

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

25 May 2005

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

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

Mitchell (P)
Pearce (P)
Pearson (P)
Read (P)
Saunders (P)
Sutton (P)

Deputy Members:

Councillor Chapman (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Stallard and Steel

25. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT**

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Councillor Pearce, who was a new member of the Committee. Following the resignation of Councillor Tait from the Conservative Group, Councillor Chapman would act as a full member of the Committee, until a new appointment was made at the Special Meeting of Council on 29 June 2005.

26. **APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

At the request of a Member, the Committee agreed that voting for the Vice-Chairman should be by voting papers.

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Davies be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Committee for the 2005/2006 Municipal Year.

27. **DATE AND TIME OF MEETINGS**

RESOLVED:

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

28. **PLANNING APPEALS**
(Report PDC546 refers)

The Committee requested that the Director of Development circulate to all Committee Members the appeal decision relating to 55 Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

29. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE**
(Report PDC539 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Telecommunications Sub-Committee held on 21 April 2005 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 21 April 2005 be received.

30. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE**
(Report PDC542 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Telecommunications Sub-Committee held on 9 May 2005 (attached as Appendix B to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 9 May 2005 be received.

31. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**
(Report PDC543 refers)

Councillor Jeffs declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item as he had discussions with New Alresford Town Council regarding the traffic problems within the area. He had indicated that he would speak and vote but he had subsequently left the meeting before consideration of this item.

The Director of Development circulated at the meeting the previous report and recommendations in respect of the application by Alresford Salads (GEEST), The Nythe, Bighton, Old Alresford (ref. W0763/1305/00057/FUL).

The Director of Development stated that since the Viewing Sub-Committee meeting, correspondence had been received from New Alresford Town Council stating that the Town Council had met with GEEST and that a further meeting between the two parties had been arranged for the week commencing 30 May 2005. New Alresford Town Council had requested that the Committee defer making a decision on the application pending the outcome of this meeting, which would discuss amongst other issues traffic using the load road network in Alresford. The Director advised the Committee that the issues relating to traffic would not be made any worse by the application under consideration and the issues raised by New Alresford Town Council could be addressed outside of consideration of the application. He therefore advised the Committee that it would be appropriate to determine the application before it. The Committee agreed with this approach.

The Council's Highway Development Control Engineer was in attendance at the meeting and explained the responsibilities between Hampshire County Council and the City Council for traffic matters. Commenting on the application, he explained that the use of large vehicles by Alresford Salads in narrow country lanes around Alresford was not ideal, but it was a current use. The proposals for a cold store and associated works would have a positive effect in decreasing traffic movements between the application site at The Nythe and Alresford Salads' present site at Manor Farm, which was to be closed.

In answer to Members' questions, the City Secretary and Solicitor also clarified that it was possible for the applicant to enter into a legal agreement that would stop the link between the Nythe site and the Manor Farm site i.e. discontinue lorry movements between Manor Farm, Old Alresford and The Nythe, Bighton Lane, Old Alresford. This would in effect stop the interest of GEEST at Manor Farm. The legal agreement would be binding on the occupiers of the Nythe site only, but after five years it could be varied or discharged by application to the Local Planning Authority.

The Chairman read to the Committee a letter provided by Councillor Jeffs, a Ward Member and member of the Committee who had been unable to stay at Committee for consideration of this item. Councillor Jeff's supported New Alresford Town Council in asking that consideration of the item be deferred until the conclusions of discussions on traffic consultations had been completed.

After discussion, the Committee agreed to grant planning permission as set out in the Schedule of Development Control Decisions which is attached as an appendix to the minutes, to include a legal agreement by the applicant that they would discontinue lorry movements between Manor Farm, Old Alresford and The Nythe, Bighton Lane, Old Alresford.

RESOLVED:

1 That planning permission be granted as set out in the Schedule of Development Control Decisions which forms an appendix to the minutes.

