

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**8 September 2004**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

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

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

Deputy Members:

Councillor Pearce (Standing Deputy for Councillor Sutton)

Others in attendance in speaking:

Councillors Hollingbery and Verney

---

232. **UNAUTHORISED RESIDENTIAL USES AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS AROUND WINCHESTER (GARNIER ROAD, ITCHEN NAVIGATION AND NEAR BY)**  
(Report PDC545 refers)

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item and left the room during its consideration.

The Director of Development Services circulated at the meeting for Members' consideration a letter received from the occupier of site number 3 – Tunbridge (along side Itchen navigation – off Garnier Road). In summary the letter stated that there were a number of inaccuracies within the report relating to the occupation of certain sites; that the perceived threat of unauthorised encampments had been exaggerated; that the Human Rights Act should be complied with, and that the action being taken by the Council was an inappropriate use of public money.

The Director of Development Services stated that the situation regarding site 1 had now been resolved and the recommendation relating to this site should therefore be deleted. The Director continued that Cabinet had already agreed action to repossess sites 3 and 4 and this should be reflected within the recommendation.

The City Secretary and Solicitor answered Members' questions regarding the current legal position in taking action against the occupiers of sites 3 and 4 and the potential options that were open to the Council.

## RESOLVED:

1. That at sites 3 and 4, where the City Council is the land owner, the Committee noted that legal action had been authorised by Cabinet to repossess the land.

2. That should further similar breaches of planning control reoccur in the future, action be taken by the land owner where possible and by enforcement action (if necessary) to secure cessation of residential use.

233. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB - COMMITTEE**  
(Report PDC463 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub Committee held on 25 August 2004 (attached as Appendix B to the Minutes).

Councillor Pearce addressed the meeting as a Ward Member sitting apart from the Committee and did not vote thereon.

The Director of Development Services circulated at the meeting for Members' consideration further letters submitted by local residents in objection to the application.

These letters were from Mr J Fairbrother, 20 Byron Avenue, Winchester dated 6 September 2004; Mr R L Davey, 16 Chilbolton Avenue dated 8 September 2004 and from P A Greenwood, 3 Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester dated 3 September 2004.

The Director also submitted a plan of the local area showing the positioning of site notices advertising the meeting as publicity had been an issue of objection. The procedure for neighbour notification and display of site notices was explained to the Committee and in response to neighbour notification, no comment had been received from Sarum Road Hospital. The representatives of Kings School had confirmed that the City Council's original consultation letter had been received. A second consultation letter was also received. However, the school's comments were not received by the council even though the school sent it by e mail.

The Director summarised the principles of development and stated that the fencing to the mast compound would be post and rail (which negated the need for a relevant condition) and there would not be any impact on the adjacent tree belt.

Councillor Pearce, speaking as a Ward Member, stated that there had been local concerns at the application. These included the publicity for the site visit and that those affected had not been given the opportunity to state their views. The concerns included those of visual impact and the incidence of the beam of greatest intensity (BOGI). It was the opinion of the objectors that as this was a new application the issue of alternative sites should have been taken into consideration. There had been confusion over the dates for public comment and that the standards of plans showing coverage provided by the operator were inadequate. He urged the Committee to defer consideration of the application until the outcome of the Byron Avenue appeal on 19 November 2004.

In response, the Director of Development Services explained that the coverage plots provided by the agents had acceptable detail and that although no independent assessment of the emissions figures provided by the applicant had been made, the emissions would be the same as they existed for the present mast, all be it in a slightly changed position and higher by 4.5 metres.

In assessing the application, the Chairman of the Sub Committee, Councillor Bennetts, commented that by the Council considering and approving a full application it could keep control by condition over the mast's design, location and treatment of the enclosure, which would not be the case if the application was refused and then won on appeal.

After consideration, the Committee agreed to support the recommendation to approve the application as set out but agreed to include an additional condition that the applicant be requested to submit a method statement to show how the replacement mast could be provided with the least possible impact on the adjacent tree belt.

**RESOLVED:**

That subject to inclusion of an additional condition that the applicant be requested to submit a method statement for the installation of the replacement mast and its relationship to the existing tree belt to minimise the possible loss of limbs of the trees, the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub Committee held on the 25 August 2004 be approved and adopted.

**234. PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB - COMMITTEE**  
(Report PDC459 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub Committee meeting held on 16 August 2004 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes).

The Director of Development Services reported that further to the Sub-Committee meeting, correspondence had been received from Fisher German, Chartered Surveyors, acting on behalf of The Oil and Pipelines Agency, stating that they had observed the proposals with respect to the subterranean oil pipeline and still raised no objection to the application subject to specified safeguards. Further, with respect to highways, developer contributions would be received for highway improvements.

