

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**28 June 2004**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)  
Bennetts (P)  
Beveridge (P)  
Davies (P)  
Darbyshire (P)  
Evans  
Jeffs (P)

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

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Coates and Learney

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillor Hiscock

---

19. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Evans and Councillor Pearce (standing deputy for Councillor Evans).

20. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT**

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Councillors Darbyshire and Saunders who were new members of the Council and also new members of the Committee.

21. **APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN**

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Baxter be appointed Vice Chairman of the Committee for the 2004/2005 municipal year.

22. **DATE AND TIME OF MEETINGS**

RESOLVED:

That meetings of the Committee keep to the pre-published calendar, with meetings on single days to commence at 10am and on two consecutive days to commence at 2pm.

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

(Report PDC435 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Royal Observer Corps) Sub-Committee held on 1 June 2004 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Royal Observer Corps) Sub-Committee held on 1 June 2004 be approved and adopted.

24. **PLANNING APPEALS**  
(Report PDC436 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

25. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS**  
(Report PDC437 refers)

In the public participation part of the meeting, Mr B Edwards of 92 Priorsdean Road, Harestock, spoke against the confirmation of the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 1830. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Learney, a Ward Member, also spoke in respect of TPO1830. In summary, she stated that the two trees to the front and rear of 90 Priorsdean Road, Harestock, were the subject of a minor disagreement between neighbours, as the trees in the curtilage of 90 Priorsdean Road, Harestock, affected the neighbour at 92 Priorsdean Road. Mr Edwards was not proposing their removal, but had incurred considerable cost in the past in tree surgeon fees to remove overhanging branches, and also building fees to repair a broken sewerage drain that had been cracked by the trees' roots. Mr Edwards, was therefore not in favour of the confirmation of the Tree Preservation Order.

In reply to Members' questions, the Director of Development Services explained that the two trees subject to proposed TPO1830 were both weeping willows. It was further explained that even if the trees were subject to a Tree Preservation Order, application could still be made to the City Council to carry out remedial works, for example the trimming of branches.

Following debate, the Committee considered that the trees provided amenity value, but were equally of the opinion that weeping willows were an inappropriate tree for the location and that the amenity value could be better provided by a more appropriate tree, for example, a birch tree. Therefore, following debate, the Committee agreed not to confirm TPO1830.

The remaining proposed Tree Preservation Orders (TPO1818 and TPO1835) were confirmed as set out.

RESOLVED:

1. That having taken into consideration the representations received, that Tree Preservation Orders 1818 and 1835 be confirmed.

2. That having taken into consideration the representations received, that Tree Preservation Order 1830 be not confirmed.

26. **PONDSIDE, UPHAM – LEGAL ADVICE**  
(Report PDC434 refers)

Councillor Busher declared that as she had attended a lecture organised by the applicant's architect, she would not be taking part in the consideration of the application, and she left the meeting during the consideration of this item.

Councillor Baxter chaired the meeting for this item.

In the public participation part of the meeting, Mr Davies spoke in objection to the application and Mr House, applicant, spoke in support. During his representation, Mr House asked that the additional condition set out in paragraph 7.13 of the report, which stated: 'notwithstanding condition 6, no structures, features or domestic paraphernalia, either temporary or permanent, shall be placed or installed on the area hatched green on drawing number 23108, received 8 June 2004', was unreasonable and should be removed in any approval of the application.

The Director of Development Services also reported that an additional condition should be taken into consideration, which was that the existing dwelling should be demolished prior to the occupation of the new replacement dwelling.

Following debate, and after taking into consideration the points made by Mr Davies and Mr House, the Committee agreed to support the Officers' recommendation as set out.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted for the application, subject to the conditions in report PDC425 and the additional conditions in Section 7 of the report, together with an additional condition that the existing dwelling should be demolished prior to commencement of building works on the replacement dwelling.

27. **APPOINTMENT OF SUB-COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES 2004/2005**  
(Report PDC428 refers)

RESOLVED:

1. That the following Sub-Committees be re-appointed and their terms of reference be endorsed as set out in report PDC428:

1. Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee.

2. Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee (and that Councillor Bennetts be appointed Chairman to the Sub-Committee for the ensuing municipal year).
3. Planning Development Control (Knowle Hospital) Sub-Committee and that the following Councillors be appointed to serve thereon:  
 Liberal Democrats (4) Bennetts, Clohosey, Evans, Sutton (Deputy Mitchell);  
 Conservatives (3) Chapman, Pearson, Read (Deputy Baxter);  
 Labour (1) Davies (Deputy de Peyer);  
 Independents (1) Busher (Deputy Hammerton).
4. Planning Development Control (Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester) Sub-Committee and that the following Members be appointed to serve thereon:  
 Liberal Democrats (4) Beveridge, Nunn, Pearce, Sutton (Deputy Johnston);  
 Conservatives (3) Baxter, Chapman and Pearson (Deputy Tait); Labour (1) Davies (Deputy de Peyer);  
 Independents (1) Busher (Deputy Hammerton).
5. Planning Development Control (Royal Observer Corps Winchester) Sub-Committee and that the following Members be appointed to serve thereon:  
 Liberal Democrats (4) Bennetts, Beveridge, Evans and Johnston (Deputy Mitchell);  
 Conservatives (3) Pearson, Saunders, Tait (Deputy Read);  
 Labour (1) Davies (Deputy de Peyer);  
 Independents (1) Busher (Deputy Hammerton).
6. That Councillor Beveridge (Portfolio Holder for Planning) be appointed to the East Hampshire Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty – Joint Advisory Committee.
7. That Councillor Johnston (Deputy Tait) be appointed to the Stockbridge Oilfield Liaison Panel.
8. That the following Sub-Committees not be re-appointed:
  - (a) Planning Development Control (Northgate House, Staple Gardens, Winchester) Sub-Committee.
  - (b) Planning Development Control (Antrim House, St Cross, Winchester) Sub-Committee.
  - (c) Planning Development Control (Police Headquarters, Winchester) Sub-Committee
  - (d) Planning Development (Red Cross Site, Weeke) Sub-Committee

28. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**

(Report PDC429 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 Bennetts declared that in respect of item 14 he was the Council's nominated Director on the Board of Winchester Housing Trust, who were the applicants, and he left the meeting for consideration of this item.

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of items 1 and 15, as he was a Member of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on the applications, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Busher declared that as she had attended a lecture organised by the applicant's architect, she would not be taking part in the consideration of the application, and she left the meeting during the consideration of this item.

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of items 1 and 15, as he was a Member of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on these applications, and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Pearson declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of item 5, as this was his own application, and he left the meeting during its consideration.

Councillor Tait declared that in respect of item 14 he was an observer to the Board meetings of the Winchester Housing Trust, the applicants, and he left the meeting during the consideration of this item.

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

In respect of item 2 – Knowle Village, Knowle Avenue, Fareham (Phase 5) - Mr Shepherd, Agent, spoke in support of the application. During debate, Members raised concern that Phase 5 contained no affordable housing. It was commented that if affordable housing was not included within this phase then there were only 3 phases remaining until completion of the scheme. This could possibly make it increasingly difficult to provide affordable housing and could lead to a disproportionate concentration of affordable housing within a remaining phase. It was the Committee's wish that affordable housing be scattered throughout the scheme, including Phase 5, in order that the concentration of affordable housing into large blocks was avoided. Therefore, following debate the Committee deferred the application in order that negotiation could take place between the Officers and the applicant to further discuss the possibility of including affordable housing within phase 5 and also to seek the "pepper potting" of the provision of affordable housing throughout the remaining phases rather than for it to be provided in concentrated blocks.