2 That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) sub-Committee held on 10 May 2005 be received.

32. **AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROVISION IN RELATION TO PLANNING APPLICATION REF. W00519/22 - PEEK PLC, HEADBOURNE WORTHY, WINCHESTER**
(Report PDC.540 refers)

The Director of Development reported that the issues contained within the report had been resolved with the applicant to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority prior to the meeting and therefore this report was withdrawn.

RESOLVED:

That the withdrawal of consideration of the report be noted.

33. **APPOINTMENT OF SUB-COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES 2005/2006**
(Report PDC548 refers)

The Committee agreed to rename the Knowle Hospital Sub-Committee the Knowle Village Sub-Committee.

RESOLVED:

1 That the following Sub-Committees be re-appointed and their terms of reference be endorsed as set out in Report PDC548:

- (i) Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee
- (ii) Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee (and that Councillor Bennetts be appointed Chairman and Councillor Read Vice-Chairman of the Sub-Committee for the ensuing Municipal Year)
- (iii) Planning Development Control (Knowle Village) Sub-Committee and that the following Members 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).

- (iv) Planning Development Control (Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester) Sub-Committee and that the following Members be appointed to serve thereon:

Liberal Democrats (4) Bennetts, Beveridge, Johnston, Mitchell (Deputy Sutton);

Conservatives (3) Chapman, Jeffs, Pearson (Deputy Read);

Labour (1) Davies (deputy de Peyer);

Independents (1) Busher (Deputy Hammerton)

- (v) Planning Development Control (Chesil Street, Winchester) Sub-Committee and that the following Members be appointed to serve thereon:

Liberal Democrats (4) Bennetts, Evans, Mitchell, Sutton (Deputy Beveridge);

Conservatives (3) Baxter, Read, Saunders (Deputy Chapman);

Labour (1) de Peyer;

Independents (1) Busher (Deputy Hammerton)

- (vi) Planning Development Control (Police Headquarters, Winchester) Sub-Committee and that the following Members be appointed to serve thereon:

Liberal Democrats (4) Beveridge, Evans, Mitchell and Sutton (deputy Pearce);

Conservatives (3) Jeffs, Pearson, Read (Deputy Saunders);

Labour (1) Davies (Deputy de Peyer);

Independents (1) Busher (Deputy Hammerton)

- (vii) Planning Development Control (Learning Resources Centre, Peter Symonds College, Winchester) Sub-Committee and that the following Members be appointed to serve thereon:

Liberal Democrats (4) Beveridge, Johnston, Mitchell, Sutton (Deputy Evans);

Conservatives (3) Baxter, Chapman, Saunders (Deputy Pearson);

Labour (1) Davies (Deputy de Peyer);

Independents (1) Busher (Deputy Hammerton)

- (viii) That Councillor Johnston (Deputy Baxter) be appointed to the Stockbridge Oil Field Liaison Panel.
- (ix) That the following Sub-Committees be not re-appointed:
 - (a) Planning Development Control (1-7 Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester) Sub-Committee
 - (b) Planning Development Control (Chilbolton Avenue (8-22) Winchester) Sub-Committee
 - (c) Planning Development Control (Royal Observer Corps, Winchester) Sub-Committee
 - (d) Planning Development Control (Hampshire Chronicle, High Street, Winchester) Sub-Committee
 - (e) Planning Development Control (Peeks, Kingsworthy) Sub-Committee
 - (f) Planning Development Control (Lower House, Wickham) Sub-Committee
- (x) That a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Police Headquarters, Winchester) Sub-Committee be held on 9 June 2005, to commence at 2.30 pm in the Walton Room, Guildhall, Winchester, and that a meeting of the Planning Development Control (Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester) Sub-Committee be held on 30 June 2005 to commence at 10.00 am in the Walton Room, Guildhall, Winchester.

34. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**
(Report PDC 549 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 Sutton declared a personal (but not prejudicial interest) in respect of item 4 as she was a member of Colden Common Parish Council, which had considered this item, and she spoke and voted thereon.