A letter had also been received from the applicant in which they explained that if the site was considered to be 0.33 hectares in size, this would equate to a density of 42 units per hectares, not 46 units per hectares as set out in the report. With regard to the possible existence of bats on the site, English Nature had stated that the applicant would be required to undertake a survey to establish the presence or absence of bats on the site and this was included within the ecological report. With regard to drainage issues, the Council's Drainage Engineer would enter into discussions with the applicant to achieve a satisfactory solution for drainage on the site.

The Chairman of Itchen Valley Parish Council had also stated that her views had been misrepresented in the minutes and that the Parish Council was supportive of some redevelopment of the site and that six units was about right.

In answer to points raised by Members, the Director of Development Services stated that affordable housing provision on the site would accord with the Council's policies and that issues relating to the Ministry of Defence pipeline would need Government consent before planning permission could be granted.

Although it was noted that the applicants had indicated that they were willing to continue negotiation with the City Council to achieve a satisfactory scheme, such were the reservations of the Committee regarding issues as, for example, too high a density, arrangements for sewage effluent disposal within the site; the loss of a beech hedge parallel to the western boundary, issues of overlooking and of affordable housing provision, that any revised scheme would need to be the subject of a new application. This being the case, the Director of Development Services advised that the proper course of action would be to refuse the present application and to seek a new application from the applicant. The Committee supported this approach and refused that the application for the reasons set out below.

RESOLVED:

1. That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Viewing Sub Committee held on the 16 August 2004 be noted, and;
2. That the application in respect of Abbotsbury, School Lane, Itchen Abbas, Winchester be refused for the following reasons:
  - 01 The proposed development is contrary to the policies UB3, T2, T4, T5, T12, H2, H7, H8, H11, R2, E1, E6, E8, E16, E17 of the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review and the policies EN1, EN4, EN5, EN9, EN13, H1, H5, RT3, T8, T9, T11 of the Winchester District Local Plan, and policies DP1, DP3, DP4, DP5, DP6, DP9, DP12, H2, H5, H7, RT3, T1, T2, T3, T4, T5 of the Winchester District Local Plan (Review) in that it would:  
Represent an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the character of the area which is defined by large buildings, surrounded by mature landscape screening, this proposal does not reflect the character, layout, design or appearance of development in this area. It is considered the proposed layout of the development, with hard landscaping and tandem car parking is out of keeping with the character of the area and would cause material harm to the street scene;
  - 02 The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the future occupiers of this site and neighbouring properties, by virtue of overlooking;
  - 03 The applicant has failed to prove that sewage effluent from the dwellings can be adequately disposed of within the curtilage of the development and has not indicated if an alternative disposal method is available. It is considered that as proposed the development would place an unacceptable burden on the amenity of the area.
  - 04 The removal of the beech hedge parallel to the western boundary of the site would result in the loss of a mature landscape feature to the detriment of the character of the area;

## Informatives

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

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: UB3, T2, T4, T5, T12, H2, H7, H8, H11, R2, E1, E6, E8, E16, E17.

Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: EN1, EN4, EN5, EN9, EN13, H1, H5, RT3, T8, T9, T11 Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: DP1, DP3, DP4, DP5, DP6, DP9, DP12, H2, H5, RT3, T1, T2, T3, T4, T5

## 235. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS** (Report PDC460 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 Jeffs declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of item 2 – Clutha Farmhouse, Bighton Lane, Gundleton, Alresford as he lived close by the application site and he left the meeting during consideration of this item.

Councillor Johnston declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 3 – Mulberry Lodge, Bishops Sutton Road, Bishops Sutton, Alresford as he personally knew the objector to the application as a work colleague and he spoke and voted thereon.

The following applications were considered in the public participation part of the meeting.

In respect of item 2 – Manor Cottage, Beauworth Road, Beauworth, Alresford, Mrs Chollerton, applicant, spoke in support of the application and against the officers' recommendation for refusal. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Verney, Ward Member, also spoke in support of the application. In summary, Councillor Verney stated that the application had the support of the Parish Council together with a number of local people. He stated that the neighbour of the semi-detached dwelling had already extended that property to the side and that Mrs Chollerton was seeking the same size of extension. Affordability was not an issue and the extension would provide a visual balance to the semi-detached dwellings. Greater consideration should also be given to the size of existing dwelling (at 126 square metres) rather than the size of the original at approximately 90 square metres. Following debate the Committee agreed to support the officers' recommendation for refusal as set out.