In respect of item 6 – Towns End, North End Lane, Droxford, Southampton, Mrs Chandler and Mr Hibbert, representing Droxford Parish Council spoke against the application and Mr Buchanan, Agent, spoke in support. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Coates, a Ward Member, spoke on this item. In summary, he stated that the proposals were a too intensive use of the site, would lead to increased visual intrusion in the AONB and represented an undesirable form of development. He stated that there should be more discussion between the Council, Droxford Parish Council and the Ward Member on the findings of the Urban Capacity Study and the

Housing Monitoring Report. A number of the 16 sites identified in these reports to provide 42 units within Droxford were now not suitable for development or were unavailable. Following debate, the Committee supported the application as set out.

In respect of item 11 – Kingfisher Nurseries, Selworth Lane, Soberton, Mr Harris spoke in support of the application and against the Officers' recommendation for refusal. Mr Harris commented that evidence had been submitted to the Council about the marketing of the Nursery and had concluded that it was unviable. The Director of Development Services responded that the submitted market survey had no financial appraisal included and could not therefore be accepted as evidence. Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse the application as set out.

In respect of item 13 – The Restaurant on the Square, The Square, Bishop's Waltham, Southampton, Mr Symes spoke against the application and Mr Berbeck, representing Bishop's Waltham Parish Council, also spoke against the application. Mr Gee, prospective leasee, spoke in support. The Director of Development Services stated that in response to representations received, details of the Restaurant's extraction system for removing smells etc from the premises would be inspected by the Council's Environmental Health Department, who would also inspect provision for the removal of waste refuse from the premises. It was added that there were no highway objections regarding parking issues with the application. During his presentation, Mr Gee stated that he did not wish the premises to operate as a takeaway, but instead wished to operate a delivery service from the premises. The Director of Development Services explained that it was necessary to determine the application that was before Committee, and after debate the Committee supported the application as set out.

In respect of item 14 – land between 5 and 7 Buddens Road, Meon Park, Wickham, Mrs Hulls spoke against the application and Mr Barron, representing the Winchester Housing Trust, spoke in support. The Committee agreed that its Viewing Sub-Committee should visit the application site to view issues of demarcation of boundaries, the positioning of trees in relation to the application site, and to observe on-site issues relating to drainage and private sewers that crossed the site.

In respect of item 15 – Osborne School, Andover Road, Winchester, Mr A Cooper, representing the applicant, spoke in support of this item. The Director of Development Services referred to additional conditions to accompany any granting of the application, including one to stop car parking in surrounding roads. The Committee agreed that an additional condition be included to protect the tulip tree on the site which needed to be removed, including stipulating that a replacement tree be provided should it die. It was also agreed that an informative be added to the application that if possible pedestrian access be secured to encourage permeability of the development. Subject to inclusion of the additional conditions and the informative, the Committee agreed to the application as set out.

In respect of items not subject to public participation, it was agreed that the Planning Viewing Sub-Committee should visit item 3 – Rose Cottage, Turkey Island, Shedfield to observe issues relating to the potential for loss of light and amenity space to the neighbouring property, Hillcrest.

In respect of item 9 – Rozel Forge, Stapleford Lane, Durley, the Committee agreed that the Environmental Health Department be consulted on the storage of manure on the site and its disposal, and that an informative be added that the Planning Enforcement Team be made aware of the application and the fact that it would be monitored at regular intervals.

In respect of item 12 – The Hurdles, Brockbridge, Droxford, the Director of Development Services reported that two further letters of representation had been received which had resulted in the application being referred to Committee for determination. The issues raised in the further letters of representation reiterated points of objection as set out in the report.

In respect of item 16 – 163 Olivers Battery Road South, Olivers Battery, Winchester, the item stood deferred as requested amended plans had not been received from the applicant.

**RESOLVED:**

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

2. That the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee visit application site numbers 3 (Rose Cottage, Turkey Island, Shedfield) and 14 (land between 5 to 7 Buddens Road, Meon Park, Wickham) on Monday 12 July 2004 to commence at 9.30am, and that Councillors Baxter, Bennetts, Busher, Darbyshire, Jeffs (and Councillor Mitchell appointed on 29 June 2004 Meeting) be appointed to serve thereon.