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

In respect of item 2 – Cobbles, Stockbridge Road, Sutton Scotney, Mr Kamm, agent, spoke in support of the application and against the officers' recommendation for refusal. The Director of Development updated the Committee that following consultations, Highways had no objection to the application subject to the inclusion of a condition relating to the provision of cycle storage, and Southern Water had no objection subject to the inclusion of a condition relating to drainage. Wonston Parish Council also supported the application subject to conditions. Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse the application as set out.

In respect of item 3 – Carpenters Cottage, Uplands Road, Denmead, Councillor Stallard, a Ward Member, spoke on this item at the invitation of the Chairman. In summary, Councillor Stallard stated that Denmead Parish Council and a number of owners of neighbouring properties had objected to the proposals. The objections related to the size and bulk of the proposals and the impact on the neighbouring property at Uplands Gate through loss of privacy and natural light. Additional factors were impact on the character of the area and detrimental impact on the street scene. There was the potential for overlooking from the rear of the property over Uplands Gate and the development would be close to the neighbouring property's windows. In conclusion she requested that a Planning (Viewing) sub-Committee visit the application site. The Chairman added that Councillor Allgood, a Ward Member, had also written to request a Viewing Sub-Committee to assess impact on the amenity of the neighbour and the effect on the street scene. Following debate, the Committee agreed that the application be determined at Committee without the need for a Viewing Sub-Committee and that planning permission be granted for reasons as set out in the report.

In respect of item 5 – The Dower House, Springvale Road, Headbourne Worthy, Mrs Hartley and Mr. Pearcey, representing Headbourne Worthy Parish Council spoke in objection to the application and Mr Smallman, agent, spoke in support. The Director of Development explained the relevance of the Section 52 Agreement as referred to in the report. The Section 52 Agreement had been made in 1980 by Hampshire County Council to protect the amenities of the area for current residents by restricting further development. Part of the area covered by the current application related to land covered by the Council's countryside policies and on this part of the application site the Section 52 Agreement and its restrictions were still relevant. It was the advice of the City Secretary and Solicitor that a condition could be included if the Committee was minded to grant planning permission that development would not take place until the Section 52 Agreement had been varied to allow development on the part of the application site to which it related. The Director continued that additional representations had been received from Mark Oaten, MP, stating his concerns about the planning history of the site, that development was inappropriate and would affect the level of natural light available to the current residents. Further representation had also been received referring to reduction in light, overshadowing and the restrictions of the Section 52 legal agreement. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Steel, the Ward Member spoke on this item. In summary, Councillor Steel stated that there were concerns of local residents as expressed by Mrs Hartley in her public participation. Councillor Steel had a copy of the Section 52 legal agreement as made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1971, which was a forerunner to the present Section 106 Agreements. The Section 52 Agreement stated that part of the application site should not be developed and should be retained as an amenity area for Headbourne Worthy House. The legal agreement could be amended at a later stage if appropriate. The Dower House was occupied by residents over fifty-five years of age, some of whom were disabled. The proposals would have an impact on the amenity of the area and would dominate the appearance of the area. There was the potential for flooding of the proposed development site due to water run-off from surrounding fields, and maintenance of the site in the future would also need to be resolved. He asked that the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee visit the application site to make an assessment.

In response to points made by Councillor Steel and the public speakers, The Director of Development stated that a condition could be attached to any granting of planning permission to limit the hours of construction between 8 am to 6 pm, Monday to Friday; 8 am to 1 pm on Saturdays and not on Sundays or Bank Holidays. This measure of environmental protection would be appropriate to protect the elderly residents from undue disturbance due to noise and dust during the construction period. It was also proposed that the new development would also be restricted to residents being over fifty-five years in age in order that the existing residents of The Dower House would not be disturbed by the activities of families. As the application proposed a density of development of twenty-one units per hectare, it could not be regarded as being over-development, and if there were future proposals to sub-divide the dwellings then this would be subject to planning permission to be judged on its own merits at the appropriate time. Following debate, the Committee agreed that its Viewing Sub-Committee visit the application site on Friday 17 June 2005 at 9.30 am to assess the layout of the proposed development and the potential impact on the existing residents of The Dower House, Headbourne Worthy.