In respect of item 3 - Mulberry Lodge, Bishops Sutton Road, Bishops Sutton, Alresford, Mrs Shaw spoke in objection to the application. Following consideration, the Committee approved the application as set out.

In respect of item 1 – Clutha Farmhouse, Bighton Lane, Gundleton, Alresford Mrs Hooker spoke in objection to the application and Mrs Smith, applicant, spoke in support. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Hollingbery spoke on this item as a Ward Member. In summery Councillor Hollingbery stated that the neighbours did not object to a cattery at the site, but had concerns about alterations to the access, which would lead to the loss of hedgerow. They could see no reason why the southern access could not be used. He asked that the application be deferred or

be approved with authority being delegated to the Officers to negotiate on the issue of the access. Following debate the Committee supported the application as set out.

RESOLVED:

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

236. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**

RESOLVED:

That the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items of business because it is likely that, if members of the public were present, there would be disclosure to them of 'exempt information' as defined by Section 100I and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

<u>Minute Number</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Description of Exempt Information</u>
237	Report of progress to secure compliance with enforcement notices served at Bowlake Farm, Fishers Pond, Colden Common	<p>Any instructions to counsel and any opinion of counsel (whether or not in connection with any proceedings) and any advice received, information obtained or action to be taken in connection with:-</p> <p>(a) any legal proceedings by or against the authority, or</p> <p>(b) the determination of any matter affecting the authority, (whether, in either case, proceedings have been commenced or are in contemplation). (Para 12 to Schedule 12A refers).</p> <p>Information which, if disclosed to the public, would reveal that the authority proposes:-</p> <p>(a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; or</p> <p>(b) to make an order or direction under any enactment. (Para 13 to Schedule 12A refers).</p> <p>Any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime. (Para 14 to Schedule 12A refers).</p>

238 & 239	Allegations of non compliance to an enforcement notice and planning conditions at Geest Manor Farm, Alresford	<p>Any instructions to counsel and any opinion of counsel (whether or not in connection with any proceedings) and any advice received, information obtained or action to be taken in connection with:-</p> <p>(a) any legal proceedings by or against the authority, or</p> <p>(b) the determination of any matter affecting the authority, (whether, in either case, proceedings have been commenced or are in contemplation). (Para 12 to Schedule 12A refers).</p> <p>Information which, if disclosed to the public, would reveal that the authority proposes:-</p> <p>(a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; or</p> <p>(b) to make an order or direction under any enactment. (Para 13 to Schedule 12A refers).</p>
-----------	---	---

237. **REPORT OF PROGRESS TO SECURE COMPLIANCE WITH ENFORCEMENT NOTICES SERVICED AT BOWLAKES FARM, FISHERS POND, COLDEN COMMON**  
(Report PDC455 refers)

The Committee considered a report on the progress of enforcement action at Bowlakes Farm, Fishers Pond, Colden Common.

RESOLVED:

That the current position be noted and the actions being pursued be endorsed.

238. **ALLEGATIONS OF NON COMPLIANCE WITH ENFORCEMENT NOTICE AND PLANNING CONDITIONS AT GEEST MANOR FARM, ALRESFORD**  
(Report PDC433 refers)

The Committee considered a report reviewing the planning history of premises at Manor Farm, Old Alresford setting out current operational arrangement at the premises and summarising complaints from nearby residents about the situation. The report set out the planning merits of remedial action that were suggested (details in Exempt Minute).

The meeting commenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 6.05pm

Chairman



**APPENDIX A****PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE****16 August 2004****Attendance:****Councillors:**

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)

Davies (P)

Evans (P)

Johnston (P)

**Others in attendance:**

Councillor Pearson

Mr C Buchan-Hepburn (Hyde Housing Association)

**Officers in attendance:**

Mr J Hearn (Development Control Team Manager, East)

Mrs E Patterson (Principal Planning Officer)

Mr N Culhane (Engineer - Highways)

---

239. **DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUNGALOWS AND RESIDENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT COMPRISING 7 NO. THREE BEDROOM AND 7 NO. TWO BEDROOM DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED GARAGING, PARKING AND ALTERATIONS TO ACCESS AT ABBOTSBURY, SCHOOL LANE, ITCHEN ABBAS (REFERENCE NUMBER W02980/02)**

The Sub-Committee met at the application site where the Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr S Johns, Architect from BHP Harwood Architects, representing the applicant, representatives from the Parish Council and approximately 50 members of the public.

The application sought permission to demolish the two dwellings on site at present and erect 14 No. new dwellings, four of which were to be affordable housing. Hyde Housing Association had held initial discussions with the developer regarding managing the affordable housing.

