

## PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

24 September 2003

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)  
Bennetts (P)  
Beveridge (P)  
Davies (P)  
de Peyer (P)  
Evans (P)  
Hatch (P)  
Hammerton (P)

Johnston (P)  
Nunn (P)  
Pearce (P)  
Pearson (P)  
Read (P)  
Sutton (P)  
Tait (P)

Others in attendance:

Councillors Bailey, Nelmes and Mather

---

419. **MEMBERSHIP OF SUB-COMMITTEES, ETC**

RESOLVED:

1. That Councillor Davies replace Councillor de Peyer on the Planning Development Control (Police Headquarters, Winchester) Sub-Committee.

2. That a Planning Development Control (Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester) Sub-Committee be established with terms of reference to consider the application relating to 8 – 22 Chilbolton Avenue, Winchester, and to recommend to the Planning Development Control Committee and that the following Members be appointed to serve thereon:-

Lib Dems – Councillors Beveridge, Hatch, Nunn, Pearce and Sutton;

Conservatives – Councillors Baxter and Pearson;

Labour – Councillor Davies;

Independent – Councillor Busher.

That the first meeting of the Sub-Committee be held at 9.30am on Monday, 13 October 2003, to commence with a site visit to be followed by a meeting at The Guildhall, Winchester. (Subsequent to the meeting, the times were amended to be 11.00am on site and 2.00pm in the Guildhall, Winchester).

420. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (POLICE HEADQUARTERS, WINCHESTER) SUB-COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC348 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Police Headquarters, Winchester) Sub-Committee held on 9 September 2003 (attached as Appendix D to the minutes).

The Committee noted that the site visits to the Police Headquarters, Romsey Road, Winchester, and also to view similar building cladding to that proposed, would take place on Monday, 29 September 2003.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Police Headquarters, Winchester) Sub-Committee held on 9 September 2003 be received.

421. **PLANNING (VIEWING) SUB-COMMITTEE**

(Report PDC350 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 10 September 2003 (attached as Appendix E to the minutes).

Councillor Evans declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of the application relating to Mislingford Livery Stables, Bishops Wood Road, Mislingford, Fareham, and left the meeting during this item's consideration.

The Director of Development Services stated that in respect of the application relating to land opposite Moorhill Coach House, St Annes Lane, Shedfield, Hampshire, negotiations were continuing with the applicant and that this item stood deferred until their satisfactory conclusion.

Also, in respect of Mislingford Livery Stables, Bishops Wood Road, Mislingford, the Council's Landscape Architect's comments had now been received. These were satisfactory but further information was required on the topography. In addition, the comments of the Council's Arboricultural Officer had been received and he suggested that a condition be included to protect trees to the north of the site by means of a fence. The fence should be erected prior to development commencing.

The Committee agreed to these additional conditions and in response to a Member's question, it was accepted that an informative be added that the stable doors should be kept closed whenever possible.

RESOLVED:

That the deferral of the item relating to land opposite Moorhill Coach House, St Annes Lane, Shedfield, be noted and that, subject to the inclusion of an additional condition to protect trees on the site, and corrections to Recommendation 5 and 6 to add reasons for the conditions, as set out in the schedule which forms an appendix to the minutes, the minutes of the meeting of the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee held on 10 September 2003 be approved and adopted.

422. **PLANNING APPEALS – SUMMARY OF DECISIONS**  
(Report PDC342 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

423. **CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS**  
(Report PDC345 refers)

The Director of Development Services explained that in respect of TPO1791 – land at Quarry Road, Winchester, the goat willow (T7) had been incorrectly named and would now be excluded from the order.

RESOLVED:

That having taken into consideration the representations received, that Tree Preservation Order 1790 be confirmed and that, subject to the exclusion from the order of T7, Tree Preservation Order 1791 be confirmed.

424. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (NORTHGATE HOUSE, STAPLE GARDENS, WINCHESTER) SUB-COMMITTEE**  
(Report PDC344 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the Planning Development Control (Northgate House, Staple Gardens, Winchester) Sub-Committee held on 21 August 2003 (attached as Appendix B to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Northgate House, Staple Gardens, Winchester) Sub-Committee held on 21 August 2003 be received.

425. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (ANTRIM HOUSE) SUB-COMMITTEE**  
(Report PDC349 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the Planning Development Control (Antrim House) Sub-Committee held on 21 August 2003 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Antrim House) Sub-Committee held on 21 August 2003 be received.

426. **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB-COMMITTEE**  
(Report PDC343 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the Planning (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 1 September 2003 (attached as Appendix C to the minutes).

Councillor Busher declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of the item relating to Botley Road, Bishops Waltham and remained in the meeting as the minutes were received without discussion.

The Director of Development Services reported that in respect of the application at Pondsides Farm, New Road, Meonstoke, the applicant had now agreed for the equipment cabins to be painted a suitable green colour.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 1 September 2003 be noted.

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

(Report PDC347 refers)

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 11 September 2003 (attached as Appendix F to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Development Control (Telecommunications) Sub-Committee held on 11 September 2003 be received.

428. **EAST HORTON GOLF CENTRE, MORTIMERS LANE, FAIR OAK**

(Report PDC352 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the Section 106 Agreement dated 10 April 2002 in respect of East Horton Farm, Mortimers Lane, Fair Oak, be varied to remove the covenant restricting use of the clubhouse and bar to golf-related use only.

429. **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**

(Report PDC346 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 Evans declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of items 9 and 23 and left the meeting during their consideration.

Councillor Pearson declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of item 10 and left the meeting during its consideration.

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal interest (but not prejudicial) in respect of items 3, 8, 16, 17 and 22 as comments on the applications had been received from the City of Winchester Trust, of which he was a Member. He also declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of item 9, which stood deferred and was not debated.

Councillor Davies declared a personal interest (but not prejudicial) in respect of items 3, 5, 6, 8, 15, 16, 17 and 22, as comments on these applications have been received from the City of Winchester Trust, of which he was a City Council appointed Member.

Councillor Davies also declared a personal interest (but not prejudicial) in respect of items 5, 11 and 12 on the main agenda.

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

In respect of items 1 and 2 – Winnall Down Farm, Fair Lane, Winchester, Mr Curley spoke against the application and Mr Fraser spoke in support. Following consideration, the Committee agreed to support the applications as set out.

In respect of item 3 – 12 Fordington Road, Winchester, Dr Bennett spoke against the application and Mr Lee spoke in support. Following debate, the Committee were of the opinion that the proposals would adversely effect the character of the area as the street scene would be affected by the break in the rhythm of the present semi-detached dwellings, and agreed to defer the application for reasons for refusal to be brought to its next meeting.

