

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE**14 February 2005**Attendance:

Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
Busher (P)
Davies (P)
Jeffs (P)Johnston (P)
Jeffs (P)
Pearson (P)
Read (P)Officers in attendance:Ms Fettes (Senior Planning Officer)
Ms Hutchings (Principal Planning Officer)

1. INSTALLATION OF A 15 METRE STREETWORKS MONOPOLE WITH METER CABINET AT LAND AT ALRESFORD ROAD, WINCHESTER

The Sub-Committee met at the application site at land at Alresford Road, Winchester.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Henderson (representing the applicant's agent, Turner and Partners) and Ms Rashid (a Radio Engineer for the applicant, O2) together with approximately twenty members of the public, and representatives and parents of St Swithuns School.

The application site was on Highways Authority land on a wide roadside verge on the northside of Alresford Road and was close to the M3 Spitfire Bridge. The site was also adjacent to the perimeter of St Swithuns School. The site was 80 metres from the nearest school building (a swimming pool), 180 metres from the main school building and 150 metres from the nearest residential dwelling on Alresford Road. A demonstration mast had been raised to the full height of the proposals (15m) at its approximate position.

Ms Fettes explained that an application had been received from O2 for the erection of a 12.5 metre high slimline monopole with 2.5 metre high polar antennae (the total height was therefore 15 metres) and an equipment cabinet measuring 1.7m x 0.75m x 1.4m. The mast would provide 3G coverage for the St Giles Hill area of Winchester and the M3 motorway.

As the total height of the proposal did not exceed 15 metres, Ms Fettes explained that the application was a prior notification which meant that the Sub-Committee could only comment on the appearance and setting of the proposal and that it was not possible to attach any planning conditions.

Ms Fettes reported that 85 letters of objection had been received in relation to the proposal. In summary, she explained that the letters raised concerns that the

applicant had provided insufficient information regarding alternative sites, emissions, insufficient consultation and publicity. There were also concerns regarding health issues and the mast's proximity to the school and residential properties.

Although some of the letters received had also raised concerns regarding the proposal's effects on the nearby Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), Ms Fettes reported that the Landscape Officer had raised no objection, so long as the mast was painted a light colour to blend with the other street furniture and that the cabinet be painted a dark colour. In considering the mast's visual effect on the landscape, Members agreed that the mast would be visible from long distance views from the ANOB and St Catherines Hill but that its impact was likely to be lessened by the presence of other street furniture in the area, such as lamp-posts.

Members questioned why the school had objected to the proposed mast whilst there was an existing telecommunications mast in the grounds of St Swithuns School approximately 20m from the site of the proposed mast. In response, Dr Harvey (the Head of St Swithuns School) explained that the mast in the school's grounds had been granted permission in 1996 when she considered that the possible health risks associated with telecommunications masts were less well known. She added that the school would review its 10 year lease agreement with Orange (the operator) when it expired in 18 months time.

At the invitation of the Chairman, several members of public raised concerns with regard to the possible health effects of the proposed mast and its relationship with the school. Ms Rashid explained that the application would be ICNIRP complaint and that the direction of the mast's beams would be aimed towards the M3 and the St Giles Hill area and not therefore towards the school. It was noted that, if granted, the applicant would be able to alter the direction of the beams as part of the mast's general maintenance. Although Members noted that to alter the direction of the antenna would diminish the mast's intended effectiveness, the Sub-Committee requested that any alterations of the beam's direction should be reported to the City Council. On behalf of the applicant, Mr Henderson agreed to this request.

During his comments against the application, Mr Graham (Chairman of the Council of St Swithuns School) stated that the applicant had not replied to the school's request for further information on the radiation and health risks of the proposed mast and the Sub-Committee noted and regretted that this information had not been supplied. In response to questions, Dr Harvey stated that the primary school buildings were located at the opposite end of the St Swithuns School site from the proposed application.

A Member commented on the proliferation of mast sites and Ms Rashid explained that the applicant had investigated alternative sites. Sites in St Giles Hill had been discounted as they were considered to be too residential and a site share with an existing mast on top of Earle House in Winnall had also been discounted as the landlord, the City Council, had refused permission. Another possible site share at the Alresford Road hospital had not been pursued as it fell outside the required coverage area. Mr Henderson added that the applicant had taken into account the conclusions of the Stewart Report and had evaluated the application to be an "amber-light" case although in response to questions, he was unable to clarify how the evaluation had been calculated.

