

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

27 May 2004

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
Bennetts (P)
Beveridge (P)
Davies (P)
de Peyer (P)
Evans (P)
Hatch (P)
Hammerton (P)

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

Deputy Members:

Councillor Wagner (Standing Deputy for Councillor Johnston)

Others in attendance:

Councillors Campbell and Verney

1547. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB COMMITTEE**
(Report PDC424 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub Committee held on 4 May 2004 (attached as Appendix D to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub Committee meeting held on 4 May 2004 be approved and adopted.

1548. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB COMMITTEE**
(Report PDC417 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub Committee held on 20 April 2004 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub Committee held on 20 April 2004 be received.

1549. **DEMOLITION OF REAR SINGLE STOREY STORE AND REBUILD TO PROVIDE ONE BEDROOM FLAT ABOVE – FRYING FISH, WEST STREET, ALRESFORD**
(Report PDC426 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and other matters set out in paragraph 3.1 of the report.

1550. **MORN HILL – SECTION 106 AGREEMENT**
(Report PDC418 refers)

The Director of Development Services updated the Committee on the latest situation in respect to the planning conditions that had been discharged and also on the detail of a further letter of objection that had been received. In summary the letter of objection had raised issues regarding the increase in traffic; that the development would be to the detriment of landscaping; that the proposed hotel location was too far from the centre of Winchester and that the hotel's location was now in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the possible new National Park. Concern had also been raised on the location of the display of the orange site notices advertising the proposed amendment to the Section 106 Agreement.

In the public participation part of the meeting, Mrs A Matthews, Chairman of Itchen Valley Parish Council spoke on behalf of the Parish Council, Chilcomb Parish Meeting, the Upper Itchen Valley Society and the Council for Protection of Rural England against the variation to the agreement, and Mr Ward, applicant's agent, spoke in support. After debate, the Committee supported the report's recommendation to agree the variation of the Section 106 Agreement.

RESOLVED:

That the City Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to agree a variation of the Section 106 Agreement dated the 4 June 1999 on land at Morn Hill, Alresford Road, Winchester, to extend the implementation period for the hotel element by one year to 4 June 2005.

1551. **REQUEST FOR AUTHORITY TO TAKE ENFORCEMENT ACTION IN RESPECT OF UNAUTHORISED USE OF LAND FOR COMMERCIAL STORAGE AND PARKING OF RELATED VEHICLES, MANOR FARM, CHILCOMB LANE, CHILCOMB**
(Report PDC420 refers)

RESOLVED:

That enforcement action be authorised, including the service of an enforcement notice to secure the cessation of the use of the land for non agricultural storage and associated parking of vehicles.

1552. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC 421 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub Committee held on 28 April 2004 (attached as Appendix C to the minutes).

The Director of Development Services reported that the Sub Committee had agreed to recommend its decision to Committee for confirmation to allow additional time for public representation to take place. The Director continued that since the Sub Committee eight further letters had been received, seven in objection and one from the Winchester Ramblers Association. The letters of objection had in summary raised concern at visual intrusion in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; that alternative sites had not been fully considered; concern at the pulsation and frequency of the signal; that the transformer would be on the road side verge; that Airwave had not signed up to the ten commitments for mobile phone operators; that the application was retrospective; the effect on tree coverage and concerns that the proper procedure had not been undertaken in considering the application.

In response, the Director of Development Services explained that development at the road side did not require planning consent as it was on Highways land; alternative sites had been considered and discounted, and that a temporary mast was in-situ but this would be removed should full permission be granted.

At the invitation of the Chairman the Ward Member, Councillor Verney spoke on this application. In summary he stated that there was a need for an Airwave site within the AONB and that the applicant had explored alternative sites. Trees should surround the application site and that the land owner would supply additional landscaping to the site. The site was also not too close to the South Downs Way. His objection to the application was therefore withdrawn.

Councillor Bennetts as Chairman of the Telecommunications Sub Committee, commented that negotiations with the applicant to provide additional planting at the mast site were welcomed. He added that Member training on telecommunications masts would also take place in the new municipal year.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Telecommunications Sub Committee held on 28 April 2004 be approved and adopted.

1553. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (ROYAL OBSERVER CORPS) SUB COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC419 refers)

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

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

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Royal Observer Corps) Sub Committee held on 26 April 2004 (attached as Appendix B to the Minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Royal Observer Corps) Sub Committee held on 26 April 2004 be received and it be noted that the next meeting of the Sub Committee be held on the 2 June 2004.

1554. **PLANNING APPEALS – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS**
(Report PDC427 refers)

The Director of Development Services stated that in response to Members' comments, details of items that were going to appeal would be notified to Members.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

1555. **VOTE OF THANKS**

The Committee noted that this would be the last meeting to be attended by Mr P Eggleton, Principal Planning Officer, before he left the Authority to commence work with Fareham Borough Council. The Committee thanked Mr Eggleton for his work on behalf of the City Council.

This being the last meeting of the municipal year, the Committee passed a vote of thanks to Councillor Busher for her Chairmanship during the last year. In turn, Councillor Busher thanked the Committee for its support.

1556. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**
(Report PDC425 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 the respect of items 23 and 24 as he was a Member of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on these applications, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of items 21, 22, 23, 23 and 39, as he was a Member 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 items 1 and 2 as she was a Member of Wickham Parish Council, which had commented on this application but she was not a Member of the Parish Council's Planning Committee that had discussed these applications.

Councillor Hammerton declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of items 23 and 24 as in her capacity of Mayor of Winchester, she was a Director of the Trustees of St Swithuns School, the applicants. She left the meeting during the consideration of this item. Councillor Hammerton also declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of item 19 as her residential property adjoined the application site. She left the meeting during consideration of this item.

Councillor Hatch declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 6 as the applicant was personally known to herself and she stayed and voted on this item, and in addition she declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of item 17 as again the applicant was personally known to herself, and she left the meeting for consideration of this item.

Councillor Pearson declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of item 6 as the application was from the wife of his political agent and he left the meeting during its consideration. Councillor Pearson also declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of item 25 as the applicant was known to himself, and he left the meeting during its consideration.

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

In respect of item 1 – Border Side – Southwick Road, Wickham, Fareham, Mr Ward spoke in support of the application and against the Officers' recommendation for refusal. In introducing the item, the Director of Development Services stated that a letter of objection had been received from a neighbouring property principally raising concern at the impact on the neighbour. He added that the application was contrary to planning policy. After taking into consideration points raised by Mr Ward as to the applicant's personal circumstances, the Committee agreed to grant permission with conditions to be agreed by the Director of Development Services in consultation with the Chairman.

