the compound being set down lower at the Lanham Lane end of the site (as levels fall away from the Lane), and would also have created significant disturbances to underground Southern Water utilities. Miss Hutchings advised that the existence of underground utilities had been confirmed by a survey plan showing ducting and water pipes very close and under the compound given to Orange at the pre start meeting by Southern Water.

Miss Hutchings concluded that the base of the compound had been built out at the level of the highest part of the site, and that this was anticipated when the original application was approved. The actual height of the mast allowed for the height of the concrete base beneath and some marginal levelling at this end of the compound. It was therefore considered that the overall height of the mast would be as approved – 20.40 metres in height from ground level with the structure itself 20.20 metres.

Miss Hutchings also advised that the revision of the plans with lower cabinets was acceptable as these would have less visual impact. Additional planting was proposed to screen the compound from views from Lanham Lane.

In conclusion, Members agreed to approve the amendments to the original proposals (included the amended plan) as they were satisfied that the proposed base station was being implemented in the most appropriate way, given the limited detail on the original plans and somewhat inaccurate survey detail with reference to the reservoir lid and road.

RESOLVED:

That amended plans are approved and no further enforcement action be taken.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 12.00pm.

Chairman