In respect of item 4 – Hall Farm, East End, West Meon, Mr Kratz spoke in support of the application and against the Officers' recommendation for refusal. The Director of Development Services added that comments had now been received from the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Officer and the Planning Panel who commented that the building proposed was satisfactory but could not warrant an exception under Planning Policy Guidance Note 7. There was no real connection between the farmhouse and the land and no justification for the increase in size over the existing dwelling. Following debate, the Officers' recommendation for refusal was supported as set out.

In respect of items 5 and 6 – 14 Greenhill Close, Winchester, Mrs James spoke against the application and Mrs Hauser spoke in support. The Director of Development Services reported that representation had been received regarding a number of issues which objectors felt had not been covered by the report. These included overlooking (it was explained that the bathroom would now include obscure glazing) and noise and disturbance during construction (which could be reported via the Environmental Health Department if a problem arose). In conclusion of considering the application, the Committee agreed that its Viewing Sub-Committee should visit the site on 6 October 2003 in order that issues relating to highways, site constraints, the relationship to neighbouring properties including overlooking and relative heights could be assessed.

In respect of item 6 – 15 Sparkford Close, Winchester, Mr Frost spoke against the application and Mrs Hauser spoke in support. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Mather, a Ward Member, addressed the Committee. In summary, she stated that the proposed development would not be on vacant land but was, in fact, a small rear garden backed by substantial trees, which had been sheared off. Although very cramped, the rear garden provided a breathing space within the development. There was also local concern at the proposed increase in density in Sparkford Close. There were already a lot of student bedsits with cars being parked over lawns and pavements and the balance of the neighbourhood between families and students needed to be considered. The proposals would result in an increased use of an over-occupied cul-de-sac with density proposed at 188 units per hectare which was much higher density than the minimum 33

dwellings per hectare under PPG3. The Director of Development Services explained that the proposals were for a single residential unit and that the proposals fell short of requirements for the definition of a house in multiple occupation. Following debate, the Committee agreed that its Viewing Sub-Committee should also visit this application site on 6 October 2003 to assess the relative position of the proposed dwelling to those existing and the spaces that would exist between them.

In respect of item 10 – Swanmore Park Farm, Park Lane, Swanmore, Mrs Brown spoke against the application and Mr Main spoke in support. The Director of Development Services reported the comments from the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Officer to the Committee. Following debate, the Committee supported the application as set out.

In respect of items 13 and 14 – 3 Swanmore Park, Park Lane, Swanmore, Mrs Stokes spoke against the application. The Committee were of the opinion that it had insufficient information as submitted by the applicant on which to base its decisions and, therefore, agreed to defer the applications for reasons for refusal to be brought to its next meeting. It was also requested that the Council's Arboricultural Officer visit the application sites.

In respect of item 20 – Brooklyn, Main Road, Otterbourne, Mr Warne spoke against the application and Mr Brane spoke in support. The Director of Development Services reported that Southern Water had now commented and had no objections to the revised proposals both in terms of the disposal of surface water and foul sewerage. It was noted that works to provide a new foul sewerage system would not be completed until March 2005. He added that details for a cycle store were still awaited.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Bailey, a Ward Member, spoke on this item. In summary, she stated that the amendments proposed might appear minor but they did have a wider knock-on effect. The issues involved the increase in scale and density. It was a H1 frontage development site and higher density was encouraged under PPG3, but this could only be if the development complied with Policies EN5 and EN13. However, the Manor House design was large and inappropriate for such a small plot. Surrounding properties were modest and the proposals would be overwhelming and contrary to Policy EN5.1. The extra two units proposed would decrease parking provision to 1.28 spaces per unit, with no provision for off-site spill-over parking due to its location adjacent to the main road, and a small adjacent cul-de -sac. The bus route only served Southampton and Winchester and a car would be required to visit other parts of the district, leading to pressure on the site. The local sewage system was overloaded and it would be 2 years before the sewer would be upgraded. Flooding problems last Christmas had led to raw sewage being deposited on the site. In conclusion, she stated that the density of 67 units per hectare would be catastrophic for the site.

The Director of Development Services explained that, although planning permission on the site had not been issued as the public open space agreement had not been completed, the principle of development and style had been established by the Committee's previous resolution to grant permission. The revised proposal was seen as a small change to a sustainable project and, although accepting the comments made by Southern Water regarding the capacity of the sewage system, this was not a material consideration. He added that the proposals would be wildlife friendly and that water protection would take place.

Subject to the inclusion of details on the cycle storage on the site, the Committee agreed to support the Officers' recommendation for approval as set out.

In respect of item 21 – Daisy Cottage, Forrester Road, Soberton, Mr Bailey spoke against the application and Mr Packer spoke in support. After consideration, the Committee supported the application as set out.

In respect of item 22 – Winchester Delivery Office, Middle Brook Street, Winchester, Mrs Nation and Mr Weeks (on behalf of the Winchester Residents Association) spoke against the application and Mr Hecks spoke in support. In introducing the item, the Director of Development Services detailed further letters of support and objection that had been received since the Officers' report had been written. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Nelmes, a Ward Member, spoke on this item. In summary, she stated that it was a Council policy to encourage people to live in the town centre, but this policy was being effected by the problems associated with excessive alcohol drinking on an evening. She was concerned at the proposed late leaving times for clientele and the conflict that might be caused with nearby residents and also the conflict between vehicles and pedestrians at the car park entrance and egress in Tanner Street. She was not against such an establishment, but its location needed to be properly considered. She also commented on the base noise that could be problematic and she urged the Committee to refuse the application.

In response to Members' questions, the Director of Development Services explained that the Council needed to be careful not to sterilise this part of the town during the lead-in time to the Broadway/Friarsgate re-development. Proposals for its use, however, needed to be short-term as not to compromise the future long-term plans for the re-development. It was also necessary in Condition 2 of the recommendation to define which neighbouring residential properties would be affected by the proposals. A revised recommendation was circulated at the meeting with the Chairman's consent which deleted Condition 3 "the proposal is premature in that it is not in accordance with the adopted Local Plan". The Committee also noted that provision had been made in the Broadway/Friarsgate Development Brief to include a night club if required. Following debate, the Committee agreed to support the Officers' recommendation for refusal subject to the Director of Development Services being authorised to amend the wording of Condition 1 to define which neighbouring residential properties would be affected.

In respect of item 16 – Old Market House, High Street, Winchester, the Director of Development Services reported that more detail was required on the Section 278 Agreement regarding highways and the arrangements for safe pedestrian access and the provision for service vehicles to access The Square. A number of Members questioned whether further evidence should be obtained from the applicant that the property had been fully marketed to see if there were any potential takers for its commercial use, prior to allowing part of the units to be converted for residential use. However, after debate it was agreed to support the application as set out subject to the inclusion of a Section 278 Agreement being obtained.

