

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE****4 December 2007**Attendance:

## Councillors:

Johnston (Chairman)

Bushier (P)  
Baxter (P)

Jeffs (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Barratt

Officers in attendance:Mr J Hearn (Team Manager (DC East))  
Mr N Fisher (Senior Planning Officer)  
Mr B Lynds (Principal Legal Officer)

- 
1. **PLANNING APPLICATION FROM O2 UK LTD/VODAPHONE – ADDITION OF 2 NO. ANTENNAS AND 2 NO. 300MM MICROWAVE DISHES AT HEIGHT OF 17.0 METRES ON EXISTING 20 METRE MAST AND ANCILLARY DEVELOPMENT THERETO – HUTCHINSON 3G SITE, TEG DOWN RESERVOIR, SARUM ROAD, WINCHESTER. (REFERENCE 07/02361/FUL).**  
[\(Report PDC722 refers\)](#)

The Sub-Committee met at Teg Down Reservoir, Sarum Road, Winchester. The application site was located in a secure compound to the front of Teg Down Reservoir, adjacent to Sarum Road. The Chairman reminded the meeting that this application was previously considered at the meeting of the Sub Committee held on 8 November 2007 (Minutes of this meeting, Report PDC725 refers). The matter had been deferred so that arrangements could be made for a representative of the applicant to attend to answer technical questions that arose during the meeting.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting one member of the public. Also present were Mr Knowles, Mr Morris, Dr Matthews and Mr Pritchard from Vodafone and Mr Johnston from Mono Consultants (agent for O2 UK).

As part of his presentation to the Sub-Committee, Mr Fisher explained that the reservoir was bounded to the west by Sarum Road Hospital and to the north by the Royal Winchester Golf Course. The area to the east was undergoing residential re-development to front onto Chilbolton Avenue. Opposite the application site was Kings School's boarding house and residential areas. There were mature trees and other vegetation in the vicinity which provided some partial screening of the existing structure. It was acknowledged that the existing mast was very prominent in the area. Mr Fisher also explained that the mast onto which the proposed antenna would be attached, had been granted planning permission, on appeal, in 2001. At the request of the Council, the appeal Inspector had removed permitted development rights to erect further equipment on the mast – hence the need for the current application which would otherwise have been acceptable under permitted development rights. Mr Fisher reported that the applicant had provided ICNIRP certification to demonstrate that the proposal conformed with requirements of radio frequency exposure guidelines. The applicant had also

demonstrated that their research for alternative siting of the mast, none of which had been suitable, and these were set out in the Report. The principle of the development was also acceptable, as it complied with the requirements of Policy DP14 which promoted the sharing by operators of telecommunications equipment. At the conclusion of his presentation, Mr Fisher stated that, in the opinion of officers, the addition of the antenna as proposed would not create any additional visual intrusion in the area and therefore the application was recommended for approval.

Mr Fisher reminded the Sub-Committee that, since the publication of the Report for the original meeting, a further letter of objection had been received, which reiterated similar concerns to those already raised and highlighted within the Report. Representations had also been received from the three Ward Members (Councillors Barratt, Love and Pearce) regarding the proposal's visual intrusion, no proven need for greater coverage in the area, and concern for the cumulative effect on health from the masts at the site. An email had been received from the applicant's agent explaining the assessment of alternative sites, which concluded that none were suitable for the proposals. Finally, Mr Fisher reported that since the previous meeting, a further letter had been received from a member of the public with various technical questions.

One member of the public (a local resident) spoke with reference to his letter sent to the Council with various technical questions about the proposals. He stated that he had consulted with the representatives of the applicant prior to the meeting, and that his questions had now been answered to his satisfaction.

Councillor Barratt addressed the Sub-Committee and reiterated some of the matters that she had raised at the previous meeting in her objection to the proposals. In summary, she referred to the previous decision of the Inspector to remove permitted development rights, and suggested that the Council's earlier concern of proliferation of ancillary development would be reasonable to quote, as one reason for refusal for this application. She also suggested that the coverage to be provided was a commercial matter for the applicant (and not a matter of concern for the Council) as residents in the vicinity may wish to utilise other operators should they experience poor reception. Councillor Barratt was also concerned that she had been previously given verbal reassurance that this site would not become intensively developed with telecommunications equipment in a similar manner to other sites in the district. She had also heard that the two proposed 300mm microwave dishes as part of this application may not be utilised by the operators from the outset. Therefore, she suggested that they should be added only when required and determined by the Council at this time.

During discussion, Mr Hearn and Mr Fisher clarified that the decision of the Inspector to remove permitted development rights had allowed the Council greater control of the site to assess all additions to the mast, each on their own merits. Their removal did not indicate that future development at the site would be unacceptable. Mr Lynds also clarified that the commercial success of the operator was not a relevant planning consideration.

At the permission of the Chairman, Dr Matthews (from Vodaphone) explained that the proposed dishes may be required in the future to link to other base stations. Fibre optic cabling was currently utilised, however this may not be suitable over time. The dishes (approximately half the size of those already on a nearby mast) would only be added when required.

Also at the permission of the Chairman, Mr Johnston (from Mono Consultants, acting as agent for O2 UK) stated that no comments had been received from the neighbouring Sarum Road Hospital with regard to the application. He also explained that should permission for this application be not granted, his client would investigate alternative siting of the equipment, including the possible redevelopment of other existing masts at the reservoir to a greater height to accommodate it.

At the conclusion of further debate, Members agreed to grant planning permission as it was satisfied that the addition of the equipment would not significantly increase the visual prominence of the existing mast. It also endorsed the recommendation of the landscape officer for planning permission to be on condition of the equipment being painted to match the existing mast, antennae and dishes.

**RESOLVED:**

That the application be approved subject to the following conditions:

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 The additional equipment subject to this application shall be painted the same colour as the existing mast and antenna.

02 Reasons: In the interests of visual amenity.

**Informatives**

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

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review:

Winchester District Local Plan Review Proposals: DP1, DP.3, DP4 and DP.14

The meeting commenced at 9.35am and concluded a 10.10am

Chairman