

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**6 April 2005**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

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

---

1073. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Darbyshire and Sutton.

1074. **MEMBERSHIP OF SUB-COMMITTEES ETC**

The Chairman gave advance notice that it would be necessary to appoint at a future meeting Sub-Committees to consider applications for residential development on the site of the Police Headquarters, Romsey Road, Winchester, and the development of a Learning Resources Centre at Peter Symonds' College, Berewecke Road, Winchester.

1075. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (CHILBOLTON AVENUE, WINCHESTER) SUB-COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC524 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester) Sub-Committee held on 28 February 2005 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes.)

The Acting Director of Development Services reported that information from consultees was still being received and that negotiations on an amended application were continuing with the applicant. Once these consultations and negotiations had been completed, then a further meeting of the Sub-Committee would be arranged.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester) Sub-Committee held on 28 February 2005 be received.

1076. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE**  
(Report PDC523 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 11 March 2005 (attached as Appendix B to the minutes.)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester) Sub-Committee held on 11 March 2005 be received.

1077. **PLANNING APPEALS – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS**  
(Report PDC527 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

1078. **PENINSULA BARRACKS – AFFORDABLE HOUSING**  
(Report PDC.530 refers)

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item as he was a member of the Winchester Housing Group and on the board of Wykeham Properties (formerly known as the Winchester District Housing Association), but he had not taken part in these organisations' consideration of this item and he spoke and voted thereon.

RESOLVED:

That the City Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to vary the affordable housing provisions in the Section 106 Agreement dated 24 July 1995 in respect of Peninsula Barracks, Winchester, so as to simplify the sales and allocations process as outlined in the report.

1079. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**  
(Report PDC.525 refers)

The Schedule of Control decisions arising from the consideration of the above report is circulated separately and forms an appendix to the minutes.

Councillor Davies declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of items 7 and 8 as he was a member of the Council of the City of Winchester Trust which had commented on these applications and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of items 7 and 8 as he was a member of the City of Winchester Trust which had commented on these applications and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Busher declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 8, as her granddaughter attended Peter Symonds' College (the applicant) and she spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Bennetts declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of item 8 as his wife was an employee of Peter Symonds' College (the applicant) and he withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this item.

Councillor Johnston declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of item 4 and as he had prior contact with the objector to the application withdrew to the public gallery and did not speak or vote on this item.

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

In respect of item 2 – Windmill House, Hambledon Road, Denmead, Waterlooville, Mr Dove and Mr Lander-Brinkley, representing Denmead Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application and Mr B Jezeph, planning agent, spoke in support. Following debate, the Committee supported the application and set out, subject to an additional condition that Permitted Development Rights be removed for units 1 to 4 and that an informative be added on working hours for construction.

In respect of item 4 – Westleigh, 10 Boyne Mead Road, Kings Worthy, Mrs Walker spoke in objection to the application and Mr Harris, applicant, spoke in support. The Acting Director of Development Services reported that since preparing the report a further letter of objection had been received from the owner of 24 Felmer Drive reiterating the points of objection as set out in the report, together with the reason that the proposed development would be out of character with the area. The Committee approved the application as set out.

In respect of item 5 – 38 Drayton Street, Winchester, Mrs Balmain and Mr Weeks spoke in objection to the application and Mr Welch, applicant, spoke in support. Following debate, the Committee approved the application as set out.

In respect of item 7 – Enniskerry, Sleepers Hill, Winchester, Mr D Gilliat spoke in objection to the application. In response to Members' questions, the Acting Director of Development Services clarified that Southern Water had raised no objection to the application; that there was no public access to the site, therefore the applicant was required to make the full contribution to public open space; that an additional condition was required to ensure that a management body was set up to maintain the open area of communal area; that the applicant may choose to set up a private sewage system for the development, and that although a Local Area Design Statement (LADS) was being prepared for the Sleepers Hill area of Winchester, the statutory policy

and PPG3 would take precedence in assessing the application. Following debate, the Committee agreed that the application be deferred in order that detailed answers to the points raised by the Committee (those relating to arrangements for managing public open space on the site, sewage disposal and drainage and managing trees on the site) could be clarified and reported back to a future meeting of the Committee.