In respect of item 2 – Knowle Village, Knowle Avenue, Knowle, Fareham, Mr Shepherd, Agent, spoke in support of the application. In approving the application, the Committee requested that the Officers explore with the applicant the provision for visitor parking on the site, the safety access and positioning of the local area of play, and that the advice of the Royal Society of the Prevention of Accidents be sought on this element of the application and that the details of the pumping station be included as a reserve matter.

In respect of item 4 – Glenwood, Heath Road, Soberton, Fareham, Councillor Bradbury from Soberton Parish Council spoke in objection to the application. After consideration, the Committee agreed to support the application as set out.

In respect of item 5 – land adjacent to 11 Seldon Close, Winchester, Mr Dyer spoke in support of the application. In introducing the item, the Director of Development Services, reported that there had been two further written letters of representation which had reiterated points already set out in the report. After consideration, the Committee agreed to support the application as set out.

In respect of item 6 – Hoe Farm, House Hoe Road, Bishops Waltham, Mrs S Organ, Agent spoke in support of the application and against the Officers' recommendation for refusal. Following debate, the Committee agreed to support the Officers recommendation for refusal.

In respect of item 9 – Brooke Garage, New Road, Swanmore, Southampton, Mr Harris spoke in support of the application. At the invitation of the Chairman, a Ward Member, Councillor Campbell, spoke on this item. In summary she stated that issues of surface water drainage and landscaping should be dealt with as part of the application. In response, the Director of Development Services stated that these issues were covered by condition. The Committee supported the application as set out.

In respect of item 13 – Laburnum House, Solomons Lane, Shirrell Heath, Mr Hillier spoke in support of the application. At the request of the Committee, the Highways Engineer stated that he would take up the issue of extending the footpath to reach Wickham Road as part of the safer route to school scheme with Hampshire County Council. Subject to the above enquiry of Hampshire County Council, the Committee supported the application as set out.

In respect of item 14 – Pondside, Upham Street, Upham, Southampton, Mr Davies spoke in objection to the application and Mr Reans, Agent, spoke in support. The Director of Development Services stated that an additional condition should be added to the recommendation to obtain the demolition of the existing house within one month of the new property being completed. Further to Members' questions, the City Secretary and Solicitor clarified that the proposed location of the replacement dwelling was within the legal curtilage of the site, that is the existing garden of the house. Furthermore, the application contained a proposal for the landscaping of the remainder of the site outside of the legal curtilage. It was proposed that Permitted Development Rights be removed. Following debate, the Committee agreed to defer consideration of this item for plans of the proposed landscaping to the agricultural land to be obtained and for more accurate demarcation of the garden area highlighted for the location of the replacement dwelling to be obtained.

In respect of item 16 – The Hurdles, Brockbridge, Droxford, Southampton, Dr Olford spoke against the application. The Committee agreed to approve the application subject to the car parking spaces being marked out clearly on the car park; that details of landscaping be submitted and also details of the play units to be provided and of their siting within the proposed play area.

In respect to item 17 – Jervis Court Farm, Jervis Court Lane, Swanmore, Mr Buchanan, Agent, spoke against the application and Mr Tutton, Agent, spoke in support. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Campbell, a Ward Member spoke on this item. In summary she stated that neighbours to the incinerator had been in the past tolerant to its use, but the proposed provision of a new incinerator to be recalibrated to run at less than its design capacity caused concern. There was potential pressure for the operator to run the machinery at a higher rate and there was also no refrigeration on site leading to smells and flies etc from animal carcasses. There was also concern that the access road was inadequate being serviced by a blind junction.

The Council's Environmental Health Scientific Officer was present at the meeting to answer Member's questions. He explained that a number of works would be carried out to the proposed incinerator to ensure that it did not operate beyond its agreed capacity and that controls would be agreed with the applicant so that animal carcasses were not stored outside of the building and were kept in special containers within an enclosed area. There would be close contact with DEFRA over the operation of the site and hours of operation would be limited. The Council's Transport Engineer added that there would not be a material increase in traffic with the provision of a new incinerator over the usage associated with the previous redundant incinerator and therefore an objection on traffic grounds could not be sustained. Following debate, the Committee agreed to support the application as set out subject to an additional condition to be included relating to landscaping of the site.

In respect of item 18 – Springfield, Hill Pound, Swanmore, Southampton, Mrs Brackstone spoke in support of the application and against the Officers' recommendation to refuse. Following debate, the Committee agreed that the application would not affect the character of the area and would represent an improvement on the original property. They did not therefore support the Officers' recommendation to refuse the application. Therefore authority was delegated to the Director of Development Services in consultation with the Chairman to agree appropriate conditions.

In respect of item 25 – Beacon Hill Farm, Allen's Farm Lane, Exton, Ms P Stokes, Agent, spoke in support of the application. The Director of Development Services reported that the Chairman of Exton Parish Meeting had sent his apologies but had made written representations, which were read to the meeting. Following debate, the Committee approved the application as set out.

In respect of items 27 and 28 – Station Hill, Station Road, Alresford, Mr Campbell spoke in support of the application. The Director of Development Services reported that the Chief Estates Officer had now considered the viability of the current office use and had reported that it had not been proven that the loss of employment could be justified. In addition to the concerns at the loss of employment, there was also a detrimental effect of the proposals on a nearby tree belt. The Officers' recommendation was therefore for refusal. He added that Alresford Parish Council had commented that a housing and office mixed development might prove possible on the site and this could be considered. After debate, the Committee agreed to refuse the application as set out.

In respect of item 29 – Land to the rear of 23-25 Fraser Road, Kingsworthy, Mr Dobson spoke in support of the application. The Committee approved the application as set out.

In respect of item 31 – The Old Coal Yard, High Street, West Meon, Petersfield, Mr Shepherd, Agent, spoke in support of the application. The Committee approved the application as set out subject to clarification that there would be no turning of service vehicles on the site and the access to the site was of a satisfactory standard. It was also agreed that an informative be added that there should be no burning of materials on site.

In respect of items 36 and 37 – 1 & 2 Chestnut Villas, Hunton Down Lane, Hunton, Winchester, Mr Hayward (Agent), Mr Harberts, and Mr Smith spoke in support. The Director of Development Services detailed to the Committee representations made by the Ward Member, Councillor Lipscombe in support of granting approval, and asking for the Committee to consider appointing a Viewing Sub Committee to visit the application sites. Following debate, the Committee did not support the appointment of a Viewing Sub Committee and approved the Officers' recommendations for refusal on both applications.