3. That item 2 – Knowle Village, Knowle Avenue, Knowle, Fareham – Phase 5 be deferred for further negotiation with the applicant regarding the provision of affordable housing within Phase 5 and also the distribution of affordable housing within the site.

4. That item 16 – 163 Olivers Battery Road South, Olivers Battery, Winchester be deferred as amended plans had not been received from the applicant.

29. **MR NEIL MACKINTOSH**

The Committee thanked Mr N Mackintosh, Planning Officer, for his work on behalf of the Committee as he would be commencing a career break from the Council.

30. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC438 refers)

The meeting noted that this item had not been notified for inclusion on the agenda within the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept the item onto the agenda, as a matter requiring urgent consideration because of the need to determine the recommendations from the meeting of the Telecommunications Sub-Committee held on 21 June 2004.

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Telecommunications Sub-Committee held on 21 June 2004 (attached as Appendix B to the Minutes).

The Director of Development Services reported that the closing date for representation on the proposals had expired on 22 June 2004, one day after the date of the Telecommunications Sub-Committee, and therefore, the matter had been recommended to the Planning Development Control Committee to determine. No further representations had been received after the closing date and therefore the recommendation was as set out. The Committee supported the recommendation for the granting of permission.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 21 June 2004 be approved and adopted.

The meeting commenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 8.35pm.

Chairman



**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (ROYAL OBSERVER CORPS) SUB-COMMITTEE****1 June 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 who did not address the meeting

Councillors Nelmes and Mitchell

Officers in Attendance:Mrs S Proudlock (Team Manager, Planning)  
Mrs H Brushett (Conservation Officer)  
Mr S Avery (Planning Officer)31. **MINUTES**

## RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 26 April 2004, be approved and adopted.

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

The Chairman welcomed approximately five members of the public and four representatives of the applicant (Bayview Developments Ltd).

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.

Councillors 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.

Mrs Proudlock stated that following Members' comments at the previous meeting, a revised plan had been submitted. This reverted to the original diamond shaped development around the centrally located Second War World listed building. This contrasted to the previous square design that was intended to reflect the line of the roads surrounding the site. However, Mrs Proudlock explained that there had not yet been time to receive consultations on these revised plans.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Beck (on behalf of the applicant) outlined the revised plans. In addition to reverting to the diamond shaped plan, he explained about the changes in the proposed affordable housing provision. He stated that the revised plan proposed a reduction from 6 affordable housing units to 2x three bedroom units. These would take up the same amount of floorspace and were contained within a separate block at the entrance of the site. Members raised concerns regarding the reduction in affordable units and its separation from other blocks and requested the advice of the Housing Enablement Officer in preparation for a future meeting.

In response to Members' questions, Mrs Proudlock confirmed that it was possible to negotiate from the 30% that was required in the Local Plan in regard to the number of affordable housing units to be provided on site, due to the particular constraints of this development. During the discussion, a Member recommended this course of action to encourage the retention of the listed building as a museum. Mr Beck also underlined his willingness to negotiate on the number of affordable housing units to be provided on the site and offered open book accounting to demonstrate the financial constraints of the development.

Mr Beck also explained that the ratio of car parking spaces per units had been increased (as a result of the reduction of the number of affordable housing units) to 1.25 per dwelling. Mr Parker (also on behalf of the applicant) stated that this was within the Government's recommended maximum parking standards (of 1.5 spaces per dwelling) and added that the site was in a sustainable location with good links to the town centre. Mr Parker also stated that Abbots Road would be able to sustain overflow parking from the development, however Members raised concerns over this issue.

On behalf of the applicant, Mr Parker outlined the changes in the engineering aspect of the revised plans. The access to the site had been redesigned to shorten its width and to improve pedestrian safety. He re-affirmed that the applicant was willing to undertake improvements to the visibility from Abbots Road onto Worthy Road by removing a bank on the northside of Worthy Road. This would improve visibility from 2.4m X 40 metres to 2.4m X 60m, although it was noted that this was still short of the required 2.5mX90m standard.