In respect of items 18 and 19 – Land off Claylands Road, Bishops Waltham, in answer to Members' questions, the Director of Development Services explained that a bund would be included as part of the boundary treatment through the landscape condition and it was also agreed that the possibility of introducing traffic calming on Claylands Road would be progressed by the Chairman of the

Committee, together with the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Access via Bishops Waltham Parish Council.

RESOLVED:

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

2. That the Planning (Viewing) Sub-Committee visit application sites numbers 5 and 6 on Monday, 6 October 2003 and that Councillors Busher, dePeyer, Hatch, Johnston and Sutton be appointed to serve thereon.

3. That items 3 and 13 and 14 be deferred for reasons for refusal to be brought to the Committee's next meeting.

430. **BYRON AVENUE TELECOMMUNICATIONS MAST APPEAL**  
(Report PDC351 refers)

The City Secretary and Solicitor informed the Committee that, in summary, the Planning Inspectorate had upheld the appeal by Orange and had awarded partial costs against the City Council. He stated that the report set out ways in which the decisions could be challenged should the Council choose to do so.

In the public participation part of the meeting, Mrs J Abbiss representing AABAM spoke in respect of the item. In summary, she stated that those involved with the Byron mast appeal were shocked by the Inspector's decision. The Inspector's decision had now been shared with Counsel, David Woolf, who advised that there were grounds to challenge both the planning appeal and the cost decision.

The City Secretary and Solicitor added that a letter had also been received from Mr and Mrs Wilson regarding points raised in the Inspector's decision and whether they had been accurately recorded. The points raised related to the ICNIRP Guidelines.

The City Secretary and Solicitor continued that the deadline for taking action was 30 September 2003 and if the Council chose to lodge an appeal, then the basis of the challenge would need to be lodged by this date.

In answer to Members' questions, the City Secretary and Solicitor stated that the cost to be claimed by Orange were at this stage not known. They related to only a partial award of costs based on the health issues, but this was a significant part of the appeal in terms of Counsel's time, witnesses, etc, and, therefore, the costs could be significant and had been estimated by AABAM at between £30,000 - £50,000. He further clarified in response to Members' questions that the City Council had not received a copy of the AABAM's Counsel's opinion but had received its own advice and this was circulated to Members by means of a supplementary agenda and would be discussed under exempt business. A Member added that he encouraged all Committee Members to read the Inspector's letter regarding costs which he thought set out quite clearly the options open to the Council in their consideration of the report.



The Chairman thanked the representatives of AABAM for their attendance at the meeting and the Committee agreed to consider Counsel's opinion under exempt business (detail in exempt minute).

Following discussions under Exempt Business, it was resolved that both decisions should not be challenged.

431. **LAND AT NORTHFIELDS FARM, TWYFORD, HUMPHREYS FARMS LTD**  
(Report PDC353 refers)

Members noted that this item had not been notified for inclusion on the agenda within the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept the item as a matter requiring urgent consideration due to the need to decide whether to defend the application for judicial review when the application has been made or whether to reconsider the application for planning permission.

In introducing the report, the City Secretary and Solicitor informed the Committee that Twyford Parish Council had sought a legal opinion on the City Council's decision to grant planning permission for the conversion of redundant agricultural buildings to light industrial research and design studio, warehouse and storage uses at SJD Humphreys Holdings, Northfields Poultry Farm, Northfields, Twyford, Winchester. In view of the possible challenge by way of judicial review, there were two options available to the City Council. The first option was to agree to re-determine the application and the second was to defend the challenge for judicial review if and when received.

In response to a Member's question, Mr Humphreys, who was present at the meeting and spoke with the Chairman's permission, clarified that in response to an informative within the original planning permission, that negotiations had now taken place with the Highway Authority to seek highways improvements and the applicant was now close to completing an Agreement with Hampshire County Council which required a lorry routing programme and a financial contribution of approximately £37,500.

The Council had been made aware of the Counsel's opinion received by Twyford Parish Council in respect of its judicial review challenge and the Council's response would be discussed by the Committee during exempt session. (Detail in exempt minute). The Chairman thanked Mr Humphreys for his attendance at the meeting and stated that any decision of the Committee would be relayed to his agent.

432. **REG HAWKES**

This would be the last meeting that Reg Hawkes, Planning Officer, would be attending, and the Chairman and the Committee thanked Mr Hawkes for his work on behalf of the Council during his time at Winchester.

433. **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>   |
|----------------------|--|--|
| 434 & 436            | Byron Avenue Telecom Mast Appeal               | 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:-<br>(a) any legal proceedings by or against the authority, or<br>(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). |
| 435 & 437            | Northfields Farm, Twyford, Humphreys Farms Ltd |  |

434. **BYRON AVENUE TELECOMMUNICATIONS MAST APPEAL**  
(Report PDC351 refers)

The Committee considered a report which updated Members on the appeal decision in respect of Orange's application for prior approval for the siting of a mobile phone mast in Byron Avenue, Winchester, and provided Counsel's opinion on whether the Council might decide to challenge the Inspector's decision on the appeal itself, or on the award of costs (detail in exempt minutes).

435. **LAND AT NORTHFIELDS FARM, TWYFORD, HUMPHREYS FARMS LTD**  
(Report PDC353 refers)

The Committee considered a report which drew to Members' attention a possible challenge by way of judicial review by Twyford Parish Council against the City Council's decision to grant planning permission for the conversion of redundant agricultural buildings to light industrial research and design studio, warehouse and storage uses at SJD Humphrey Holdings, Northfields Poultry Farm, Northfields, Twyford, Winchester, and whether the City Council should defend the application for judicial review when the application has been made or whether to reconsider the application for planning permission. The City Secretary and Solicitor provided further legal advice at the meeting (detail in exempt minute).

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and concluded at 7.00pm.

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (ANTRIM HOUSE) SUB-COMMITTEE**

**21 August 2003**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Bennetts (P)  
Evans (P)  
de Peyer (P)  
Johnston (P)

Nunn (P)  
Pearson (P)  
Sutton (P)  
Tait (P)

Officers in attendance:

Mrs S Proudlock, Planning, Team Manager (DC West)

---

438. **PROPOSED NEW BOARDING HOUSE FOR WINCHESTER COLLEGE, ANTRIM HOUSE, ST CROSS ROAD, WINCHESTER**  
(Report PDC333 refers)

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting the applicant's architect (Mr Deans from Architecture PLB) and three members of the public.

The Chairman declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in this item as her sons had attended Winchester College several years previously. She continued to participate in the meeting and to vote thereon.

Mrs Proudlock explained that the Planning Development Control Committee had considered the application on 24 July 2003 and had deferred its decision pending further investigation by this Sub Committee.

The application proposed the partial demolition of Antrim House (for which Conservation Area Consent was not required) and the erection of a new boarding house, comprising accommodation and facilities for 65 students, houses for the Housemaster and his assistant, and a flat for the matron.