In respect of item 40 – Easton Village Hall, Chapel Lane, Easton, Mr Hall and Mr Paramore, spoke in support of the application and Mrs Matthews representing Itchen Valley Parish Council also supported the application. Following debate, and although sympathetic to the spirit of the application, the Committee agreed that it was contrary to planning policy and therefore agreed to support the recommendation of the Officers' for refusal.

In respect of items that were not subject to public participation, items 7 & 8 were withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

In respect of items 21 and 21 – Hyde Post Office and Stores, 16 Egbert Road, Winchester the Director of Development Services reported that since writing the report three further letters of representation had been received, which reiterated comments already made in the report. A number of Members commented on the loss of a magnolia tree on the site. The Officers confirmed that this tree was not the subject of a Tree Preservation Order but replacement planting would take place on site. After debate, it was agreed that the standard Landscaping Condition be included within the approval in order that an element of greenery was included in the development.

In respect of item 30 – Land to the rear of Wolverton, Alton Road, West Meon the Committee noted that Permitted Development Rights would be removed on approval of the application.

In respect of item 41 – 1 Meadowland, Kings Worthy, Winchester the Director of Development Services reported that this was an application from a Member serving on the Council and he confirmed that the application had been processed normally with the Councillor taking no part in its processing. In its consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that it wished to give further consideration to the application once a detailed application had been received and therefore following debate it was agreed that the application should be considered by Committee at the detailed application stage.

RESOLVED:

1. That the decisions taken on the development control applications, as set out in the schedule which forms as appendix to the minutes, be agreed.

2. That in respect of item 1 – Border Side – Southwick Road, Wickham, Fareham, Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions to be agreed by the Director of Development Services in consultation with the Chairman.

3. That in respect of item 14 – Pondside, Upham Street, Upham, Southampton, the application be deferred to allow plans of the proposed landscaping to the agricultural land to be obtained and for more accurate demarcation of the garden area highlighted for the location of the replacement dwelling to be obtained.

4. That in respect of item 18 – Springfield, Hill Pound, Swanmore, Southampton, Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions to be agreed by the Director of Development Services in consultation with the Chairman.

5. That in respect of item 41 – 1 Meadowland, Kings Worthy, Winchester the application be considered by Committee at the detailed application stage.

The meeting commenced at 9.00am and concluded at 8.30pm

Chairman

APPENDIX A**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB COMMITTEE****20 April 2004**Attendance:

Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

de Peyer (P)
Hatch (P)Pearson (P)
Read (P)Officers in attendance:Miss E Norgate (Senior Planning Officer) – Minute 1557 only
Mrs J Pinnock (Senior Planning Officer) – Minute 1558 only

1557. FULL PLANNING APPLICATION FOR REPLACEMENT OF TOP 3 METRE OF MAST AND ADDITION OF 2 NO. ANTENNAE – CROOKED ROW WOOD, RAGLINGTON FARM, OFF A334, BOTLEY ROAD, SHEDFIELD.

The Sub-Committee met at the application site close to Southside Cottage adjacent to the A334, Shedfield. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Soper from Walden Telecommunications on behalf of the applicant, Vodafone Limited. Also present was Mr Snelling from Vodafone Limited, Mr Huxstep from the Shedfield Society and Mr and Mrs Dunkinson from Southside Cottage.

The Sub-Committee observed the structure and compound already in situ and noted that they were to consider an application for additional apparatus to the top of the existing slim line latticed mast.

Miss Norgate introduced the application and explained that Vodafone Limited had submitted a full planning application for the replacement of the existing tapered top section of the mast. This was to comprise of a straight section and the addition of 2-panel style antennae to the 3 already in place. The proposals were required for the completion of third generation coverage in the Shedfield/Curdridge area and the A334. Miss Norgate concluded that there was to be no overall increase to the height of the proposal, nor to the size of the compound or cabins although the mast would continue to be visible from the A334 and from Southside Cottage. Furthermore, Members were reminded that PPG8 encouraged the utilisation of existing structures when considering network development.

Miss Norgate reported that representation had been received from the residents of Southside Cottage (Mr and Mrs Dunkinson) located 19 metres away from the mast who expressed concern of the proximity of the proposals to their residence and the proliferation of masts in the area. They considered that the existing equipment was visually intrusive, especially on winter when there was lack of foliage. The Shedfield Society also stated that they considered that greater effort should be made by operators to share sites or equipment in this area and that this application may set a precedent for possible upgrading of the site in future years.

Miss Norgate advised that the Council's Landscape Architect officer had made no comment regarding the proposals.

Further to questions from Members, it was confirmed that the footpath running adjacent to the compound was not a public right of way. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Soper and Mr Snelling confirmed that the existing lattice mast was not structurally capable of having further equipment added to it, including that from other operators. Furthermore, any replacement mast for this purpose would need to be substantially larger and would be subject to a further planning application.

Miss Norgate detailed the existing masts located closeby. These included a temporary structure for which the consent period had recently expired. Miss Norgate suggested that although there were a number of structures in the vicinity, these were relatively small and that this was perhaps more desirable than several larger and potentially more intrusive masts.

At the invitation of the Chairman and further to a question, Mr Soper explained that the percentage increase of the ICNIRP guidelines for the cumulative effect of the proposals for the structure was minimal (approximately 0.000009%). Miss Norgate confirmed that the applicant had provided a certificate of compliance with the ICNIRP guidelines.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr and Mrs Dunkinson and Mr Huxstep reiterated their representation already submitted regarding the proposals. Mr Huxstep also suggested that Vodafone should negotiate with the operator of the temporary structure nearby at Raglington Farm for a redesigned shared facility at this site. In reply, Mr Snelling stated that this proposal would require a substantial increase in bulk and height of this structure to accommodate another operator.

The Sub Committee noted Mr and Mrs Dunkinson's concerns regarding visual intrusion and suggested that the operator may provide additional evergreen planting close to their boundary as a gesture of goodwill.

In conclusion, Members agreed to approve the application, as the proposals would not be materially visually intrusive. The Sub Committee also agreed that the applicant be requested to paint the mast a suitable colour to match that of the existing structure.

RESOLVED:

That permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. 1FUL
1FULR
2. The replacement 3m section of the mast hereby permitted, shall be painted to match the existing mast on site.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the area.

1558. **RADIO BASE STATION COMPRISING 12.5 METRE HIGH SLIMLINE MONOPOLE AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT – BADGER FARM ROAD, WINCHESTER.**

The Sub-Committee met adjacent to the application site on Badger Farm Road close to the junction with The Ridgeway. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Palmer from AWA Planning consultants on behalf the applicant Hutchinson 3g ("3"). Also present was Mr Makewell and Mr Quartly from Olivers Battery Parish Council together with approximately 7 members of the public.