In respect of item 8 – Peter Symonds' College, Owens Road, Winchester, Mr Warren, Peter Symonds' College Bursar, spoke in support of the application. The Acting Director of Development Services explained that although included within the description of the application, it was not necessary for Peter Symonds' College to seek approval for demolishing Varley Lodge and Varley Cottage and associated outbuildings, as these operations could be carried out without consent. Although the Committee expressed its deep regret at the applicant's action in removing thirty-three mature trees from the site, it was stated that the Committee did not wish to delay the application and that Condition 5 of the approval of planning permission sought their replanting within the Peter Symonds' site. The Committee agreed the application as set out, subject to Condition 2 being amended to state that the period of permission for the temporary classroom would be time-limited to a two year period only.

In respect of item 9 – 2 Nursery Road, Alresford, Mr Warner spoke in objection to the application. The Acting Director of Development Services stated that written representation had been received from Councillor Cook, a Ward Member, and this was summarised for the Committee. The Acting Director added that amended plans showing the current description of the application had been received, and these were explained to the Committee. He added that on consultations, the Environment Agency and Southern Water had raised no objection to the application. Since preparing the report there had also been two further letters of objection to the application which reiterated points set out in the report and there had been one letter of support.

Following debate, the Committee agreed the application as set out, subject to additional conditions to state that before development commences a plan delineating the private amenity space for the new dwelling, together with the proposed boundary treatment, shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority and that the boundary shall be erected in accordance with the approved plans and thereafter retained. In addition the dwelling shall not be extended to incorporate the ground floor accommodation shown as utility and dining on the approved plans, as it was considered that there was insufficient car parking and potential amenity space for a larger dwelling.

In respect of items not subject to public participation, the Acting Director of Development Services confirmed that for item 3 – Stoney Dean Farm, Marlands Lane, West Meon, the application had been processed normally as it was submitted by a Member of the Council.

In respect of item 6 – 150 Greenhill Road, Winchester, the Acting Director of Development Services reported that one further letter of objection had been received reiterating points made in the report and adding that the windows and other details of the application were not in character with the surrounding area. Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse the application as it

was out of character with surrounding development and eroded the gap between existing dwellings, with detailed wording delegated to the Acting Director of Development Services to be included, based on the refusal on 27 May 2004 at 158 Greenhill Road which had been supported by the Planning Appeal Inspector.

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 in respect of item 6 – 150 Greenhill Road, Winchester, the application be refused for the following reasons: The proposed development, by reason of its siting and design and its physical relationship to 150 Greenhill Road and 148 Greenhill Road would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to UB3 of Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review), EN5 of the Winchester District Local Plan and DP3 of the Winchester District Local Plan (Review and Deposit)

3 That in respect of item 7 – Enniskerry, Sleepers Hill, Winchester, the application be deferred in order that issues relating to arrangements for managing public open space on the site, sewage disposal and drainage and issues relating to trees on the site could be clarified and reported to a future meeting of the Committee

The meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and concluded at 7.20 pm.

Chairman

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**  
**(1-7 CHILBOLTON AVENUE, WINCHESTER) SUB-COMMITTEE**

**28 February 2005**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)  
 Bennetts (P)  
 Beveridge (P)  
 Davies (P)

Johnston (P)  
 Mitchell (P)  
 Read (P)  
 Tait (P)

Others in attendance:

Councillors Love, de Peyer and Saunders

Officers in attendance:

Mr J. Hearn (Team Manager, Planning)  
 Mrs S. Leonard (Principal Planning Officer)  
 Mr M. Edwards (Arboricultural Officer)  
 Mr N. Culhane (Traffic Engineer)  
 Mr N. Baldwin (Affordable Housing Officer)  
 Mr S. Dunbar Dempsy (Landscape Officer)

1080. **ERECTION OF 49 DWELLINGS COMPRISING 5 NO. 1 BEDROOM, 26 NO 2 BEDROOM, 11 NO 3 BEDROOM AND 7 NO 4 BEDROOM DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND NEW ACCESS FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING PROPERTIES ON LAND 1-7 CHILBOLTON AVENUE, WINCHESTER**  
 (Report PDC514 refers)

The Chairman welcomed approximately thirty members of the public to the meeting together with Mrs A. Hauser, the applicant, and Hampshire County Councillor Dickens. Prior to the meeting, Members had visited the site with the officers.