At the meeting of the Planning Development Control Committee held on 29 July 2004, it had been agreed that this Sub-Committee should visit the application site in order that issues relating to density, design landscaping and the effect of the development on the character of the area could be assessed on site.

Mrs Patterson explained the late correspondence had been received since writing the report, as follows;

- a) Mark Oaten MP had raised his concerns about the size of the development, the number of houses and the associated road access.
- b) the Surveyors for the Ministry of Defence (MOD) Pipeline commented: "at the current time we have not viewed any details in respect of the proposed positioning of the housings and would confirm that this will be affected by the existence of our client's apparatus".
- c) previous residents of Abbotsbury had reported that the site was a foraging area for bats.

With the permission of the site owner, the Sub-Committee and members of the public inspected the site. Following the inspection, Mrs Patterson clarified a number of points including the position of the MOD pipeline, the proposed siting of the 'Klargester' sewage disposal facility, and the new boundary hedge.

In response to Members questions, Ms Patterson also clarified the following;

- a) the rear elevation of plots 8-11 overlooked the end of the rear garden of the Old House,
- b) the distance from units 8-11, would be 100 metres to the Old House,
- c) the maisonettes faced into the site with a blank elevation to the rear, and
- d) the trench at the boundary would take any discharge from the sewerage plant, but the proposal had been amended so that this trench would no longer take surface water. Soakaways would be included in the gardens of the properties to take the surface water. The proposed Plans also specified that a permeable surface be used for new roads and driveways.

Mr Culhane advised that a speed survey had been carried out at the site by the applicant, which was satisfactory. He also explained that the visibility splay was not achieved in the non-critical direction, but that the centre line was visible and therefore it was unlikely to cause any problems. He advised that the proposed development would generate ten additional vehicle movements at the peak hour in the morning, and he believed there to be adequate parking and turning within the site. For these reasons, he explained that he had no objections to the proposal.

Regarding the proposed affordable housing, Mr Buchan-Hepburn answered Members' questions and advised that, subject to planning approval, Hyde Housing Association would be interested in managing four properties; three shared ownership and one rental, the rental property being the largest of the four, a three bedroom house.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mrs Matthews, representing Itchen Valley Parish Council addressed the Sub-Committee and outlined several concerns regarding drainage, traffic and the density of the proposed development. She explained that School Lane and Northington Road was used heavily by pedestrians, both parents walking children to and from school, and elderly people walking to and from the main road bus stop. Regarding the density of the development, Mrs Matthews believed it to be more in keeping with an urban area and would be out of character in this rural village. However, she welcomed new development within the village and advised that the Parish Council would prefer a development of six houses on the site.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a number of local residents spoke in opposition to the application, and underlined several issues as follows;

- a) a Village Design Statement had been written in consultation with local residents and the proposed development does not fit within its guidelines.
- b) congestion would be caused, as cars already park in School Lane, often blocking driveways.
- c) the village suffered with drainage problems, due to saturated chalk. In heavy rain, water often ran down School Lane.
- d) in the past, the MOD pipeline had been found to be less than 1 metre below the ground in other parts of the village, and concerns were raised that the maps and surveys of the pipeline were inaccurate.
- e) the removal of one of the hedges would open up the site, resulting in overlooking.

Overall, local residents agreed with the Parish Council and welcomed a smaller development of approximately six houses.

In response to these concerns, Mr Johns explained that the density was within PPG3 guidelines and that proposed developments had been refused in the past due to insufficient density.

Mrs Patterson explained that the removal and replacement at the site boundary of the hedge was requested by the Landscape Officer to give a more sustainable landscape layout to the site and that the existing beech hedge to the west of the site would be isolated from the rest of the planting and could only be protected by condition for 5 years. The density was proposed at 46 dwellings per hectare and Officers recommended the application for approval, as it was within PPG3 guidelines. Mr Hearn advised that a development of six dwellings on the site would fall well below the recommended density. If a lower density was accepted here it would set an unwelcome precedent for other sites. He also explained that there was a need for smaller affordable housing dwellings within the District.

The Sub-Committee considered the Officers' recommendations and points made by the applicants, the Parish Council and local residents and discussed the application. Several Members, having seen the slope levels of the site, were concerned at the high density and the proposed layout. Issues were also raised regarding the lack of information about the MOD pipeline, especially regarding its depth.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the majority of the Sub-Committee agreed to recommend refusal of the application, as they considered the proposed development too dense for the area and that it would therefore have a significant impact on neighbouring properties.

#### RECOMMENDED:

That planning permission be refused for reasons outlined above.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 11.25am.