Mrs Pinnock explained that Hutchinson 3g ("3") had submitted a prior notification application for a radio base station comprising 12.5 metre high slimline monopole inclusive of associated equipment. There was to be an equipment cabin measuring 1.26 metres x 0.6 metres x 1.49 metres together with a smaller electric meter cabin, an area of hard-standing ('grasscrete') measuring 11.4 metres wide and an Armco barrier adjacent to Badger Farm Road.

Mrs Pinnock reminded Members that a Telecommunications Sub Committee held on 26 March 2004 had refused permission for Orange to erect a 9.79 metre high slim-line monopole with a 2 metre slim-line dual polar. This was to be located approximately 8 metres away from this application. Mrs Pinnock explained that it was refused on grounds that the proposals together with another proposed in the immediate vicinity would cumulatively result in a detrimental visual impact to this part of Badger Farm. In addition, the applicant had failed to adequately explore mast share options with other operators who were known to be looking for a suitable site in the area.

Mrs Pinnock demonstrated that siting of the mast and equipment was to be on the highway verge of Badger Farm Road. The site was south of the junction of The Ridgeway (on the opposite side of the road) with Downlands Road, Olivers Battery to the west beyond at raised level. There was existing street furniture on both the east and west side of Badger Farm Road at a height of 10 metres. The applicant had provided a certificate of compliance with the ICNIRP guidelines.

Mrs Pinnock reported representations received to date. These included that from Olivers Battery Parish Council and 15 letters from local residents including 4 petitions with 92 signatures in total in opposition.

Mrs Pinnock advised that she had consulted with the Highway Engineer who had expressed concern regarding the proposed area of hard-standing and the barrier. As there was no drop kerb or sufficient turning room, he was recommending refusal of the application on highway safety grounds.

The Sub Committee noted the representation from Olivers Battery Parish Council. This included a statement that consideration was being given by the Highways Authority for a bus lane to be introduced along Badger Farm Road as part of the park and ride scheme, should this be developed at Bushfield Camp. This would utilise the verge where the proposed mast was to be sited. Mrs Pinnock reported that she had contacted the Highways Authority who confirmed that the bus lane was a future proposal, however there was no formal scheme for this yet or safeguard for, in the structure plan.

Mrs Pinnock detailed the applicant's exploration of possible mast and site sharing sites and the reasons why these had been discounted. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Palmer also explained why his client had considered that the proposed site was the most appropriate in terms of visual intrusion and for required coverage for his client. He also stated that regarding the comments of the Highways Engineer regarding highway safety, the site would be visited only 2 or 3 times per year for maintenance checks.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Makewell and Mr Quartly (representing Olivers Battery Parish Council) addressed the Sub-Committee. They re-iterated the representation that the Parish Council had already submitted regarding the proposals.

At the invitation of the Chairman, two members of the public addressed the Sub-Committee. Mrs Barratt stated that certification of ICNIRP compliance was not acceptable in dispelling the perception of health risks associated with masts. Mr Fairweather detailed relevant guidance and directives regarding electro-magnetic interference with domestic electrical products. A resident of Downlands Road stated that the headframe of the mast would be clearly visible from here.

The Chairman reported that a Councillor Collin, as a Ward Member for Olivers Battery and Badger Farm, was unable to be present at the meeting. However, he wished to convey his opposition to the proposals.

In conclusion, Members agreed on balance to refuse the prior approval application, as it was considered that the siting of the mast was inappropriate as it would be visually intrusive and that site share options should be more fully explored with other operators looking for a suitable site in the area, and would be a distraction on this busy section of Badger Farm Road and therefore should also be refused on highway safety grounds.

RESOLVED:

That prior approval of the details of the siting and appearance be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal would be contrary to Planning Policy Guidance Note 8 and policy TC1 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review), and proposals FS.4 and EN.5 of the Winchester District Local Plan and proposals DP.3 and DP.17 of the emerging Winchester District Local Plan Review Draft and Revised Deposit in that:-

(i) The proposed siting of the mast together with another proposed in the immediate vicinity would cumulatively result in a detrimental visual impact to this part of Badger Farm Road.

(ii) The applicant has failed to adequately explore mast share options with other operators who are known to be looking for a suitable site in the area.

2. The use of the proposed site would be likely to cause undue interference with the safety and convenience of the adjoining highway.

The meeting commenced at 10.45am and concluded at 1.15pm.

Chairman

APPENDIX B**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (ROYAL OBSERVER CORPS) SUB-COMMITTEE****26 April 2004**Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Bennetts (P)
 Beveridge (P)
 Davies (P)
 Evans (P)

Johnston (P)
 Pearson (P)
 Sutton (P)
 Tait (P)

Others in attendance and Speaking

Councillor Nelmes

Others in attendance and not Speaking

Councillors de Peyer and Mitchell

Officers in Attendance:

Mrs S Proudlock (Team Manager, Planning)
 Mr N Mackintosh (Principal Planner)
 Mr D Keeley (Conservation Officer)
 Mr I Elvin (Engineer)
 Mr N Baldwin (Housing Enablement Officer)

1559. **RESIDENTIAL CONVERSION AND DEVELOPMENT, FORMER ROYAL OBSERVER CORPS HQ, ABBOTTS ROAD, WINCHESTER**
 (Report PDC415 refers)

The Sub-Committee met at the Guildhall, Winchester, where the Chairman welcomed approximately 20 members of the public, together with representatives of the applicant (Bayview Developments Ltd) and explained that prior to the public meeting, members of the Sub-Committee had informally visited the site.

Councillor Sutton declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as she was a member of the Hampshire Buildings Preservation Trust, which had commented on the application, and she spoke and voted thereon.

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

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

Mr Mackintosh explained that two applications had been received in relation to the site, which was within the H1 Policy Boundary of Winchester. The first sought Listed Building Consent to alter the existing Second World War building into 3 one-bed and 1 two-bed residential units. The second application sought planning permission for the erection of 23 further dwellings.

The site was on the northern corner of Abbots Road and Worthy Road and Mr Mackintosh explained that, in response to advice from the Council's Urban Design Consultant, the amended application had proposed that these dwellings be erected in line with the street frontages of Abbots Road and Worthy Road.

On the Abbots Road frontage of the site a terrace of 6 two-bedroom town houses was proposed. The buildings would be modern in style, which was an attempt to reflect the character of the listed building, with individual garages on the ground floor and two floors of living space above and a flat roof. These three storey town houses would not be significantly taller than the two-storey brick element of the listed building. The Sub-Committee also noted that the buildings would be stepped to reflect the change in ground levels.

A similar arrangement of town houses were proposed at the northern edge of the site towards Manningford Close with the erection of two terraces, one containing 5 two bed-houses and the other 4 two bed houses.