It was noted that the Conservation Officer was satisfied with the retention of Antrim House (but with the unattractive extension removed) and regarded the new design as attractive, with sympathetic use of materials.

It was also noted that eight letters of objection had been received which, in summary, objected to the proposals on the following grounds:-

- contrary to policies EN1 and EN2
- detriment to neighbouring properties
- loss of open space
- detriment to view
- loss of public amenity
- too large and imposing
- precedent

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Deans from Architecture PLB addressed the Sub Committee. He explained that the new application would retain the medical centre within Antrim House, and the flat roofed extension built in 1982 would be removed. The area of the proposed building was smaller than the original application and had been reduced from 3,000sq.m. to 2,400sq.m. There was dormitory style accommodation planned for boys in years 1 and 2, with individual study bedrooms, a mix of single and twin rooms, proposed for boys in years 3, 4 and 5. Other rooms included a kitchen, dining area, lounge and games room.

The proposed building would be 12m from the largest tree on the site, which was a copper beech. More trees would be introduced at the end of the proposed Housemaster's dwelling to strengthen the tree line along St Cross Road.

In answer to a Member's question regarding policies EN1 and EN2, Mrs Proudlock advised the Sub Committee that the policy did not preclude development within these areas of open space. In certain circumstances where there was a specific need such as additional buildings for educational establishments such developments could be undertaken provided it could be accommodated without harming the overall appearance of the open area.

A Member asked if Winchester College intended to establish a central dining area in the future. In response, Mr Deans advised that he understood the central dining proposal was an alternative to this application at Antrim House. He continued that Winchester College was prepared to accept a condition stating that no other development be allowed in Kingsgate Park.

In answer to Members' further questions, Mr Deans confirmed that the proposed Housemaster's dwelling had been reduced in size from 280sqm. to 200sq.m and was now 4 bedrooms within 2 storeys, reduced from 5 bedrooms within 3 storeys. He also confirmed width measurements of the proposed villa of 12.6m, and the library of 11.5m.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Chair of the Residents Association of Hanover Lodge addressed the Sub Committee. She advised that the residents broadly supported the revised proposal, although they were concerned that other applications to develop in similar areas may arise if permission was granted. In response, Mrs Proudlock explained that all applications must be considered on their individual merits and that the possible creation of a precedent was not, of itself, a valid reason for refusal.

Another member of the public, representing local residents, addressed the Sub Committee. She was concerned that the scale of the proposal was too large and the design poor, and requested that detailed plans be placed on view in Kingsgate Park so that local residents could see how much of Kingsgate Park would be lost.

Mr Keeley suggested that it may be useful to mark out the proposed buildings on site. He continued that he was not concerned about the views of the park as there were many trees. However, he was concerned that the low pitched roof may appear flat from the ground and would prefer the pitch to be increased.

During debate, several Members expressed concern at the loss of part of Kingsgate Park and the overall height and size of the Housemaster's dwelling. It was suggested that representatives from Winchester College be invited to the next meeting, as it would be useful to know its policy with regard to accepting girl students in future and also the issue of centralised dining.

It was also suggested that the Sub Committee reconvene at a future date for a site visit followed by a public meeting. Mr Deans agreed to contact Winchester College to investigate this possibility.

RESOLVED:

That the application be deferred for further information from Winchester College and a site visit be arranged to view the proposed buildings, which should be marked out on site prior to the visit.

The meeting commenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 3.20pm.

Chairman

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (NORTHGATE HOUSE, STAPLE GARDENS,  
WINCHESTER) SUB-COMMITTEE**

**21 August 2003**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

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

Nunn (P)  
Pearce (P)  
Read (P)  
Sutton (P)

Others in Attendance:

Councillor Nelmes

Officers in Attendance:

Mrs S Proudlock (Team Manager, Planning)  
Ms E Norgate (Senior Planner)  
Mr D Keeley (Conservation Officer)

---

439. **PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION  
OF 74 DWELLINGS AND 4 COMMERCIAL UNITS, NORTHGATE HOUSE,  
STAPLE GARDENS, WINCHESTER.**

(Report PDC332 refers)

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting the applicant's architect, Mr Dean from PLB, and approximately fifteen members of the public.

Mrs Proudlock explained that the original applications relating to part of the site had been withdrawn. Members had initially deferred consideration of these applications pending the submission of applications covering the whole site.

The current proposal had been received as two applications. The first had proposed the demolition of the buildings within the site. These were Northgate House and Documentation House that were both 1960s office buildings, formerly occupied by SCATS, that added little to the character of the conservation area. The third building to be demolished was an occupied Victorian detached dwelling, 19 Staple Gardens, which officers had unsuccessfully requested to be listed by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. However, this building was not easily visible from Staple Gardens or Tower Street, but Mr Keeley commented that the case for its demolition had not been sufficiently justified.

The second application proposed the construction of four blocks, incorporating parking and landscaped areas for 74 dwellings and four commercial units. Block A would be a three storey building onto Tower Street that increased to a four storey building onto Staple Gardens to maximise the change in levels. This block

would comprise of one and two bedroom units. Block B would extend along the northern boundary of the site and would be primarily a three storey building with a single element at four storeys. This block would comprise one office unit on the ground floor with one and two bedroom flats above. Block C would be three and four storeys and would comprise one and two bedroom units with car parking beneath. Block D was proposed to front onto Staple Gardens and be four storeys in height with underground car parking. This block would have three office units on the ground floor with the remainder of the building to provide one and two bedroom units.

Mrs Proudlock reported on the consultations that the officers had conducted in respect of the applications. The Director of Environment at the County Council had requested that the developer complete a traffic prediction and flow study before commenting on the highway implications of the scheme. The Director had also commented on the need for the developer to make a contribution to the Winchester and Movement Access Plan and to produce a travel plan in relation to the operation of the offices.

The Sites and Monuments Officer had commented that it was likely that any archaeological artefacts would have been lost during the construction of Northgate House and Documentation House and had therefore recommended that a "watching brief" be held over the construction of the new development.

The Urban Designer had commented that the scale of the buildings was too big and that the roof lines were out of character with the surrounding properties. He had also raised concerns at the visibility of the underground car parks and the overlooking of the public footpath through the site.

Mrs Proudlock reported that whilst the Architect's Panel had broadly welcomed the scheme, the City of Winchester Trust had raised a number of concerns including that the density of the development was too great at 164 dwellings per hectre. Other comments of objection had been received from a neighbouring business, Drewett Neat, and local residents.

On behalf of the applicant, Mr Deans explained that the application had been amended in response to these comments. The amended application had reduced the height of Block A by one storey to a three storey building. As a result of this and other changes, the density was reduced to 151 dwellings per hectre. He explained that the proposed density was typical of the surrounding area and added that the calculation of densities at any development was partly subjective.