Mrs Leonard introduced the application as set out in report PDC514. The site was bordered by a belt of mature trees fronting Chilbolton Avenue and existing vehicular accesses onto Chilbolton Avenue would be blocked up and new pedestrian access created. The proposals included 90 car parking spaces, of which 80 would be provided by a new underground car park, the entrance to which would be from Sarum Road. The density was 45 dwellings per hectare, which met Planning Policy Guidance Note (PPG) 3 criteria. The property at No. 9 Chilbolton Avenue was not included in the proposals at present, but in the interests of comprehensive development provision had

been made within the scheme's design for its future inclusion should this become a reality.

Mrs Leonard continued that the proposed dwellings nearest Chilbolton Avenue would be approximately one metre higher than the existing dwellings to be demolished, and would utilise shallow roofs. The design would be of a Classical and Arts and Crafts style with either pitched roofs or mansard roofs with parapet detail. The elevations of the town houses would have simple design with quality materials used throughout. No. 11 had not been included in the scheme as this property had already been developed into multiple units. The property at Pheasants Way fronting Sarum Road would be retained.

The development would contain 30% affordable housing, which equated to 14.7 units and the applicant was prepared to provide 15 units on the site in two blocks one fronting Sarum Road, the other at the corner of Sarum Road and Chilbolton Avenue.

Mr Edwards stated that in terms of the impact on trees it was proposed to retain the significant belt of pine and beech trees fronting Chilbolton Avenue. The proposals included a woodland walk footpath to weave between these trees and the officers would need to be satisfied that the materials to be used for the footpath's surface were appropriate for the trees' long-term retention.

Mr Edwards added that the proposals also provided a great opportunity for further landscaping and tree planting within the site. For example, at the rear boundary of the site there was the opportunity to plant more substantial trees which in time would break up the development from long-distance views. Further detail was also required as to tree species proposed within the scheme. More thought needed to be given to the positions of the trees and the species to ensure the longevity of mature large trees within the site which would be visible from distant views as the site was on a ridge. He added that management of the existing trees in Chilbolton Avenue was required, but overall the scheme was satisfactory provided these additional details were submitted by the applicant.

Mr Culhane stated that in terms of highways issues, the responsibility for the scheme rested with Hampshire County Council as Highway Authority. The applicant had carried out an impact assessment on traffic flows in Chilbolton Avenue and the scheme was satisfactory. The proposals included provision to widen Sarum Road to 5.5 metres in width and to provide a 2 metre pedestrian footpath to accommodate the new access for the development onto Sarum Road. The visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 90 metres accorded with Hampshire County Council standards and further off-site works for junction improvements would be carried out in conjunction with contributions received from Linden Homes for their development at 8-22 Chilbolton Avenue, or by direct contributions from the applicant if the Linden Home development did not proceed. The applicant would enter into a Section 278 agreement with Hampshire County Council making a contribution of £135,000 for off-site pedestrian and highway works.

Within the scheme, the applicant was providing parking at a standard of 1.63 spaces per unit together with cycle storage. Basement parking would be provided by means of an underground car park and further detail was required as to whether the parking provision on site met the needs of the

residents. In addition, there was provision for service vehicles on-site, but the turning area provided of 7.8 metres was inadequate and needed to be increased to 9.4 metres. This amendment might lead to further adjustment of the buildings on the site. Further details were also required of the form of the access road, including proposals that long-term parking on the access road did not take place. Details of access for fire appliances and arrangements for pedestrian access on the site were also required.

Mr Dunbar-Dempsy stated that the proposals met the open space requirement but that the opportunity for planting larger trees on the site would be welcomed. He also stated that a small scale local area of play would be provided.

Mr Baldwin confirmed that the requirement for 30% affordable housing was met by the application. In addition, the housing mix accorded with housing needs data. The affordable housing would be provided in the two blocks at the entrance to the site rather than being integrated across the development to ease maintenance by the housing association that was working in conjunction with the applicant.

In answer to Members' questions, Mr Edwards stated that the trees to the front of the site adjacent to Chilbolton Avenue would not be affected by the excavation for the proposed underground parking. A protection zone would be provided around the trees and the excavation of the site would not interfere with the root feeding area of the trees.

Mr Culhane commented that although there was peak hour traffic congestion at the Chilbolton Avenue and Sarum Road and Romsey Road junctions, Hampshire County Council was satisfied that the developer contributions received would be available to carry out highway improvements to alleviate the situation. It was also confirmed that lifts would be provided from the underground car parking into the three storey housing above.