Towards the south of the site and on the Abbots Road and Worthy Road junction, the application proposed a four-storey block to accommodate 8 one-bedroom flats. These dwellings would be provided as affordable housing units and, in response to comments, Mr Mackintosh confirmed that Members' preference that affordable housing units should be fully integrated with, and indistinguishable from, the open market housing had been reiterated to the developer during negotiations.

The Sub-Committee also noted that demolition work neared completion on a Cold War bunker that had stood at the north of the site.

Members noted that the status of the listed building in the centre of the site dictated the design of the development and raised the question as to whether it could be de-listed. It was explained that whether any such request came from the applicant (as part of an application to demolish the listed building) or from the Council, the Department of Culture, Media and Sport would make its decision upon the advice of English Heritage. To that end, Mr Underwood (the applicant's architect) explained that this issue had been raised in discussions with English Heritage, but that English Heritage's Head of Military Listing Programmes (Mr Schofield) had stated that the basis for its listing was sound. The building had been listed in 1993 as part of English Heritage's thematic review of military buildings. It had been listed, not only in recognition of the work conducted inside the building during the war (the Royal Observer Corps had plotted the position of enemy planes over the country and during the Cold War would have measured the location and after effects of any nuclear attack), but also because of the construction techniques used. The building had been constructed in 1943 to a standard design, penned by Flight Lieutenant Tebbit, and that out of the ten other buildings that were constructed to this design, the site at Winchester was the sole survivor.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Maasz (Chairman of the Trustees of the Royal Observer Corp Museum) explained that the Trustees held in storage artefacts and equipment that had been used in the building, but that they had been unsuccessful in securing a Lottery Grant to restore the HQ as a museum. In response to comments, it was noted that it would be difficult to exhibit these artefacts in the Guildhall Gallery in the near future due to their size and the number of prior bookings at the Gallery.

Mr Keeley commented that although the conversion of the HQ to residential use was acceptable, Conservation Officers had requested further information with regard to details. He explained that these details would need to demonstrate how the HQ would be converted to comply with the Building Regulations and result in a conversion from which the public would be able to recognise why the building had been listed. However, it was noted that the applicant had proposed to erect a plaque and a display in the foyer area to commemorate the building's history.

Whilst the Sub-Committee noted that there were no significant constraints in restoring the listed building from its current dilapidated state, a full condition survey would have to be submitted, as indicated in the application's Design Statement.

The Sub-Committee considered the setting of the listed building and noted that the developer's original plan had proposed that the surrounding new buildings be angled at 45 degrees across the site to reflect the angle of the HQ. Following advice from the Urban Design Consultant this had been amended so that the new buildings reflected the street frontages of Abbotts Road and Worthy Road and not the angle of the HQ.

Mr Keeley confirmed that the setting of the listed building in relation to the proposed surrounding buildings depended in part on the intended use of the HQ. He suggested that as it was proposed that the HQ would be converted to residential development, rather than as a museum, it was reasonable that its surrounding buildings need not reflect the angle of the HQ. However, it was noted that this "squared" development was more likely to have a detrimental effect on the site's trees (some of which were protected by Tree Preservation Orders).

Members also discussed the style of the proposed new buildings and agreed that these should reflect the style of the private properties in Abbotts Road, rather than the proposed designs that reflected the listed building. Members considered that the proposed designs were more appropriate to an inner-city setting, rather than the suburban character of Worthy Road and Abbotts Road.

The Sub-Committee considered the traffic engineering issues relating to the application and Mr Elvin confirmed that the sight lines of the Abbotts Road and Worthy Road junction were approximately 2.5m X 40m. On behalf of the applicant, Mr Parker reported that by cutting back vegetation and earth-works it could be possible to gain some improvement visibility to approximately 2.5m X 60m, although it was noted that this was still short of the required 2.5m x 90m standard.

Mr Elvin also commented that as the site was outside the controlled parking zone, the limited number of spaces provided on-site could result in parking outside the application. He therefore advised an increase in the number of spaces from the proposed one per designated dwelling to ideally 2 or 1.5 spaces per dwelling and that these additional spaces be used for casual parking. However, in response a representative of the applicant stated that there was insufficient space on the site to allow 1.5 spaces per dwelling.

Mr Elvin also raised concerns with regard to the ingress and egress access points to the site and recommended that this should be replaced with a single access and that it should be of a sufficient standard to accommodate refuse vehicles. On Mr Elvin's advice, the Sub-Committee also noted that the pedestrian access from the site onto Worthy Road could encourage potentially dangerous parking on Worthy Road.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Luken (on behalf of the applicant) spoke of the constraints of the site. He explained that density had come as a result of the need to generate enough capital from the site to be able to renovate the HQ and from the Council's policies that 30% of the dwellings should be offered as affordable housing. Mr Luken added that in meetings with local residents, a clear preference for a lower density development had been identified and requested that consideration be given to reducing the number of affordable housing units on-site. To support this request, Mr Luken agreed to open the accounts of the scheme (in regard to the renovation of the HQ) and commented that there were both national and local planning policies that permitted exceptions in the provision of on-site affordable housing.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Nelmes (as a Ward Member) spoke against the application. She commented that the appearance of the proposed new buildings were likely to compound the unattractive effect of the HQ on the area. Councillor Nelmes also explained that the suggestion that the development should follow the street scenes was inappropriate, as the character of the area was such that the properties were set back from the road, behind substantial gardens. Finally, she also raised concerns about the traffic and stated that the junction was sufficiently dangerous enough that local residents avoided it.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a number of local residents spoke against the application. Although they were not against the principle of residential development on the site, concerns were raised with regard to densities, overlooking onto Manningford Close's gardens, the trees, car parking, the character of the area and the difficulties and importance of restoring the HQ and the need for affordable housing units.

Also at the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Maasz (Chairman of the Trustees of the Royal Observer Corp Museum) commented that the HQ should be preserved and used as a museum, but stated some reservations that their conversion to residential dwellings (particularly through alterations made by the new owners) could destroy the building's character.

At the conclusion of the debate, Members requested further information on the history of the HQ and that the applicant's Design Statement be provided for information. However, the Sub-Committee considered that if the HQ could not be retained as a museum, which was its preferred use, its conversion to residential units would have limited relevance and therefore recommended that this application be deferred for further negotiation. These negotiations would discover if the HQ, or part of it, could be retained as a museum and whether it could be removed from the listed building schedule.