In response to the comments on the massing of Block C, Mr Deans proposed that this block should be split into two, although it would not be any closer to the boundaries of the surrounding buildings.

Mr Deans explained that the affordable housing, Block B, would be located close to the Winchester Housing Association's existing property at 21/22 Staple Gardens, at the request of the Housing Association.

A number of comments were made regarding the character of the development and Mr Keeley commented that the design of Block A and its relationship with the corner would be closely examined when the application was resubmitted. Mr Deans explained that the majority of the roofs would be slate with large overhanging eaves and that the varying range of roof heights echoed the character of the area.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Weekes spoke as a representative of the Winchester Residents' Association and commented that the scheme did not meet the conservation area policies of the emerging Local Plan as it was not sympathetic to the surrounding buildings, nor did it enhance or promote the conservation area. In response, Mr Keeley explained that there was an inherent conflict between PPG15 and PPG3, but that in conservation terms it was considered that the majority of materials proposed for the development were suitable.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a representative of the City of Winchester Trust stated that the Trust was concerned by the design of the front elevation onto Staple Gardens. Whilst several members of the public recommended that the site would be more appropriate to the development of small terraced houses, Mr Deans explained that this would not make the scheme economically viable.

In response to a Member's question, Mr Deans confirmed that some of the roofs were flat to accommodate sufficient units to make the development viable but agreed to re-examine the overlooking of neighbouring properties from these rooftop units.

Further to concern about the effect the development would have on the area's parking and traffic problems, and that this was likely to increase as a result of nearby new developments, Mr Deans stated that the current buildings had spaces for 71 cars whilst the development proposed spaces for 57 cars and that the design of the car parks would be re-evaluated.

Mr Deans also noted the traffic problems along Five Corners Lane and explained that a speed bump would be placed in Tower Street outside the development for a pedestrian crossing.

It was noted that Serco had been consulted over the collection of refuse from the development and the single carriageway entrance to the site was sufficiently large enough to accommodate the refuse lorries. However the entrance was unlikely to be able to accommodate removal lorries and Mr Deans agreed to investigate the possibility of creating enough room for a drop-off zone.

In response to a suggestion to re-open Tower Road to general traffic, a representative of the Theatre Royal explained that this road had been closed partially to close off a rat-run and to aide the delivery of heavy scenery etc. to the theatre.

The Sub-Committee discussed the security and safety aspects of the development and Mr Deans explained that the footpaths and open spaces would be overlooked by living rooms to minimise the risk of anti-social behaviour. It was noted that officers would consult with the Police to encourage "security by design."

Members also expressed a wish for a play area to be included within the scheme and Mr Deans explained that a play area was unlikely to be used as most of the development was one and two bedroom units and therefore unlikely to have young families. It was also noted that an off-site open space contribution was likely to be agreed through a Section 106 agreement.

Members questioned the provision of cycle storage and Mr Deans confirmed that there would be adequate storage for one cycle per unit at the development.



Councillor Nelmes spoke as a Ward Member on her concerns about the traffic implications of the development, the lack of open spaces and play areas on site. She also questioned the lack of lifts in the affordable housing block. Mr Deans explained that none of the two and three storey blocks on the development had any lifts and that the housing association had indicated a reluctance to install them because of the cost of maintenance.

In response to Councillor Nelmes' comments, Mr Deans agreed to invite the Ward Members to future meetings between the developers and local residents.

Mrs Proudlock stated that the revised plans would be re-advertised and she anticipated that it would be considered by Members at a late autumn meeting of the Planning Development Control Committee.

At the conclusion of the meeting, Members thanked Mr Deans for responding to the public comments in the submission of revised plans. It was agreed that any decision should be deferred for further consideration in the light of the amended plans.

**RESOLVED:**

That the application be deferred for further consideration in the light of amended plans.

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and concluded at 12.00pm

Chairman

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (TELECOMMUNICATIONS) SUB  
COMMITTEE

1 September 2003

Attendance:

Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)  
Pearson (P)

Sutton (P)

Officers in attendance:

Ms A Fettes (Senior Planner)  
Ms E Norgate (Senior Planner)

- 
440. **CONSIDERATION OF A FULL PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE REPLACEMENT OF THE EXISTING 20 METRE MAST WITH NEW 20 METRE LATTICE TOWER, TO INSTALL EXISTING ANTENNAE AND DISHES OF ALL OPERATORS FROM EXISTING TO NEW TOWER, INSTALL NEW AIRWAVE AND ORANGE EQUIPMENT, EXTEND COMPOUND TO ACCOMMODATE PROPOSAL AND ALL ANCILLARY EQUIPMENT AT PONDSIDE FARM, NEW ROAD, MEONSTOKE.**

The Sub-Committee met at the application site at Pondside Farm, New Road, Meonstoke. There were no public, Ward Member, or representatives of the Parish Council nor applicant present at the meeting.

Ms Fettes explained that a full planning application had been submitted on behalf of MM02 Airwave to replace the existing 20 metre lattice tower with a new 20 metre permanent lattice tower, to re-install all the existing equipment that was used by the operators Orange, O2 and T-Mobile, and to install new additional equipment for Airwave.

Members noted that an application for an Airwave temporary slimline pole had been granted by the Sub-Committee at its meeting on 25 July 2003 and that if granted, this equipment would be transferred onto the permanent structure. The Planning Permission stipulated that the temporary structure would be dismantled prior to 28 July 2004.

Ms Fettes stated that the proposal would not increase the visual impact of the existing mast on the area of outstanding natural beauty and that no representations had been received in respect of the application. Ms Fettes also reported that the electromagnetic radiation levels were within the guidance of the NRPB and ICNIRP codes and she recommended its approval.

During the discussion, Members requested that the equipment cabins should be painted green and that landscaping should be planted around the enclosure to

reduce its visual impact. In response to Members' comments, Ms Fettes agreed to confirm with the agent the precise location of the new mast, so as to ensure that it was as screened as much as possible by the trees to the north.

In conclusion, Members agreed the application as the proposals would not further deteriorate the visual amenity of the area beyond that of the existing mast, subject to the suitable painting of the equipment cabins and landscaping.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be granted subject to the suitable painting of the equipment cabins and landscaping.

1. 1FUL  
1FULR

2. That the equipment and electric cabinets within the compound should be painted BS 12C39 unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, as the site is within the East Hampshire Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the proposed South Downs National Park.

3. That a landscaping buffer should be planted around the compound, consisting of a native mix of 45% Hawthorn, 45% Blackthorn and 10% Holly, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The plants shall be a staggered row with 600mm between rows and planted at 600mm centres. The new planting shall be completed before the end of the first planting season following the completion of the development hereby permitted, and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, as the site is within the East Hampshire Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the proposed South Downs National Park.