In respect of item 6 – Unit 2, Bypass Road, Sutton Scotney, Winchester, Mr Davies, applicant, spoke in support of the application and against the officers' recommendation for refusal. The Director of Development stated that additional representations had been received since the report was prepared. Mr Davies, the applicant, had written providing details of the history of the site and that due to a lack of demand he had not been able to let the industrial building, which had a B1 and B8 use (including storage) for a number of years. Wonston Parish Council had supported the application for residential use, stating that Sutton Scotney now had Station Yard and Taylor's Yard which catered for employment uses, but that three residential units would be more appropriate than four. Barratts Builders, who were developing adjacent sites, also supported the site's development for residential use as an employment use was inappropriate for a site now surrounded by residential dwellings. The Council's Highway Development Control Engineer had also objected to the application due to the high speeds of traffic on the A30 Bypass Road and the wide bell-mouth opening to the application site. The proposals did not allow for any service vehicles to access the proposed residential dwellings, which would lead to them parking in the bell-mouth, which was unacceptable. The application could be re-designed to close down the bell-mouth to stop such parking, but this was not shown on the application plans. The Engineer also objected to the proposed car parking provision which should be of a standard of two feet each property, leading to eight in total rather than the six proposed, due to the isolated rural position of the application site.

The Director of Development also detailed to the Committee the Council's policies relating to loss of employment sites and the considerations that Committee needed to take into account in assessing whether the need for housing outweighed the demand for employment sites. In answer to Members' questions, the Director of Development stated that the present industrial unit could be used for storage or light industrial use without

detriment to adjacent residential properties, and that if the present unit on the site was proving difficult to let it may be that a replacement modern industrial unit would be more attractive to potential users. An alternative that might be considered by the Committee could be the provision of affordable housing, which would carry weight to provide an exception to policy. It was also confirmed that the site had not been included for consideration as part of the Local Plan Review. Following debate, the Committee agreed to refuse the application as set

In respect of items not subject to public participation, in respect of item 1 – Cobbles Cottage, Stockbridge Road, Sutton Scotney (case Nos. 05/00824/FUL and Ref. No. W00834/07), the Director of Development reported that amended plans had now been received from the applicant and it was now therefore proposed that the application be determined under the Director of Development's delegated powers. The Committee agreed to this course of action.

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 the application site No 5, The Dower House, Springvale Road, Headbourne Worthy, on Friday 17 June 2005 at 9.30 am and that Councillors Baxter, Bennetts, Beveridge, Busher and Davies be appointed to serve thereon.

35. **MS ABBY FETTES**

The Committee thanked Ms Abby Fettes, Senior Planning Officer, for her work on behalf of the Committee, as she would be embarking on a world tour, to be followed by employment in Australia as a planning officer.

The meeting commenced at 2 pm and concluded at 6.45 pm.

Chairman

APPENDIX A

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

21 April 2005

Attendance:

Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
Busher (P)
Davies (P)

Pearson (P)
Read (P)

Officers in attendance:

Mr R Ainslie (Senior Planning Officer)

36. **5 METRE EXTENSION TO LATTICE TOWER (TOTAL HEIGHT 25.7M), 5 NO. ANTENNAE, 4 NO. DISH ANTENNAE AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT AT EASTON MANOR FARM, FULLING MILL LANE, EASTON**

The Sub-Committee met at the entrance of Easton Manor Farm, Fulling Mill Lane, Easton, near to the application site. The site of the proposed mast was approximately 200 metres across one of the farm's fields and abutted a ridgeline of mature evergreen and deciduous trees.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Raymond who represented the applicant's agent (Patrick Farfan Associates) and Mrs Matthews who represented Itchen Valley Parish Council. No other members of the public were in attendance.

Mr Ainslie explained that a full planning application had been received from Hutchison 3G (UK) Ltd for the erection of a 5 metre extension to an existing lattice tower which was operated by Vodafone. The total height of the structure would measure 25.7 metres and the application also proposed five additional antennae and four dish antennae (three 600mm and one 300mm diameter dish antennae). These additional antennae would result in the mast supporting a total of four dishes. Mr Ainslie also stated that the application proposed a radio equipment housing at the base of the tower.