Members also requested that the application for the new dwellings be deferred for further negotiation with a view to giving further consideration to the following issues:

- reducing the density of the development
- a re-consideration of the design so that it better reflects the area and not the HQ (although Members expressed a preference for the original diagonal design proposed by the applicant)

- car parking
- a possible reduction of the number of on-site affordable housing units and that they be fully integrated with the remainder of the development,

RECOMMENDED:

That the applications be deferred for further negotiation, for the reasons stated above.

The meeting commenced at 10.30am and concluded at 12.20pm.

Chairman

APPENDIX C**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE****28 April 2004**Attendance:

Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
de Peyer (P)Hatch (P)
Pearce (P)
Read (P)Officers in attendance:

Miss A Fettes (Senior Planning Officer)

Others in attendance:

Councillor Verney (Ward Member for Cheriton and Bishops Sutton)

1560. **APPLICATION FOR 12.5 METRE HIGH MONOPOLE WITH TWO FOUR STACK ANTENNAE, ONE 300MM DISH AND ONE SMALL CABINET (MEASURING 1M BY 1M BY 4CM IN WOODEN STOCK PROOF FENCE AT LANE END DOWN, LONGWOOD, OWSLEBURY**

The Sub-Committee met at the application site at Lane End Down, Longwood. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mrs Scott from Cheriton Parish Council, Mr Whetman from Beauworth Parish Meeting and approximately 15 members of the public.

Prior to introducing the details of the application, Miss Fettes explained that some members of the public had reported that the application notification posters had not been displayed prominently prior to the meeting. Miss Fettes continued that the meeting of the Sub-Committee had been subsequently delayed by one week in order for those members of the public initially unaware of the proposals to make their representations to the Director of Development Services.

Following discussion, it was agreed that the Sub-Committee should recommend its decision to the next meeting of the Planning Development Control Committee scheduled for the 27 May 2004 for approval where Miss Fettes would provide an update on any additional representations received (by 19 May 2004).

There was some concern that there was no representative from the applicant Airwave MMO2 present at the meeting to answer technical queries.

Miss Fettes explained that an application had been received from Airwave MMO2 for a 12.5 metre high monopole with two four stack antennae, one 300mm dish and a small cabinet in a wooden stock proof fence. The total height of the proposals would be 15 metres. In answer to a question, Miss Fettes explained that there needed to be a degree of horizontal separation from the adjacent existing Orange mast to prevent potential interference. The proposals were required to complete the mobile telecommunications network for emergency services in the area and this was demonstrated on coverage maps provided by the applicant. A certificate of ICNIRP compliance had been supplied.

Miss Fettes added that a previous application from Airwave MMO2 for the installation of a 22-metre monopole close to this site had been refused on the 12 January 2004 as it was considered that it would be too visually intrusive. Subsequently, a temporary mast measuring 18.5 metres had been erected by the applicant. Miss Fettes explained that the applicant had been in negotiations with the Council regarding its presence and it had been agreed that if permission was given for the proposals under consideration, the temporary structure would be removed.

Miss Fettes reported that she had received two letters of representation from members of the public and Cheriton Parish Council in opposition to the application regarding siting and design. The Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Board advised that it did not object to the proposals as it was satisfied that issues regarding the prominence of the earlier application had been addressed and that the proposed smaller mast was more suitable.

Miss Fettes explained that officers were recommending approval of the application, as the mast was a considerably smaller slimline structure with less equipment on top than that previously proposed and therefore would not be overly prominent or visually intrusive. The antennae would be just visible above existing trees and that the monopole itself would be fairly well screened especially in the summer months.

Further to questions, Miss Fettes explained that to accommodate the MM02 equipment on the existing Orange mast would require the construction of a substantially larger and more visually intrusive structure.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Verney, as a Ward Member, reported that in his opinion, the structure and the proposed location were fairly acceptable.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mrs Scott from Cheriton Parish Council stated that although it was understood why there had to be a degree of separation from the existing Orange mast, she suggested that the site was not appropriate for any further structures. In reply Miss Fettes stated that the capacity of the site was limited for any further applications for masts. Furthermore, any future proposals for an extension to or replacement of the proposals would require a new planning application.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Whetman from Beauworth Parish Meeting addressed the meeting. He stated that although the location of this mast was probably the most appropriate, any subsequent approval should be conditioned with the painting of the structure an appropriate dark green colour. Mr Whetman also suggested that the trees in situ should be given some degree of official protection as they were vital to the screening of the structure.

A number of comments were made regarding the ancillary electricity transformer compound close to the crossroads at Lane End Down. The Chairman advised that although this equipment was undoubtedly an integral part of the operation of the masts, this had been erected on Highways Land and was not part the planning application under consideration. Miss Fettes added that the County Council Highway's Officer was currently in dialogue with the owner of the compound regarding concerns of its intrusiveness on the landscape as well as highway safety issues. Furthermore, it was explained that removal or relocation of the compound could not be conditioned as part of approval of the application.

Further to questions from the public, Miss Fettes detailed the area of search undertaken by the applicant for potential sites. Due to the coverage required it was explained this had ruled out additional masts near Cheesefoot Head. Furthermore, it was explained that the masts had to be located on higher ground in this area due to the undulation of the land.

In conclusion, Members agreed to recommend approval of the application subject to conditions, as they were satisfied that the proposals would not be materially visually intrusive in an area of outstanding natural beauty. A condition was that the mast should be painted a suitable green colour (holly green). Furthermore, it was requested that officers should negotiate with the applicant for additional landscaping and the possibility of protection of existing trees. The applicant should also remove the temporary equipment (including equipment cabins) and the ground restored as soon as the new structure was operational.

RECOMMENDED:

That permission be granted subject to conditions:

1. 1FUL
1FULR

2. The mast and equipment be painted Holly Green unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity

3. The temporary equipment shall be removed within one month of the completion of the mast hereby permitted, and the ground restored to its former condition.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

4. L050
L050R

INFORMATIVES:

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 materials considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. in accordance with Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), planning permission should therefore be granted.

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

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: C1, C2, E7, TC1

Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: C1, C2, C7, EN5, EN7, FS4

Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: C1, C7, DP3, DP17

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 11.00am

Chairman

APPENDIX D**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB - COMMITTEE****4 May 2004****Attendance:****Councillors:**

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Davies (P)
Johnston (P)Read
Sutton (P)**Others in attendance:**

Councillor Hatch

Officers in attendance:Mrs S Proudlock (Team Leader, Planning)
Miss E Norgate (Principal Planning Officer)

1561. ERECTION OF ONE 3 STOREY OFFICE BUILDING AND ONE 2 STOREY FLEXIBLE B1 USE BUILDING WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS WORKS, PARKING, DISTRIBUTOR ROAD AND LANDSCAPING (DETAILS IN COMPLIANCE WITH OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION W12503/03) – LAND AT SOLENT 2 BUSINESS PARK, ROOKERY AVENUE, WHITELEY, HAMPSHIRE

The Sub-Committee met at the application site. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr D Simpson, Architect and Mr N Holland from RPS Planning, representing the applicant, together with three representatives of Whiteley Parish Council.