In answer to a Member's question regarding comprehensive development, Mr Hearn stated that a number of previous applications at properties in Chilbolton Avenue had been refused as the proposals put forward to the Authority would have prevented the potential for further development of neighbouring plots in the future. This was not the case with this present application as the future potential to integrate No. 9 Chilbolton Avenue within the scheme at a future date had been included. No. 11 Chilbolton Avenue had already been re-developed and therefore need not be included. He added that Matrix Planning (urban design consultants) had been employed by the Authority to draw up a Local Area Design Statement (LADS) for Chilbolton Avenue. - The statement would include general design principles and guidance to applicants who were proposing to develop plots within Chilbolton Avenue. The LADS was in its initial stages and would undergo public consultation and in due course would be considered by Cabinet. A public meeting to discuss the LADS was to be held on the 8<sup>th</sup> March 2005. The LADS would have to comply with PPG3 if it was subsequently to be adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) by the Council. The intention of a LADS was not to promote the comprehensive re-development of Chilbolton Avenue, but rather to act as a guide for applicants and also a development control tool which would be a material planning consideration if adopted as SPG. Matrix Planning had also been consulted on initial redevelopment proposals for this site (at pre-application stage) as the Council was not



satisfied with the earlier proposals. The scheme now before the Council largely adhered to the design advice given by Matrix.

Mr Hearn continued that policy EN1 in the local plan had not now been included in the Local Plan Review as it did not accord with PPG3. The Local Plan Review provided guidance that the character of an area should not be harmed by inappropriate development. This could be achieved by providing space between buildings and the planting of mature trees. In the proposals before the Sub-Committee, the inclusion of 31 two and one bedroom units increased the density but in his opinion the character of the area was not harmed.

Mrs Leonard added that Building Control and a Southern Water condition would provide for adequate sewerage capacity on the site. It was proposed that the belt of trees fronting Chilbolton Avenue and the open space on site would be under the ownership of a single body, for example a management committee, or alternatively these areas could be managed by the Council on receiving a commuted sum.

Mrs Leonard continued that the potential for overlooking of No. 9 Chilbolton Avenue and Pheasants View on Sarum Road had been taken into consideration in the application. Small secondary windows would be included on elevations of the new development facing these properties, and the applicant confirmed that these could include obscure glazing if required. There was also sufficient provision for bin storage within the development.

The applicant, Mrs Hauser, stated that she had commissioned an arboricultural report for the development to ensure that the trees on site were protected. The development would be approximately 8 metres away from the trees on Chilbolton Avenue, which was well outside the recommended 5 metre distance for their protection. The principal rooms of the development would face onto the open central courtyard and therefore bedrooms would face onto Chilbolton Avenue, which would reduce the conflict between the development and the tree belt. It was proposed that a management company would look after the trees and the open space. No. 9 Chilbolton Avenue was not included in the scheme as the occupier was unwilling to sell the property, but the design had made provision for its future inclusion. The density of development was less than 40 units per hectare if car parking was excluded, and the footprint of development in terms of the size of the site was low. There were technical solutions to providing adequate sewage capacity on-site, for example the provisions of holding tanks, but negotiations on this point were continuing. The need to control parking on the site was recognised and the clamping of owners' vehicles would be utilised if necessary. The windows facing No. 9 Chilbolton Avenue were secondary, with high cills, and could be obscure glazed if required. Bin storage was provided between buildings and was well screened and integrated.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Hampshire County Councillor Dickens stated that the character of Chilbolton Avenue would be affected by the proposals and that a Local Neighbourhood Design Statement to protect the area, together with a comprehensive traffic scheme, was required. Before proceeding, the Sub-Committee should be satisfied on the details of road improvements proposed by Hampshire County Council and that visibility

splays should be looked at carefully. Details of bus stops should also be provided. She also asked why the scheme at 1.63 parking spaces per unit was above the County Council standard of 1.5 spaces. There was also concern about the junction between Chilbolton Avenue and Sarum Road and the Winchester Movement and Access Plan Panel had discussed improvements to this junction. However, the proposals at 8 - 22 Chilbolton Avenue had added to the traffic to be generated, and the Sub-Committee now needed to satisfy itself that a comprehensive road improvement scheme was in place before proceeding with the application before it.