Mr Ainslie reported that subsequent to the publication of the Sub-Committee's agenda representations had been received from Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Officer who had objected to the application. In summary, they had concluded that whilst proposals to site shared telecommunications equipment were ordinarily encouraged, the proposed mast extension at Easton Manor Farm represented an unacceptable visual intrusion on the surrounding countryside. The ANOB officer also raised particular concerns regarding the application site's likely inclusion in the proposed South Downs National Park.

Mr Ainslie also reported that a letter of strong objection had been received from Itchen Valley Parish Council, stating that there had been no consultation with the local community and that the tower would be seen over a wide area of open downland.

Mr Ainslie stated that the officer's recommendation was to approve the application. Whilst it was accepted that the extension was likely to make the mast more visible, it was probable that the visible intrusion of the mast on the public domain, principally from Fulling Mill Lane and from Worthy Manor across the valley, was unlikely to be considered unacceptable.

During debate, Members agreed that in order to minimise the visual effect of the proposal, the entire mast, all the antennae and the equipment cabinets should be painted a suitable non-reflective colour on the advice of the City Council's Landscape Architect.

In response to Members' questions, Mr Raymond explained that whilst the existing structure was capable of supporting the proposed extension and additional equipment, it could not support a crown design that could achieve the necessary separation between the antennae at the same height. The Sub-Committee therefore noted that the additional height was required to achieve the necessary separation between the antennae of the Hutchison 3G and Vodafone to serve mobile phone customers, principally along a stretch of the M3, north of Winchester. Mr Raymond added that he was unaware of any further proposals from Hutchison 3G for additional telecommunications equipment in the vicinity.

The Sub-Committee discussed the other sites that the applicant had investigated before selecting Easton Manor Farm and it was noted that these would have brought forward a proposal of a similar height to that proposed at Easton Manor Farm. Following debate Members agreed that, of the sites investigated, Easton Manor Farm was the most appropriate.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mrs Matthews spoke in objection to the application as a representative of Itchen Valley Parish Council. Mrs Matthews highlighted that the officer's report stated that there were no public footpaths in the vicinity of the application site and this was, in her assessment, incorrect. She argued that Fulling Mill Lane served only one further property beyond Easton Manor Farm and was, by virtue of its low vehicle use, in effect used as a public footpath by numerous walkers and horseriders.

Mrs Matthews added that contrary to the application's Consultation Plan (published with the agenda for the Sub-Committee), Hutchison 3G had not contacted Itchen Valley Parish Council prior to the submission of the application.

Members also noted with concern that a neighbouring property had not been informed of the proposals by the Council and, although it was acknowledged that the statutory site notices had been posted, Members requested a review of consultation procedures. In response to a Member's question, Mr Ainslie reported that the nearest residential property was approximately 300 metres from the application site.

In her final objection to the proposal, Mrs Matthews agreed with the comments expressed by the ANOB Officer in that the extended mast was likely to have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity of the valley. As a consequence, Mrs Matthews recommended that the Sub-Committee should consider requesting the applicant to submit an application for a separate mast, sited close to the existing Vodafone tower.

At the conclusion of debate, Members discussed the possibility of refusing the application to encourage the submission of an application for a separate mast. Members were mindful of the tall mast proposed by the application, but following the Chairman's casting vote, Members reluctantly approved the application as the Council's policies encouraged mast sharing. The Sub-Committee also agreed to attach a condition to the application so that all the mast, all the antennae and the equipment cabinets were painted a suitable non-reflective colour on the advice of the City Council's Landscape Architect.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

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

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

The mast, antennae, fencing 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.

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

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.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 10.40am.