Although it was noted that the Detailed Design Statement had been submitted by the applicant, Members regretted that it had not been made available for this meeting. However, in response to Members' questions, the applicant confirmed that the external appearance of the listed building would remain essentially unaltered from its original design. The two storey central core of the building would be retained as an open space (with the addition of roof windows) and the remainder of the building would be converted into four units with the only external alterations being the inclusion of French doors.

Members noted that the restoration work in the listed building would be in compliance with a repair and methods statement that would be placed as a condition on any planning permission granted.

With regard to the style of the proposed new buildings, Mr Beck explained that some consultation work had been undertaken with local residents and that a clear preference for a suburban design had emerged, which better reflected the character of neighbouring properties. The latest designs before the Sub-Committee proposed terraced blocks of three storey buildings, with garages on the ground floor. Following discussion, Members also indicated a preference for a more suburban style and noted Mrs Brushett's comments that the designs appeared to assume greater massing and therefore would come to dominate the central listed building.

At the previous meeting, Members had requested further information on the history of the surrounding buildings and the Chairman read a letter that had been sent to the Sub-Committee from a local resident, Mr Kingdom. His letter stated that at the time of the construction of the listed building, the site was surrounded by large residential buildings to the north (that were built in the early 1930s) and to the south by a large pre WW1 building (which was subsequently demolished and re-developed).

In response to Members' questions, Mrs Brushett outlined the history of the listed building and confirmed that she would be able to provide further details on request.

Mrs Brushett confirmed that the Royal Observer Corps Museum had been unsuccessful in securing a grant to maintain the listed building as a museum. The Sub-Committee discussed the possibility of retaining part of the listed building as a museum which could be open to the public on a limited number of days of the year.

However, a representative of the applicant explained that it would not be possible to integrate the museum with the residential development. This was because, in addition to the problems of security and access, it would be unreasonable to expect the occupiers of the development to contribute towards the museum's maintenance.

Following discussion the Sub-Committee agreed that as a result of the surrounding residential development, it would be difficult for a third party in the future to understand why the central building had been retained due to its listing. Because of this, and because of constraints arising from the listed building's preservation, the Sub-Committee agreed that enquiries should be made to English Heritage to get the building de-listed and demolished. However, it was noted that English Heritage had already been consulted and did not object to the residential conversion of the listed building, which they had regarded as the only viable option to restore the building and to remove it from the Buildings at Risk register.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Bruty (a resident of Manningford Close, adjacent to the north of the site) spoke of the need to protect the privacy of Manningford Close's residents, the traffic issues pertaining to the Abbots Road/Worthy Road junction and that he was against the proposed design of the new buildings, but he supported the demolition of the listed building.

Also at the invitation of the Chairman, another local resident echoed Mr Bruty's views and added that because of the close proximity between the site and Manningford Close, the border should be marked by a screen.

At the conclusion of the meeting it was agreed that the application should be deferred, pending further investigation of the following issues:

- Information from the Museum and the Hampshire Buildings Trust as to the viability of the Royal Observer Corps Museum.
- That in the light of the Royal Observer Corps Society inability to secure funding to maintain the listed building as a museum, it was the Member's clear wish that the building be demolished and that the reasons why be progressed with English Heritage.
- Further details on the proposals for the listed building (as contained within the applicant's design statement).
- Further negotiation (to include the Housing Enablement Officer) regarding the number and integration of the affordable housing units on the site.
- Confirmation of the City Council's Engineers' view on the revised plan (including the inadequacy of the junction onto Worthy Road and possible overspill parking onto Abbots Road).
- Further negotiation on the style of the new buildings, that Members considered to be too terraced and urban and which did not reflect the character of the surrounding buildings.
- Further consideration of the development's proximity and issues of overlooking to Manningford Close

**RECOMMENDED:**

That the applications be deferred for the reasons stated above.

The meeting commenced at 2.30pm and concluded at 4.10pm.