In reply, Mr Culhane stated that Hampshire County Council's concerns had been met by the developer and that parking was in excess of the 1.5 standard, as this was the average for the district and was not site-specific. It was accepted that it would be of benefit for the Sub-Committee if an officer from Hampshire County Council Highways Section was present at the meeting to answer the Sub-Committee's questions.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a number of local residents spoke on the application. In summary, points raised included the effect on the character of the area of the proposals, the precedent that would be set and that the proposed dwellings would be three storeys in height. There were potential problems from the accumulated effect of additional cars in the area following completion of this and other schemes. These added to the change of character to the local area. Members of the public asked why policy EN1 had been ignored and whether the Local Design Statement would add additional protection to the area. Additional comments were made on the proposals for traffic calming on Chilbolton Avenue, including central refuges; why a cycle lane had not been provided; whether Kilham Lane had been included in any traffic survey and the present problems encountered by motorists accessing Chilbolton Avenue from Sarum Road.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Love, a Ward Member, added that if this application was approved, then approximately 200 new houses would have permission for construction in the Chilbolton Avenue area and the infrastructure of the area would be put under strain. The local schools were already full and the hospital was experiencing problems. The accumulated effect of development was too much and he asked that any final decision only be taken after the 8 March meeting to discuss the design principles for the Chilbolton Avenue area.

In reply to points raised, Mr Hearn stated that the guidance in PPG3 was a material consideration and where there was conflict with the adopted local plan and PPG3 then PPG3 would take precedence. This was the case with EN1 which did not allow the subdivision of plots. However it was important to appreciate that although PPG3 promoted an increase in density it also emphasised the importance of good design and protecting the character of an area.

Mr Culhane added that two pedestrian refuges would be provided on Chilbolton Avenue and that a cycle lane had not been provided as this had not been requested by the Cycle Advisory Panel when consulted. He added that Hampshire County Council in its traffic studies had not taken into consideration traffic in Kilham Lane due to the nodal split of traffic volumes, but had mostly concentrated on Chilbolton Avenue. However, the Sarum Road access into Chilbolton Avenue had been taken into consideration in

traffic assessments and was judged to be satisfactory within the proposals. Every effort would be made to have a representative of Hampshire County Council in attendance at the Sub Committee's next meeting to answer questions on the wider traffic implications of the proposals on the Chilbolton Avenue area.

Following debate, it was agreed that a further Sub-Committee meeting be held to address a number of issues. These included the wider traffic implications to be addressed by Hampshire County Council; the arrangements for the long-term maintenance for trees on the site and to address issues of overlooking of No. 9 Chilbolton Avenue. In the meantime the applicant would be invited to submit amendments and further information.

RESOLVED:

That a further meeting of the Sub-Committee be held to consider amended plans and to address issues as identified above.

The meeting commenced at 10.45 am and concluded at 13.20 pm.

G Busher  
Chairman

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

**11 March 2005**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)  
Davies (P)  
Johnston (P)

Pearson (P)  
Read (P)  
Sutton(P)

Others in attendance

Councillor Saunders (for Minute # only)

Officers in attendance:

Mr R Ainslie (Senior Planning Officer)  
Miss L Hutchings (Principal Planning Officer)  
Mr S Dunbar-Dempsey (Landscape Officer)  
Mr H Bone (Assistant City Secretary (Legal)) (for Minute 1104 Only)  
Mrs C Tetstall (Assistant Solicitor) (for Minute ## Only)

1103. **INSTALLATION OF A 21.35 METRE HIGH MONOPOLE WITH 2 NO. ANTENNAE, 2 NO. DISHES, 1 NO. EQUIPMENT CABINET AND ANCILLARY EQUIPMENT WITHIN A 2.4M HIGH CHAINLINK FENCED COMPOUND - BARTON FARM, ANDOVER ROAD, WINCHESTER**

The Sub-Committee met at the entrance to the footpath (opposite Halls Farm Close) that led across Barton Farm, Andover Road, Winchester. The Sub-Committee observed from this location a demonstration mast that had been raised to the full height of the proposals (21.35 metres). The site of the proposed mast was approximately 900 metres away at the opposite end of the footpath abutting the railway line and 130 metres to the south of Well House Road.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Henderson representing the applicant's agent, Turner and Partners.