At the conclusion of her presentation, Ms Fettes recommended that the application be approved and the majority of Members agreed that there were no material planning objections that could be sustained against the application.

RESOLVED:

That no objection be raised.

2. **INSTALLATION OF A 22.5M MONOPOLE WITH 2 NO. 3G ANTENNAE, EQUIPMENT CABINETS, FENCE AND ANCILLARY EQUIPMENT AT LAND OFF OVERTON ROAD, MICHELDEVER STATION**

The Sub-Committee met at the application site at land off Overton Road, Micheldever Station.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Henderson (representing the applicant's agent, Turner and Partners) and Ms Rashid (a Radio Engineer for the applicant, O2).

The site was in a rural location beside the mainline railway track and a demonstration mast had been raised to the full height of the proposals in its approximate position.

Ms Hutchings explained that the application proposed a 20m monopole with 2no panel antennas so that the total height of the structure would be 22.5m. The application was to serve O2's 3G customers on part of the mainline railway and would link in with proposed cells to the north of Hampshire Grain and to the south at Borough Farm. A compound measuring 4.5m x 6.3m and enclosed by a 1.8m high chainlink and barbed wire fence was proposed to contain 2no equipment cabinets.

Ms Hutchings reported that the Landscape Officer had raised no objection to the application but suggested that the mast be painted a dark green or brown to blend into the line of mature trees behind the application site.

Members noted that the Grade 2 Listed Warren House and farm buildings were located some distance from the application site and, as such, the Conservation Officer had been consulted but no formal response had been received. Ms Hutchings also reported that no representations had been received from the Parish Council nor any members of the public.

In response to Members' questions, Mr Henderson explained that alternative sites had been considered (including a site share at Weston Clump, Northbrook Road, where a mast had previously been approved and at the Micheldever Tyres site) but these had been discounted as they failed to provide the required coverage area.

Members considered the likely proliferation of telecommunications masts along the railway line to serve 3G customers and Mr Henderson stated that the proposed mast would be able to accommodate additional antennae from other operators.

In response to Members' comments concerning the height of the mast, Ms Rashid explained that the height was necessary to achieve the required coverage along the railway line.

The Sub-Committee noted that the proposed mast would be visible from Larkwhistle Farm Road and from longer distance views across the surrounding fields and countryside. However, it was noted that the proposal's impact on views from the nearest footpath on a ridgeline would be minimal by virtue of the long distance between the mast and the path and backdrop of trees.

Following discussion, the Sub-Committee approved the application. Although the site was not within the AONB Members requested that the compound be enclosed by a post and rail fence (rather than the proposed chainlink fence) and that this should be

surrounded by planting of an indigenous species. Members also agreed that a condition should be attached to ensure that the mast was painted a suitable colour.

RESOLVED:

That permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

01 Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

01 Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

02 A detailed scheme for landscaping, tree and/or shrub planting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The scheme shall specify species, density, planting, size and layout. The scheme approved shall be carried out in the first planting season following the occupation of the building or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. If within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, any trees, shrubs or plants die, are removed or, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, become seriously damaged or defective, others of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, in the next planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

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

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

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

04 The 1.8m high chainlink fence detailed on drawing reference numbers P_21006_GEN/02 rev. D and GEN/03 rev. D is hereby not approved. A timber post and rail fence of a standard height of 1.2m is hereby approved instead and shall be erected in place of the chainlink fence as detailed above before development is completed, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

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

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

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

06 In the event that the development hereby approved becomes redundant or otherwise not required for the purpose permitted, the mast and all associated equipment and enclosures shall be dismantled and permanently removed from the site, which shall be restored to its former condition.

06 Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

Informatives

01. This permission is granted for the following reasons:-

The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out below, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.

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

Hampshire County Structure Plan Review: C1, TC1.

Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: C1, C2, C6, EN5, SF4, HG23.

Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: C1, C5, DP3, DP17, HE16.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 12.15pm.

Chairman