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE21 June 2004Attendance:

## Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Busher (P)

Read (P)

Pearson (P)

Officers in attendance:

Miss E Norgate (Senior Planner)

---

33. **TEMPORARY INSTALLATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT COMPRISING 22 METRE HIGH POLE TO SUPPORT 3NO. ANTENNAE AND 1NO. 600MM TRANSMISSION DISH WITH ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT CABIN AND GENERATOR IN FENCED COMPOUND (RETROSPECTIVE) - AIRWAVE MM02 LTD, REF.04/01141/FUL**

The Sub-Committee met at Raglington Farm located off the A334 Botley Road, Shedfield. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Holt from LCC Limited on behalf of the applicant, Airwave MM02 Limited. There were no members of the public or parish representatives present. A Ward Member had made written representation and was also not present

Miss Norgate explained that the Sub Committee had been asked to consider a retrospective full planning application from Airwave MM02 Limited for further temporary consent for telecommunications equipment comprising a 22 metre high pole to support 3 antennae and one 600mm transmission dish with associated equipment cabin and generator within a fenced compound.

Miss Norgate reminded Members that the Sub-Committee had previously granted permission for the temporary installation on 16 December 2003 for a period expiring 31 March 2004. Members noted that that this had also been a retrospective application as the equipment had been erected without planning permission and had been subject to enforcement action. The equipment had not been removed at the expiry date of 31 March 2004 and so had been once again subject to enforcement action.

Miss Norgate advised that neither the Council's Highway Engineer nor Landscape Officer had objected to the proposals. Shedfield Parish Council and a nearby resident had objected to the proposals, expressing concern of considering retrospective planning applications as well as the proliferation of masts in the area.

Miss Norgate reminded Members that as the closing date for representation on the proposals was not due to expire until 22 June 2004, any further representations received would be reported to the meeting of the Planning Development Control Committee on 28 June 2004. Consequently the Sub-Committee would be recommending its decision to the Planning Development Control Committee rather than exercising its delegated authority.

The Chairman summarised a letter circulated to the Sub-Committee from Councillor Goodall, a Ward Member for Shedfield. Councillor Goodall suggested that a precautionary approach should be taken to granting permission for masts due to possible health risks. Members noted that the applicant had provided ICNIRP certification of compliance with current radiological emissions codes.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Holt advised Members of the reasons for his client's request for the application. Mr Holt stated that technical problems (including incorrect fabrication of steel for the equipment and collapse of the cable conduit for the land-line link) had delayed the operational status of the adjacent permanent structure, which would replace the temporary mast. However, his client was satisfied that the required works would be completed and the temporary structure removed by 31 July 2004.

The Chairman reported that, as before, the consideration of retrospective applications was inappropriate. However, the Sub-Committee in determining this application wished to be satisfied that the period requested by the applicant would be adequate for the necessary works to be completed. Mr Holt indicated that his clients had advised that it would not be necessary for any longer timescale.

In conclusion, the Sub-Committee supported the application and agreed that an informative be added to state that no further applications would be considered at this site. The Sub-Committee additionally requested that the site be cleared and restored and that an enforcement officer be requested to inspect the site on the day of expiry of the temporary permission.

#### RECOMMENDED:

That the permission hereby granted shall be for a limited permission expiring on 31 July 2004 on or before which date the use hereby permitted shall be discontinued and the equipment brought onto the site shall be removed and the land restored to its former condition in accordance with a scheme of work submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: The development is of a type not considered suitable for permanent retention.

#### Informatives:

1. 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.

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

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: C1, TC1  
Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: FS4, C1, C2, EN5  
Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: C1, DP3, DP17

3. The applicant is advised that the Local Planning Authority is unlikely to grant any further temporary planning applications for the retention of the temporary telecommunications equipment and therefore following the expiration of this planning permission the mast and associated equipment should be removed in accordance with condition 1.

34. **VOTE OF THANKS**

As this was the final meeting of the Telecommunications Sub Committee before the new Municipal Year, the Sub-Committee thanked the Chairman for his guidance and the officers for their hard work and support during the past Municipal Year.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 10.05am

Chairman