441. **CONSIDERATION TO EXTEND THE EXISTING MAST BY 3.5M TO ACCOMMODATE ADDITIONAL 3NO. ANTENNAS AT THE CELLNET MAST, BOTLEY ROAD, BISHOPS WALTHAM.**

The Sub-Committee met at the application site at The Cellnet Mast, Botley Road, Bishops Waltham. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting the landowner, Mr Underwood, five representatives of the applicant and a Ward Member, Councillor Chamberlain.

Ms Norgate explained that a full planning application had been received from Airwave to extend the existing 25 metre tower by 3.5 metres to accommodate re-located Orange antenna and three new Sigma antenna for Airwaves MM02. The total height of the tower including the Sigma antenna was 30.8 metres. The Airwave equipment would be accommodated within the existing O2 equipment cabin and there was no proposal to increase the size of the compound.

Members noted that the Sub-Committee had permitted a temporary slimline mast for the Airwaves Police digital communications system at its meeting on 25 July 2003. The applicants intended for the temporary mast's equipment to be

transferred on the extended permanent mast, so that the temporary mast could be dismantled in accordance with the planning permission by 31 July 2004.

Representations were received from the Parish Council, The Bishops Waltham Society and a neighbour, all objecting to the proposal on the grounds that it would make the existing mast more visually intrusive, perceived health effects and impact on the views into Bishops Waltham. However Ms Norgate commented that officers were concerned over the visual effect of the mast on the approach road to Bishops Waltham and views from the village and Bishops Waltham Palace and, on this basis, recommended its refusal.

Members noted that screening had been planted in accordance with the conditions of the original application and that the protective cones around the trees' trunks would be removed.

A representative of the applicant explained that the application met Planning Policy Guidance PPG8 as it proposed a mast share. The applicants had also investigated and discounted six other sites as they were either too close to residential properties or did not provide adequate coverage. As the Airwaves system would provide a new digital communications system for the emergency services, it was explained that the siting of the masts was important to ensure that a signal could be sent and received from inside buildings.

In response to Members' questions, it was explained that the mast height was a result of achieving the required distance of separation between the antennae whilst serving the coverage area.

Members discussed the perceived health risk of the mast and it was noted that the cumulative effect of the antennae were well within the electromagnetic radiation levels set out in the NRPB and ICNIRP codes. A representative of the applicant further explained that the antenna would be aimed towards Bishops Waltham and away from the nearest property, which was at a distance of approximately 60 metres.

Councillor Chamberlain spoke in opposition to the application as a Ward Member. He stated that the mast was poorly screened from the road from the direction of Botley and that the Parish Council and the Bishops Waltham Society had also objected to the mast's extension.

A Member suggested that the applicant should consider re-locating the mast further into the field away from the road and properties. However, it was noted that this would require the consent of all the operators who used the mast. Furthermore any mast constructed further into the field would need to be taller to compensate for the change in levels and to achieve the same coverage.

At the conclusion of the debate, the majority of Members agreed to approve the application as it was a mast share, alternative sites had been found to be unsuitable and that the visual effect of the additional height and equipment was unlikely to further reduce the amenity of the area.

RESOLVED:

1. That the application be granted subject to the following conditions:

1FUL  
1FULR

2. That in the event that the development hereby approved becomes redundant, or otherwise not required for the purpose permitted, the mast extension and the additional antennae shall be dismantled and permanently removed from site.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

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

Chairman

**PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (POLICE HEADQUARTERS, WINCHESTER)  
SUB-COMMITTEE**

**9 September 2003**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)  
Beveridge (P)  
De Peyer (P)  
Evans (P)

Hatch (P)  
Johnston (P)  
Pearson (P)  
Sutton (P)

Officers in Attendance:

Mr D Dimon (Principal Planning Officer)  
Mr S Opacic (Acting Director of Development Services)

- 
442. **REFURBISHMENT OF EXISTING BUILDING, INCLUDING RE-CLADDING OF ELEVATION, NEW RECEPTION, AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW OFFICE BUILDING AT POLICE HEADQUARTERS, ROMSEY ROAD, WINCHESTER**  
(Report PDC341 refers)

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting nine representatives of the applicant, which included the architects, the Police Authority and civilian officers, together with ten members of the public.

Mr Dimon explained that an application had been received to re-clad with glass panelling the elevations of the nine storey Police Headquarters building in Romsey Road, Winchester. The application also sought to remove temporary office buildings and to erect a new three-storey office block.

Mr Dimon explained that the responses of the consultees were set out in the report.

The Police stated that the purpose of the application was to modernise the working environment for its staff and to meet the Police's Estates Strategy Document on office accommodation standards. The net addition of 1500 square metres (over the loss of the office space provided by the semi-detached houses and temporary buildings) was to meet these standards and not to accommodate an increase in staff numbers at the Headquarters. In response to a question, a representative of the Police agreed to consider the possibility of a legal agreement limiting the number of staff based at the Headquarters.

A representative of the Police explained that the existing nine-storey building was opened in 1964 but was now in need of major refurbishment. The building suffered from damp penetration through the single glazed window frames and the cladding panels were failing. The Police's architect also stated that, as a result of an inherent design fault, the rain-water drainage system was leaking into the fabric of the building. In addition, the building suffered from poor thermal

efficiency and asbestos in the internal roof tiles which made minor maintenance difficult.

The application therefore proposed to enclose the building using Schuco SG50 reflective double glazed curtain walling system and to remove the existing cladding panels and windows internally once the new cladding was in place. This would be done in stages to minimise the disruption. The shorter, solid ends of the tower would also be clad but with a silver reflective composite aluminium material that would echo the appearance of the glass cladding to the front and rear elevations of the building. The applicant anticipated that the glass curtain walling would minimise the need to decant staff for long periods and presented a solution to the weatherproofing and thermal performance problems associated with the existing building.

The ground floor of the tower and west wing would be clad in the same “petrarch” cladding system proposed for the new three-storey building. This would provide a smooth marble effect appearance that the architect commented would weather well.

The Sub-Committee noted that the tall building was possibly the most prominent building in Winchester after the Cathedral, as its height and elevated position made it visible from most distant views of the city. Members were therefore concerned at the external appearance of the building, and the applicant's architect commented that the glazing would have a smooth modern appearance and provide a less dominating and dark silhouette to the skyline than the current building.

In response to Members' questions, the architect confirmed that the tower block would not be air conditioned. He explained that to air condition a building of this size would be extremely expensive and was not considered to be environmentally friendly. Ventilation would therefore be provided through top hung, opening windows. However, it was noted that the open windows would disrupt the smooth reflective appearance of the building, as would internal lighting at night.

The proposals for the tower block included the re-location of the loading bay from the front to the rear of the building to improve its appearance and to make better use of an internal lift.