Mr Ainslie explained that a full planning application had been received from O2 (UK) Limited for the installation of a 21.35 metre high monopole with 2 no. antennae, 2 no. dishes, 1 no. equipment cabinet and ancillary equipment within a 2.4 metre high chain link fenced compound.

The Sub-Committee noted that proposed compound was to be located 20 metres to the north of an existing 15 metre high mast positioned in the corner of the field.

In observing the demonstration mast from viewpoints from Andover Road and as they proceeded across the field to the application site; the Sub-Committee noted that the site was in a relatively elevated location. A group of trees and vegetation to the east provided a small element of backdrop to the proposals and also screened them from the Headbourne Worthy area to the south. However, Members noted that the top most portion of the mast would be visible against the skyline.

Mr Ainslie reported that the nearest residential properties to the site were located at Well House Road and were completely screened from the site. Other residential properties at School Lane to the east were over 300 metres away and Courtenay Road to the south east was approximately 600 metres away. The nearest school was Henry Beaufort School, some 900 metres away.

Mr Ainslie advised that 8 additional letters of representation had been received in opposition to the proposals. These detailed concerns of proliferation of masts at this location and impact upon the visual amenity to the area due to lack of screening. The mast would be visible from residential properties, the railway line and the adjacent footpath. Mr Ainslie reported that the City of Winchester Trust had made no comment regarding the application.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Henderson explained that the proposal was intended primarily to extend 3G mobile telecommunications coverage to the railway and secondary coverage to the surrounding residential area of Headbourne Worthy. Mr Henderson also detailed the investigations for alternative siting of the proposals including that for sharing of equipment. These had been all discounted due to not providing the necessary coverage and the fact that two existing masts on the site were tied into a rolling lease break clause. This allowed the landlord to end the lease at any time due to the current uncertainty about the long term development potential of the site. Further to a question, Mr Henderson also confirmed that the proposed equipment cabinet would be no larger than those included in the compound close by.

Mr Dunbar-Dempsey (one of the Council's Landscape Architects) drew the Sub-Committee's attention that although he had no objection to the proposals, he recommended that the any approval of the application should be on condition of the painting the mast and equipment a suitable colour. He suggested that this be 'van-dyke' brown.

In conclusion, Members agreed to support the application as it was considered that the proposals were unlikely to have additional impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding area

**RESOLVED:**

That Planning Permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

01 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.

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

hereby 02 The mast, antennae, fencing and all ancillary equipment 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.

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

Planning 03 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country any Order (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, as amended, or by Part 24 of revoking and re-enacting that Order, no development permitted approval, in Schedule 2 of the Order shall be undertaken without the prior writing, of the Local Planning Authority.

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

04 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.

04 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, T1  
Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: C1, C2, C6, EN5, SF4  
Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised  
Deposit: C1, C5, DP3, DP17, NC3

1104. **(AMENDED PLANS AND DESCRIPTION) PROPOSED 20.4M LATTICE TOWER FOR ORANGE PCS WITH 6 NO. ANTENNA AND 2 NO. 600MM DISH ANTENNA, EQUIPMENT CABIN, METER CABINET ENCLOSED BY 1.1M TIMBER FENCE WITH BARBED WIRE ON TOP - WEEKE DOWN RESERVOIR, LANHAM LANE, WINCHESTER.**

The Sub-Committee met adjacent to the application site at land at Weeke Down Reservoir, Lanham Lane, Winchester

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting approximately 12 members of the public including a nearby resident, Mr Tolley. Also present was a Ward Member for St Barnabas, Councillor Saunders. There were no representatives of the applicant or their agent present as they were unable to attend at short notice due to other commitments and apologies were forwarded via the planning officer to Members.

Miss Hutchings advised that the Sub Committee was being asked to consider minor variations to the existing consent for the installation of telecommunications equipment and also to consider amended plan details clarifying the contextual detail shown on the original approved plans and therefore consider if the implementation of the proposals was being undertaken in accordance with the original consent.

The Sub-Committee noted that the site was located on the Southern Water reservoir that had its south-eastern boundary along the extent of Lanham Lane. The boundary on this side comprised of a bank of trees between 10 and 18 metres in height and a low post and barbed wire fence. This fence continued around the south-western boundary of the reservoir. The site was comprised of varying land levels that rose towards the south-west and fell away across the site towards the north-west.