At the meeting of the Planning Development Control Committee held on the 22 April 2004, it had been agreed that the Viewing Sub-Committee should visit the site to assess issues including the ecology of the site (including the SINC), the treatment of the landscaping, traffic issues relating to the proposed additional roundabout and safe routes to school issues. The detail of the application is contained within report PDC411, which was considered by Committee on the 22 April 2004.

In summary this was a reserve matters application, which covered part of the site granted outline consent in March 2003. The development comprised a total floor space of 18,617m² in two buildings on 4.2 hectares. The larger flexible use building to the east of the central landscaping belt consisted of a 14,876m² building and was 14m in height to the eaves. The three storey B1 office building to be located to the west of the central landscaping area, which included a stream, was 11.4m to the eaves. The two buildings would be linked by a raised glazed walkway to ensure the retention of the stream and landscaping to the centre of the site. The details of consultations and representations were as set out in report PDC411.

In observing the site, members of the Sub-Committee noted the retained landscaping belts, the positioning of the access roundabouts, the position of certain ecological points of interest, including the SINC and also the physical barrier that had been placed on site to retain threatened reptiles from the grass area which was earmarked for development.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Hatch, a Ward Member, raised a number of points for clarification. She requested further details on the positioning and treatment of the green way across the site. This would extend from the existing green way adjacent to Mollison Rise to cross Rookery Avenue to the principal schools in the area. The route would proceed by an underpass under Whiteley Way to cross a wooded area outside of the applicant's control and therefrom via the retained hedgerow and trees forming the green way on the application site. She asked whether sufficient consideration had been given to making this route safe for children and that adequate pavements would be provided.

Councillor Hatch also asked questions about the traffic situation in the Whiteley area and the provision within the proposals for providing adequate car parking on site for employees and the arrangements for public transport for the benefit of both employees and local residents. For instance, she noted that there was no provision of a lay-by for buses on Rookery Avenue or the provision of a pavement for employees to access a bus stop.

In response, Mrs Proudlock explained that the provision of a suitable pedestrian crossing in Rookery Avenue in conjunction with the green ways was covered by a legal agreement. The provision of a safe route to school for the children accessing the green way through the applicant's site and via adjacent land, would be subject to further consideration.

Mrs Proudlock added that a variation to the legal agreement was close to being signed between the applicant and Hampshire County Council whereby the developer was willing to offer more than in the original consent by means of additional payment for improved traffic access arrangements in the local area. These monies would be for general highway improvements within the locality and not necessarily for specific works in relation to the proposed development. The applicant added that the payments to the County Council and the variation to the legal agreement would allow the County to consider wider solutions than simply concentrating on improving Segensworth roundabout. Mr Holland also clarified that Hampshire County Council would adopt the rights of way and the greenways.

Councillor Hatch commented that there was substantial sums of monies retained by Hampshire County Council for traffic improvements for Whiteley, but this had principally be spent on improvements outside of Whiteley Parish, and particularly on Segensworth roundabout, which was located in Fareham Borough Council's area. She noted the applicant's comment that monies had already been paid to Hampshire County Council in respect of the proposed development for highway improvements and these were now held in account until 100,000ft² of development had taken place, which would be a trigger point for their release. However, she suggested that pressure be brought on Hampshire County Council that these monies be spent in a more equitable way to improve the traffic situation throughout Whiteley.

The Sub-Committee supported Councillor Hatch in this request and suggested that a letter be written on behalf of the Planning Development Control Committee to Hampshire County Council on this matter. This letter would be directed to Councillor Estlin who was a County Ward Member for the Fareham Western area and also the Executive Member for Environment at Hampshire County Council. The letter would urge the County to consider issues for the safer access for children by the provision of pavements and adequate security on the green ways proposed to link present residential dwellings to local schools in the area across the development site and through adjacent land.

Mrs Proudlock continued that Hampshire County Council's Ecologist had commented that the loss of grassland was regrettable and following doubts over the success of the proposals to retain the SINC, it was a wish to see Nature Conservation Mitigation and Management Plan and a detailed survey report. The Sub-Committee noted that the central wooded area would be retained. It was the wish of Councillor Hatch that the wild nature of the site be retained and that the site should not be manicured, which was a deterrent to wildlife. She also requested that rubbish be cleared from the site to help maintain its appearance.

At the invitation of the Chairman Mr Hall from Whiteley Parish Council outlined the Parish Council's representations on the application. In summary Mr Hall stated that Fareham Borough Council also objected to the application. The Parish Council's concerns related to the provision of the new access, parking arrangements and the travel plan. Mr Hall stated that the number of car parking spaces had increased from 291 in the original application to 426 in the amended application and that the Parish Council had not been formally informed of this fact. These figures only represented one third of the potential development area of the site. There was concern over the additional traffic to be generated by the proposals and the impact of a new access on Rookery Avenue as well as the safety concerns for local children crossing Rookery Avenue as part of the greenway scheme. He asked the Sub-Committee to note that there were 3,600 employees approximately in the local area together with 3,000 residents and only one entrance and exit via Whiteley Way to the entire Whiteley development. This was anticipated to grow to 12,000 in three to four years when the remaining development was completed and he urged the Sub-Committee to take into account the impact of the traffic generation from this continued trend.

Mr Hall also commented on the mix between office and warehousing within the scheme. Mrs Proudlock explained that B8 use covered warehousing but the consent to be provided was for B1 use, which could include an element of warehousing and storage. The applicant added that there was no restriction on the type of lorries that could access the site.

Mrs Achwal representing Whiteley Parish Council commented that Whiteley was a pleasant place to live and work but the traffic situation and the long delays in access continued to cause problems and she was concerned at the potential of a major fire in the local area and the problems that could potentially occur.

Mr Wright representing Whiteley Parish Council also commented on the traffic situation and added that the Nature Conservation Mitigation and Management Plan as requested by Hampshire County Council Ecology had not been forthcoming. Miss Norgate explained that the plan would need to be prepared to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority before final consent was permitted.

In answer to points raised, representatives of the applicant explained that a specific end user had been identified for the present proposals and it was a specific need for this end user to have increased car parking provision over that originally agreed, and, after negotiation, Hampshire County Council had also concurred with this request. It was the intention that this would take away the potential for parking on the roads, which had occurred following under provision for car parking in other developments within the Whiteley area. A work travel plan had been included as part of the proposals and also a legal restriction to prevent car parking on the highway. The applicant also commented that development of the site would be phased to allow for changes in market conditions.