Further to Members' comments, the Police acknowledged the building's prominent position as part of the Winchester skyline and stated that they had investigated a number of alternatives to the current application, including total demolition of the tower and rebuild. However, the Police had calculated the costs of this to be prohibitively expensive both in terms of its construction and the total decant of staff to an alternative office during the construction process. He added that most members of the public preferred public money to be spent on front line policing rather than improving the appearance of the Headquarters building.

Members commented on the Prime Minister's “Better Public Buildings” Strategy and suggested that the Police further investigate whether there were any sources of funding linked to this initiative that could be accessed to create a building more akin to the character of Winchester.

The Sub-Committee also noted that approximately 60% of the site was undeveloped and suggested that part of the site could be released for housing and the capital raised used towards a more suitable replacement of the tower. A Member also raised the suggestion of underground parking, as was the possibility

that the tower be part demolished to reduce its height, but the representatives of the Police explained that these options would be prohibitively expensive. Members noted that part of the application sought the demolition of two semi-detached houses on the site that were currently used as offices, and in its place to erect a new three-storey purpose built office block. Mature trees would screen this building. The Police's architect added that the impact on the landscape would be minimal and that no mature trees would be felled as part of the application.

Following advice from the former Director of Development Services, this new office block was proposed to be erected some distance from the tower block where site levels and existing tree screening would reduce its impact. However, the Police stated that for operational reasons they preferred that this building be constructed adjacent to the tower block and this was a view shared by the South East Regional Design Panel. It was therefore suggested that this issue should be further discussed between the officers and applicant.

Mr Opacic stated that the Headquarters site fell outside the town centre (and the Conservation Area) and in policy terms, under both the emerging and existing Local Plans, any new office development would be resisted. However he added that the principles behind these policies included the need to limit traffic and housing pressures which may be less applicable in this instance as no extra staff were proposed.

The application included a Workplace Travel Plan and provided for cycle storage, cycle paths and showers to encourage more staff to travel to work by cycle. The County Surveyor had stated that the Plan had set ambitious targets (which included the reduction of single car use by 10%) and the Police stated that the Chief Constable had supported the Plan. The Police had been in negotiations with other organisations in the Romsey Road area in regard to the Travel Plan and added that they were willing to co-operate fully with the Council in maximising the usage of any potential Park and Ride site to the south of the town.

The application also sought to re-organise the car parking on the site although the total number of spaces would remain at 294.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Sub-Committee expressed its concerns over the appearance of the building and its effect on the surrounding area and agreed to visit the application site, various viewpoints around the town, and another building of a similar design in the region to better understand the application.

**RESOLVED:**

That any recommendation to the Planning Development Control Committee in respect of the application be deferred, pending a site visit to the Police Headquarters, Romsey Road, Winchester, various viewpoints around the town, and to view a similar building to that proposed.

The meeting commenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 3.45pm.

Chairman



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

**10 September 2003**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)  
Bennetts (P)

Beveridge(P)  
Sutton (P)

Others in attendance:

Councillor Pearson

Officers in attendance:

Ms E Norgate, Principal Planning Officer  
Mr I Elvin, Development Control Engineer  
Mr N Mackintosh, Principal Planning Officer

---

443. **STABLE BLOCK COMPRISING 2 NO. STABLES WITH TACKROOM AND HAYBARN, LAND OPPOSITE MOORHILL COACH HOUSE, ST ANNES LANE, SHEDFIELD, HAMPSHIRE**

The Sub-Committee met at the application site where the Chairman welcomed to the meeting Councillor Pearson, Mrs Thompson, the applicant, and seven local residents.

The application sought permission for the erection of stables in a 2 hectare field that had been left to pasture. The proposed stables measured 13.5 metres by 4.6metres and were 4 metres in height. The Sub-Committee was shown a photograph of stables that was indicative of the style of stabling proposed. The siting was indicated by the position of the applicant's car, parked at the top of the field, with a backdrop of trees.

At the entrance of the field and opposite the nearest dwelling, Moorhill Coach House, the applicant proposed an area of concrete hard-standing for vehicle parking.

Mr Mackintosh reported that objections had been received from the Shedfield Society and a number of local residents. Their objections included concerns about visual intrusion, manure and drainage disposal, smells, its compliance with planning policies, traffic, and access to the stables across the often muddy field. Shedfield Parish Council had commented on the application that it should be used for domestic use only. However, in summing up his presentation, Mr Mackintosh recommended that the application be approved subject to the conditions that: the stables should be for the use of the applicant only; that there would be no

floodlighting; appropriate landscaping and that further satisfactory details be provided concerning the disposal of manure, car parking, fencing and gates.

Mrs Thompson confirmed that the stables would be used for the private and recreational use of her two horses only and that the field would be free of equestrian equipment such as jumps etc.

In response to comments about vehicle access to the stables, Mrs Thompson confirmed that a nearby track that led to the far end of the field was the property of the neighbouring landowner and would not be used. She explained that in most incidences the stables would be accessed on foot and that deliveries of hay and the collection of manure were likely to be done by specialist companies in off-road vehicles. A hay store in the field would limit the number of deliveries necessary.

Mrs Thompson further explained that an on-site generator would produce the electricity at the stables. Water would be provided by collecting rainwater at the stables and a trough near the road filled by canisters brought to the field.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a number of local residents spoke against the application that underlined the written representations. It was also explained that dog walkers used the field to access the footpath across the golf course at the rear of the field. However, Mr Mackintosh agreed to further investigate the public rights of way across the field and Mrs Thompson commented that she was willing to allow enough room behind the stables to allow the public to cross the field.

Some residents were also concerned that the application would set a precedent for further development that would be damaging the area's rural character. In response, Mr Mackintosh explained that any further development would require a separate planning application that would be considered on its own merits.

The Sub-Committee discussed the proposals for the field to be enclosed by barbed wire with hedgerow all round. Whilst it was noted that the applicant had indicated that she was willing to respond to Members' comments in respect of the fencing, planning permission was not required to erect fencing of up to one metre in height next to a highway and two metres elsewhere.

Members and the public present were concerned about the disposal of manure from the field and Mrs Thompson explained that this was likely to be disposed of by specialist companies. However, Members requested that this be further investigated by the Environmental Health team.

The Sub-Committee noted that the original application had proposed that the stables be erected nearer to the road, but that following refusal of planning permission and further advice from officers, it was proposed that the stables be built in the highest part of the field furthest from the road. This was to take advantage of the backdrop of trees and reduce the visual impact of the stables. However, some Members requested that officers re-consider its original location by the roadside, which although closer to the nearest properties, could blend better into the countryside.

At the conclusion of the meeting, Members agreed to defer any recommendation to the Planning Development Control Committee pending further information from officers with regard to manure collection, the rights of way, and the location of the stables.