Miss Hutchings reported that the Sub-Committee was being asked to consider minor amendments to the application that had been granted permission on 5 September 2002 and also to clarify site references on existing and recently submitted plans specifically relating to levels of the land. Miss Hutchings advised that it had been suggested that the development was not being implemented in accordance with the approved plans and that the compound should be at a level 1.6 metres lower than the top of the reservoir (130 metres above sea level) as measured from the approved plan.

Miss Hutchings reminded Members that the original consent comprised a 20.4 metre high lattice tower for Orange PCS Limited with 6 antenna and 2 600mm dish antenna, equipment cabin, meter cabinet enclosed by a 1.1 metre high timber fence with barbed wire on top. The proposed variation was for the replacement of the approved 2.75 metre high equipment cabin with 10 no. 1.9 metre high cabinets on the same footprint. There was also to be a minor change to headframe design with 1 dish antennae instead of 2 (no change to number of panel antennas or orientation). There was also to be squaring of compound to the northern corner and clarification of the appearance of the elevation in reference to top of the reservoir. There was also proposed to be additional under storey planting along the south-eastern boundary.

Mr Dunbar-Dempsey (one of the Council's Landscape Architects) reported that he was satisfied with the amendments and clarifications to the previous consent. He advised that excavations to lower the compound would have damaged tree roots that currently screened the site from Lanham Lane. He considered that the implementation of the approved plans had been undertaken with respect the landscape and that it was unlikely that this could have been undertaken in a better way given the constraints of the site.

Further to questions from members of the public and Councillor Saunders, Mr Bone (Assistant City Secretary (Legal)) confirmed that the principle of development was not in question as permission has been granted for the

compound and equipment. However, the Sub-Committee was being requested to confirm whether it was satisfied that the implementation of the consent had been undertaken in accordance with the approved plans (as clarified by those recently submitted) particularly in terms of levels of the land at this location and reference points used. In cases where it becomes apparent that reference points are inaccurate it would be usual practice to seek amendments clarifying their detail.

A member of the public suggested that the plans should have indicated heights 'above ordnance datum' as this would have assisted in the determination of the mast's actual height in relation to the reservoir and levels of the surrounding land.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Tolley advised that the site compound should be set down lower than the top of the reservoir by 1.6 metres as the reservoir was detailed on an elevation drawing showing the cabin behind it. Following commencement of construction by Orange, it had been observed that the concrete base had been levelled and was therefore actually higher than this point. Mr Tolley therefore reported that the resulting height of the mast would be approximately 2 metres higher than what was originally approved.

Several of the Members pointed out that they had been on the previous site visit when the application was originally approved. Members acknowledged that the relationship between the compound and the reservoir top was not a material factor in determining the original application and that the plan only provided indicative detail of this. Therefore this detail could not be considered alone when assessing compliance and Members noted that this was now more accurately portrayed in the amended plans. Members also took into account the uneven levels on the site and the need for a level compound when considering the height demonstrated by the demonstration mast when originally assessing the application. It was apparent that any intention to set the site down for the base 1.6 metres below the level of reservoir in the southern corner would have entailed cutting into the site considerably to achieve this. This would have resulted in the level of the compound being set down lower at the Lanham Lane end of the site (as levels fall away from the Lane), and would also have created significant disturbances to underground Southern Water utilities. Miss Hutchings advised that the existence of underground utilities had been confirmed by a survey plan showing ducting and water pipes very close and under the compound given to Orange at the pre start meeting by Southern Water.

Miss Hutchings concluded that the base of the compound had been built out at the level of the highest part of the site, and that this was anticipated when the original application was approved. The actual height of the mast allowed for the height of the concrete base beneath and some marginal levelling at this end of the compound. It was therefore considered that the overall height of the mast would be as approved – 20.40 metres in height from ground level with the structure itself 20.20 metres.

Miss Hutchings also advised that the revision of the plans with lower cabinets was acceptable as these would have less visual impact. Additional planting was proposed to screen the compound from views from Lanham Lane.



In conclusion, Members agreed to approve the amendments to the original proposals (included the amended plan) as they were satisfied that the proposed base station was being implemented in the most appropriate way, given the limited detail on the original plans and somewhat inaccurate survey detail with reference to the reservoir lid and road.

RESOLVED:

That amended plans are approved and no further enforcement action be taken.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 12.00pm.

Ch  
airman