In conclusion, the Sub-Committee noted that the proposals were part of the Whiteley Master Plan and that the application was details in compliance with the outline permission already granted. Therefore, many of the issues raised, for example, the crossing of Rookery Avenue as part of the safe route to schools initiatives and the issues relating to ecology were already covered by legal agreement or a condition. It was agreed that correspondence be entered into with Councillor Estlin at Hampshire County Council regarding the safe routes to school for children and to urge that monies be spent to improve the traffic situation in Whiteley. The Sub-Committee also requested that Committee looked at the design details. The purpose of the site visit had been to look at the site and the highway issues concerned. Therefore, all Members present recommended that the application be approved subject to consideration of the design details and to correspondence with Hampshire County Council as set out above.

RECOMMENDED:

That the application be approved – subject to the following condition(s):

1 Conditions/Reasons:

01 APPROVE THE "MATTERS RESERVED" BY CONDITION:-

PART

- siting;
- design;
- external appearance of the development;
- means of access.

Of outline Planning Permission W12503 and subject to the following conditions:

02 No development shall take place until details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

02 Reason: To ensure that the development presents a satisfactory appearance in the interests of the amenities of the area.

03 No development shall take place until details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include the following, as relevant:

03 - existing and proposed finished levels or contours:

03 - means of enclosure, including any retaining structures:

03 - other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas:

03 - hard surfacing materials:

03 - minor artefacts and structures (eg. street furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc):

03 - proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (eg. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines etc, including lines, manholes, supports etc.):

03 Soft landscape details shall include the following as relevant:

03 - planting plans:

03 - written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment:

03 - schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate:

03 - retained areas of grassland cover, scrub, hedgerow, trees and woodland;

03 - manner and treatment of watercourses, ditches and banks:

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

04 All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out before the use hereby permitted is commenced and prior to the completion of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed with the Local Planning Authority. If within a period of five years after planting any tree or plant is removed, dies or becomes, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged, defective or diseased another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally approved shall be planted at the same place, within the next planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

04 Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscape in accordance with the approved designs.

05 A landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscaped areas, specifically the woodland area to the front of the site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the development or any phase of the development, whichever is the sooner, for its permitted use. The landscape management plan shall be carried out in accordance with the details hereby approved.

05 Reason: To ensure that due regard is paid to the continuing enhancement and maintenance of amenity afforded by landscape features of communal, public, nature conservation and historic significance.

06 No development shall take place until a schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of 5 years has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The schedule shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation. Landscape maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule.

06 Reason: To ensure that due regard is paid to the continuing enhancement and maintenance of amenity afforded by landscape features of communal, public, nature conservation and historic significance.

07 In this condition "retained tree" meaning an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of, from the date of the occupation of the building(s) for its permitted use.

a) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998 (Tree Work).

b) If any tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species and shall be planted at such time as may be specified in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

c) The erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree shall be undertaken in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto site for the purposes of the development and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor any excavation made without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

07 Reason: To ensure the protection of trees to be retained.

08 No development, or works of site preparation or clearance, shall take place until details, including plans and cross sections of the existing and proposed ground levels of the development and the boundaries of the site and the height of the ground floor slab and damp proof course in relation thereto, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

08 Reason: To ensure a satisfactory relationship between the new development and adjacent buildings, amenity areas and trees.

09 Details of the design of building foundations and the layout, with positions, dimensions and levels of service trenches, ditches, drains and other excavations on site, insofar as they affect trees and hedgerows on or adjoining the site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any works on the site are commenced.

09 Reason: To ensure the protection of trees and hedgerows to be retained and in particular to avoid unnecessary damage to their root system.

10 Details of all works to trees (on or adjacent to the site), must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of those works. All tree surgery/works shall be carried out in accordance with the relevant recommendations of BS 3998 Tree Work.

10 Reason: To ensure the continuity of amenity afforded by the tree(s) in question.

11 No development shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision of a surface water regulation system is designed and implemented to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. (Supported by detailed calculations). The regulation system of the site must ensure that the runoff from 1% probability storm is controlled and will restrict the outflow to that which would have occurred had the site been a greenfield. The scheme shall include a maintenance programme and establish ownership of the storage system of the future.

11 Reason: To prevent flooding and ensure future maintenance.

12 Details of surface water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development hereby approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Sustainable Urban Drainage System should ensure that the native hydrological conditions are maintained.

12 Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory sustainable urban drainage system which will protect and enhance natural vegetation and ecology.

13 All surface water from roofs shall be piped to an approved water surface system using sealed down pipes. Open gullies shall not be used.

13 Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment.

14 During construction any facilities for the storage of fuels shall be sited on impervious bases and surrounded by impervious bund walls. The bund capacity shall give 110% of the total volume for single and hydraulically linked tanks. If there is multiple tankage, the bund capacity shall be 110% of the largest tank or 25% of the total capacity of all the tanks, whichever is the greater. All filling points, vents, gauges and sight glasses and overflow pipes shall be located within the bund. There shall be no outlet connecting the bund to any drain, sewer or watercourse or discharging onto the ground. Associated pipework shall be located above ground wherever possible and protected from accidental damage.

14 Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment.

15 The development hereby approved shall not commence until a Nature Conservation Mitigation and Management Plan is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Hampshire County Council.

15 Reason: In the interests of nature conservation and to protect the habitat of the site.

16 A buffer zone 10m wide should be retained on both sides of the stream shall be established in accordance with details which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences.

16 Reason: To prevent undisturbed refuges for wildlife using the river corridor.

17 The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and Hampshire County Council. The Travel Plan shall include the following elements:-

- measures to regulate the management and use of car parking areas;
- measures to encourage car sharing;
- the appointment of a site travel plans co-ordinator;

If users associated with the development are regularly parked on Rookery Avenue as identified by the monitoring exercise then the occupiers will fund the implementation of appropriate parking restriction measures as required by the Highway Authority or other measures agreed between the occupiers, the Local Planning Authority and Hampshire County Council.

17 Reason: To promote alternative modes of transport to the private motor car and reduce the need to travel.

18 Any other conditions on completion of consultations.

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 materials considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. in accordance with Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), 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, T4, T5, T6, EC1

Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: NC1, NC6, NC7, EN5, T9

Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: S21, DP5, S20, E1, T2, T3, T4

03. If it is proposed to fill, divert or culvert a watercourse the applicant requires prior written approval of the Agency under section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. The Agency has environmental obligations and a presumption against culverting of watercourses and would not normally consent such works.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 10.50am

Chairman