Chairman

APPENDIX B

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE

9 May 2005

Attendance:

Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)
Davies (P)
Pearson (P)

Read (P)
Sutton(P)

Others in Attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Cook

Officers in attendance:

Miss L Hutchings (Principal Planning Officer)

37. **ERECTION OF 300 MM MICROWAVE DISH MOUNTED ON TRIPOD ON ROOF (RETROSPECTIVE) – BT EXCHANGE BUILDING, STATION ROAD, ALRESFORD.**

The Sub-Committee met close to the application site at Station Road, Alresford.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Lynes representing the applicant, British Telecommunications plc. Also present was a local resident, Mrs Sheppard.

Miss Hutchings explained that a full planning application (retrospective) had been received from British Telecommunications plc for the erection of a 300 mm microwave dish mounted on a tripod on the roof of the Exchange Building, Station Road, Alresford. The equipment was located on the northern corner of a flat roof of the 2 storey building.

The Sub-Committee observed the structure in situ and noted that it was mainly visible through the entrance gates to Alresford Telephone Exchange from Station Road. However, views were limited as the site was set well back and the equipment was relatively small above the building. The dish was oriented at 144 degrees and mounted on a 2.25m high metal tripod. The surrounding area was a mixture of uses including residential, commercial, community facilities, a police station, a sub station and church with the railway station at the end of the busy road.

Miss Hutchings advised that the retrospective full application was only required as the site was within the Alresford Conservation Area. It was confirmed that the Conservation Officer had made no objection to the proposal, although recommended any ensuing consent be on condition that the tripod and dish are painted matt black.

Regarding representations received, Miss Hutchings explained that New Alresford Parish Council had no comments. However in view of comments expressed by mothers of young children the Parish Council had requested that there be further investigation as to whether there were any possible harmful effects from emissions. A further letter had been received from a local resident suggesting that as this was a retrospective application, the equipment in situ should have been removed before determination. Miss Hutchings also advised that officers had recently received a 40signature petition objecting to the structure, although no grounds for objecting were given.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Lynes responded to a number of questions from Members. He explained that 2 electronic components beneath the dish were required to transform radio signals from the dish antennae to electric signals to be carried to the exchange. Miss Hutchings clarified that the application solely related to the dish and that the components did not require planning consent.

Following further discussion, Mr Lynes confirmed that in addition to the dish and tripod being painted an appropriate colour, the components, which for technical reasons could not be painted, could be removed to the interior of the exchange building. It was clarified that the dish was required to complete a fixed radio link to a mast in the Bishops Sutton area at Western Court Farm to complete network coverage to the area.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a local resident Mrs Shepard addressed the Sub-Committee. She expressed concern as to the possible health risks associated with telecommunication equipment.

Councillor Cook (a Ward Member for The Alresfords) addressed the Sub-Committee. Councillor Cook reiterated the concern of some local residents of possible health risks associated with telecommunication equipment.

Although acknowledging the concerns of some local residents, the Sub-Committee noted that although health considerations and the public perception of risk could be taken into account, they were satisfied that due to the provision of appropriate ICNIRP certification and that the beam was not orientated towards any schools, this consideration could not be afforded much weight in comparison to the other material issues. The Sub-Committee was therefore obliged to determine the application with regards to its siting and appearance and impact on the Conservation Area.

Members therefore agreed to support the application as the equipment would not result in any materially harmful impacts on the character of the Conservation Area in accordance with policy. However, it was requested that in addition to the dish and tripod being painted an appropriate colour (matt black), that the 2 electrical components beneath the dish be removed to the interior of the building.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

01 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.

01 Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

02 The electrical components attached to the tripod sited below the 300mm dish antenna hereby approved shall be removed and relocated within the main building of the site, within three months from the date of this permission, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

02 Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the Conservation Area.

03 The antenna, tripod and any other external equipment located on the structure hereby approved, shall be painted matt black within three months of the date of this permission, and thereafter retained that colour, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

03 Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the Conservation Area.

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:UB3, TC1.
Winchester District Local Plan Proposals: EN5, FS4, HG6, HG7.
Emerging Development Plan- WDLP Review Deposit and Revised Deposit: DP3, DP17, HE4, HE5.

The meeting commenced at 9.35am and concluded at 10.15am.

Chairman