Chairman

**APPENDIX B****PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE****25 August 2004**Attendance:

## Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)

Busher (P)

Davies (P)

Pearson (P)

Read (P)

Others in attendance:

Councillor Pearce

Officers in attendance:

Ms A Fettes (Senior Planner)

Ms N Whitehead (Planning Officer)

---

241. **PROPOSAL TO REPLACE EXISTING 15 METRE TELECOMMUNICATION MONOPOLE WITH 20 METRE MONOPOLE WITH ASSOCIATED ANTENNAE AND WORKS TO COMPOUND – SARUM ROAD RESERVOIR, SARUM ROAD, WINCHESTER.**

The Sub-Committee met at the application site to the rear of Sarum Road Reservoir, Sarum Road, Winchester. A demonstration mast had been erected near to the proposed location of the application, although it was explained that the final position of the mast would be within the wooded area to the rear.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Palmer from AWA Limited (on behalf of the applicants, Hutchinson 3G UK Limited “3”). Three members of the public were also present.

Ms Fettes explained that the proposals were for the replacement of the existing 13.8 metre high timber clad monopole with an 18.3 metre high timber clad monopole. There would be three 1.7 metre high panel antennas attached and a further 0.3 metre dish antenna at 17.6 metre high. The total height, including the equipment, would be 18.3 metres. The existing monopole would be removed after the proposed mast was erected and tested, so as to avoid any breaks in coverage. Ms Fettes advised that the existing compound would be extended to the north by 4 metres with all equipment remaining in situ within a 1.8 metre high chain-link fence. The monopole would be located within a wooded area and the proposals would be visible just above the tree line.

Ms Fettes reported that 40 letters explain the proposals had been sent by the Department to neighbouring homes and businesses, including Sarum Road Hospital and Kings School Boarding House although no representations had been received to date.

Further to questions, Ms Fettes explained that proposals were required to improve third generation telecommunications coverage in the area. This was demonstrated on coverage maps indicating improvements to the strength of signal from the proposals. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Palmer explained the operator's methodology of assessing sites for required coverage and that, in this instance, the height of the structure had not proved satisfactory once operational. He confirmed that the proposal was not to extend coverage and that ICNIRP certification regarding the proposal's compliance had been provided.

Following discussion, Members requested that the size of the compound remain unaltered, but be 'moved' to accommodate the monopole in its new location. In addition, it was requested that the chain link fence be replaced with a timber three-bar fence and that existing hedging around the compound be extended. Members considered that the chain link fence was unsightly and that security was not an issue as the whole reservoir site was enclosed.

In their assessment of the proposal, Members noted two existing masts to the front of the reservoir (fronting Sarum Road) measuring 15 and a 20 metres.

Following the concern of some Members regarding the potential for damage to trees, Mr Palmer advised that the positioning of the mast within the wooded area would be carried out by a crane so as to avoid damage, and the removal of branches. Furthermore, the compound's foundations were sufficiently shallow so as to not adversely impact upon the trees' root systems. Following discussion, Ms Fettes stated that she would request the Council's Arboricultural Officer comments prior to any subsequent approval of the proposals.

As a Ward Member, Councillor Pearce reported to the meeting his concerns regarding the proposals. He considered that the height of the structure was excessive and would be visible from far reaching views, that surrounding trees may be damaged and that the compound should be improved to be less visually intrusive.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mrs Barrett and Mrs St Ledger-Davey addressed the meeting and suggested that site notices (and those advertising the meeting) should have been placed along Chilbolton Avenue. Furthermore, concern was expressed that Kings School Boarding House had been notified at the start of the school holiday when the House Master may not be in residence.

Members noted the concerns raised and agreed that notices should be erected along Chilbolton Avenue. Therefore, any subsequent approval of the proposals would be subject to any representations received by the next meeting of the Planning Development Control Committee (8 September 2004) and would be verbally reported to that meeting. Furthermore, a letter should be sent to the Head Teacher of Kings School notifying him of the proposals and inviting representation.

In conclusion, Members agreed on balance to support the application, subject to the requests regarding public representation as detailed above and to receiving favourable comments from the Council's Arboricultural Officer. It was also agreed that the existing compound chain link fence should be replaced and that the top section of the mast (above the timber cladding) be of a non-reflective colour.

RECOMMENDED:

That the permission hereby be granted on condition of

1FUL  
1FULR

Details of the fencing and planting around the compound shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of works. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

The mast hereby permitted shall be wood clad, and the antennae painted a non reflective colour.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

Details of the piled foundations for the mast and the fencing insofar as they affect trees on or adjoining the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of works.

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

The existing mast shall be removed and the compound reduced in size accordingly within one month of the erection of the mast hereby approved.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the locality.

X060  
X060R

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 10.25am.

Chairman