RESOLVED:

That the application be referred back to the Planning Development Control Committee, following receipt of further information.

444. **CHANGE OF USE FROM LIVERY STABLE BUILDING (D2) TO OFFICES AND REPAIR WORKSHOP (B1), MISLINGFORD LIVERY STABLES, BISHOPS WOOD ROAD, MISLINGFORD, FAREHAM**

The Sub-Committee met at the application site, where the Chairman welcomed to the meeting Councillor Pearson as a Ward Member, a representative of Swanmore Parish Council, two local residents, the applicants, Mr and Mrs Tavender, and the applicant's agent, Mr Tutton.

Ms Norgate explained that the application sought a change of use of the former livery stable building to offices and a repair workshop in the grounds of Wassall House, Mislingford for the applicants small kitchen goods repair business.

The building was of single storey pitched roof construction, that the Sub-Committee noted had recently been restored to a high standard.

Ms Norgate explained that the applicant had submitted landscaping plans to the Council's landscape architect and anticipated that an oral report would be presented to the next meeting of Planning Development Control Committee. As the application was in accordance with planning policies and was in keeping with the character of the locality, Ms Norgate therefore recommended its approval, subject to conditions.

If granted, Members requested that further conditions should be placed on the application to ensure that the temporary buildings on the site currently used in connection with the business be removed. Members also requested that officers draft a condition limiting the use of the building to the current occupiers of Wassalls House to prevent further development.

The Sub-Committee also discussed the permitted development rights that might accompany the change of use if granted. Mr Tutton stated that it was possible to waive these rights in respect of the application.

Members questioned the provision of utilities at the site and whilst Mrs Tavender confirmed that water, electricity, and toilets would be provided, further information was sought on the provision of foul drainage.

Councillor Pearson spoke as a Ward Member of his concerns in relation to the traffic implications of the application as it was opposite the entrance to Watsons Dairy and onto a fast road. Mr Elvin confirmed that, in accordance with officers' advice, the applicant had replanted hedgerows away from the egress onto Bishops Wood Road to provide better visibility. He added that the business was likely to generate little extra traffic. It was also noted that of the 4.5 FTEs that worked at the business, three lived in the family home on site.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a representative of Swanmore Parish Council underlined their objection to the application. They considered the location to be inappropriate for a light industrial business and that there were vacant units at a nearby business park. The Sub-Committee also heard objections from local residents whilst Mr Tutton spoke in support of the application.

At the conclusion of the meeting Members agreed to recommend approval, subject to the following issues being clarified: the satisfactory results of the landscape architect consultation, that the permission be granted to the current owners only (so as to limit any future development), that the temporary buildings on site be removed, and further details on foul drainage.

RECOMMENDED:

That permission be granted subject to the following:

1. 1FUL  
1FULR
2. B510 (B1A AND B1C)  
B510R
3. L020  
L020R
4. B520 (0800) AND (1800) [(0800) AND (1300)]  
B520R
5. No machinery, plant or materials shall be stacked, stored or deposited in the open on the site.
6. 1pepe (Mr and Mrs J Tavender) (Mr and Mrs J Tavender)  
1pepe
7. Within three months of the date of this permission, the portacabins located to the north west of the offices and repair workshop hereby permitted shall be demolished and all resultant materials removed from the site.

Reason: to safeguard the amenity of the locality

8. Detailed proposals for the disposal of foul water shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before commencement of the development hereby permitted. the approved details shall be fully implemented before the use hereby approved is commenced.

Reason: to ensure satisfactory provision of foul drainage.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 11.20am

Chairman

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

**11 September 2003**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)

Busher (P)

Davies (P)

Pearson (P)

Read (P)

Sutton (P)

Officers in attendance:

Miss E Norgate (Principal Planning Officer)

Mrs J Pinnock (Planner)

---

445. **ERECTION OF 12.5 METRE ULTRA SLIMLINE MONOPOLE AND EQUIPMENT  
CABINET AT LAY-BY, SOUTHBOUND HOCKLEY LINK, WINCHESTER.**

The Sub-Committee met at the application site at the southbound lay-by, Hockley Link, Winchester. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Ms Marsden representing the applicant Hutchinson 3G ("3").

Miss Norgate explained that a prior approval application had been submitted by Hutchinson 3G ("3") for the replacement of the existing 10 metre mast and to replace it with a 12.5 metre ultra slimline monopole and antenna. Miss Norgate confirmed that the 12.5 metres was the overall height, including the antenna. The purpose of the proposal was to improve the existing coverage and provide 3G coverage to the area. It was noted that the applicant had provided a certificate of compliance with the ICNIRP guidelines. The ultra slim-line mast was similar in size to that currently in situ.

The Sub-Committee noted that the existing smaller equipment cabinet was painted grey whereas the other larger cabins were coloured ivy green.

In conclusion, Members agreed to approve the prior approval application, as it was unlikely to have further impact on the visual amenity of the area as there was a large amount of surrounding street furniture. Members requested that the applicant be requested to ensure that the existing cabins were all painted the same green colour.

RESOLVED:

That no objection be raised to the application.

446. **INSTALLATION OF ADDITIONAL ANTENNA ONTO EXISTING T-MOBILE MAST AND GROUND BASED EQUIPMENT CABIN ON BEHALF OF VODAFONE – MAST AT MARWELL ZOO, THOMPSONS LANE, NEAR WINCHESTER**

The Sub-Committee met at the application site at Marwell Zoo, Thompsons Lane, near Winchester. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Ms Boyle representing the owner of the mast structure, Crowncastle UK Limited and Mr Blake, the Visitor Services Manager for Marwell Zoo.

The Sub Committee proceeded to view the existing structure that was situated within the zoo and reconvened outside the zoo in the public car park to debate the application.

Mrs Pinnock explained that a prior approval application had been submitted on behalf of Vodafone for additional dishes on the existing 22.5 metre high lattice T-Mobile tower, and an equipment cabin and an electric cabin within the compound. The Vodafone dishes were to be at 17 metres and the antennae were to be at 19.5 metres, beneath the existing T-Mobile equipment. Mrs Pinnock advised that the additional equipment was to comprise of 2 no. panel antennae and 2 no. 600mm wide dish.

Mrs Pinnock confirmed that the applicant had provided a certificate of compliance with the ICNIRP guidelines, although this did not detail the percentage of compliance within the accepted levels of the standard. Members agreed that this detail was preferable and was usually submitted with the certificate documentation for other applications.

Further to a question, Mrs Pinnock advised that no representation had been received regarding the application from members of the public, or the Parish Council.

In conclusion, Members supported the application on condition that the applicant supplied further documentation regarding the percentage increase in radiation levels to support their ICNIRP certification.

RESOLVED:

That no objection be raised to the application.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 11.10am.

Chairman