

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

**22 September 2003**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Bennetts (Chairman) (P)

Baxter (P)

Davies (P)

Pearson (P)

Read (P)

Sutton (P)

Others in attendance:

Councillors Learney and Porter

Officers in attendance:

Miss E Norgate (Principal Planning Officer)

---

1. **ERECTION OF 22.5 METRE HIGH LATTICE TOWER WITH ASSOCIATED ANTENNAE (OVERALL HEIGHT 24 METRES) EQUIPMENT CABIN AND FENCED COMPOUND ADJACENT TO EXISTING ELECTRICAL SUB-STATION.**

The Sub-Committee met at the application site at the Scottish and Southern Electricity (SSE) Harestock Sub Station, off the B3049 at Harestock, Winchester. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Higgins from Mason D Telecoms representing the applicant SSE Telecommunications plc and Mr Steel and Mr Griffiths from SSE plc Telecommunications.

Miss Norgate explained that a full planning application had been submitted by SSE Telecommunications plc (the mast was to be for Hutchinson 3G ("3")) for the erection of 22.5 metre high lattice tower with associated antennae. This comprised of 3 antennae and 3 dishes. The overall height was to be 24 metres. There was also to be an equipment cabin and fenced compound measuring 7 by 13 metres adjacent to the existing electrical sub-station. Miss Norgate reported that further to concerns raised by the Council's Landscape Architect regarding the potential damage to the root system and canopies of some of the trees in situ, the applicant had submitted an amended application. The plans were circulated to the Sub-Committee and Miss Norgate explained that they showed a change in the position of the mast and reduction in size of the concrete plinth. Miss Norgate commented that the Landscape Architect had confirmed that the

amended proposals were now satisfactory. Mr Higgins demonstrated the position of the mast and a cherry picker was raised to the full height of the proposals.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting a Ward Member for Littleton and Harestock, Councillor Learney and a Ward Member for St Barnabas, Councillor Porter. Also present was one local resident.

Miss Norgate advised that the purpose of the proposal was to provide third generation coverage to Harestock and Weeke and to the B3049 and the surrounding road network. It was noted that the applicant had provided a certificate of compliance with the ICNIRP guidelines. Letters of objections to the proposals had been submitted from Sparsholt Parish Council, City of Winchester Trust and from 7 local residents. Reasons for objection included intrusiveness on the landscape, detrimental to character of the area, the perception of health concerns and the poor access to the site.

The Sub Committee noted that the structure was higher than the surrounding trees (although the trees would obscure the compound and cabinets and most of the structure). However, the mast would be partially visible from the approach to Winchester along the B3049 and from the nearest properties and the Salters and Dean Lane housing developments approximately 150 metres away.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Higgins explained that regarding alternative sitings and sharing by other operators, this site provided the better footprint of the required coverage. He explained that part of their response to the concerns of the Landscape Architect regarding the impact of the tree root systems and canopies was to reduce the size of the concrete plinth foundations to measure 3.8 metres by 3.8 metres from 5.8 metres by 5.8 metres. This would limit the future capability of operator sharing to two.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Porter addressed the Sub Committee. Councillor Porter stated that she was disappointed regarding the excessive height of the mast and the limitations of the structure to support other operators.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a local resident, Mr Andrews addressed the Sub Committee. Mr Andrews stated that he considered that operators should continue to co-ordinate their coverage roll-out and share structures wherever possible.

The Sub Committee discussed the proposals and noted that officers recommended refusal of the original application. Some Members considered that the original application may be preferable, as this site was a key location where operator sharing should be encouraged. Therefore, the larger foundations to allow for a greater degree of potential operator sharing might be desirable, although they noted the concerns of the Landscape Architect.

However, on balance, the majority of Members agreed to approve the application as the future prospect of a larger concrete base and replacement of the structure to allow for the incorporation of other operators on the mast could be explored if and when necessary. The Sub-Committee also agreed that the applicant be

requested to ensure that the mast, antennae and palisade fencing be all painted a suitable green colour.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to no further objections on the amended plans and to the following conditions:

1. 1FUL  
1FULR
2. L130(5)  
L130R
3. L050  
L050R
4. L020  
L020R
5. X050  
X050R
6. X060  
X060R
7. That the mast, cabinet, antennae and palisade fencing hereby permitted shall be painted Olive Green (220) from colour chart BS381C unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.  
Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the area.

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

Chairman