

SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

13th February 2006 at 2.30 p.m.

Present: Councillors Mrs Goad (Chairman), Biss, Brookman, Mrs Brown, Dyball, Haymes, Mrs Hall, Mrs Hazlehurst, Hill, Lury, Mrs Maconachie and Menzies

603. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Butler, Parris and Mrs Coleman.

604. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Biss declared an interest and left the meeting at the outset.

605. PRIOR NOTIFICATION/TELECOMMUNICATION REPORT – M/128/05/TEL : PRIOR NOTIFICATION FOR INSTALLATION OF A 12m MONO-POLE STRUCTURE COMPLETE WITH SHROUDED TRI-SECTOR ANTENNA, RADIO EQUIPMENT HOUSING AND ANCILLARY DEVELOPMENT – GRASS VERGE NORTH SIDE OF ELMER ROAD ADJOINING FOOTPATHS LINKING TO LUCKING LANE [C546574] MIDDLETON

A report update sheet was circulated referring to the comment of the Highway Authority and that there had been confirmation that the County Council owned the land, also 22 additional letters of objection had been received, including the Bognor Regis Civic Society.

The Head of Planning presented the officer's report and explained that the proposal was a prior notification with a 56 day response period and that the meeting had been convened because the regular meeting of 15th February would fall outside the period. He also advised the Committee that the position of the proposal as shown at page 9 of the agenda required correction and that the Members should note that although the height of the supporting mast was 12 metres, the antenna was mounted on top of the pole which increased the actual height to 13.4 metres; the submitted plans were displayed to show the proposed location, height and design. The Committee was advised that its consideration was restricted to siting and design.

Following Public Speaking (3 speakers), the Committee discussed the proposal, including several questions to the Head of Planning. The Chairman allowed the applicant and one speaker, who had participated in the public

speaking, to address the Committee again to provide clarification on their views and information.

Following further discussion, the Committee resolved Not to Agree with the Officer Recommendation of No Objection. The Chairman adjourned the meeting in order that officers could examine whether the Members debate had provided reasons for the making of a formal objection and to provide suggested wording.

The meeting reconvened and the following wording was suggested:

Reasons:

- 1) The Authority is not satisfied that adequate consideration has been given to alternative siting, including the possible sharing of existing sites in the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DEV41 of the Arun District Local Plan.
- 2) The Authority is not satisfied that sufficient consideration has been given to the sensitive location of the site, which is in the proximity of two public open spaces and a church. The proposal does not therefore accord with best practice guidance to avoid such locations.

The suggested wording and a resolution to object and refuse to approve the proposal was moved and seconded. The Committee then

RESOLVED

That the Committee OBJECTED to the proposal contained in the prior notification and REFUSED TO APPROVE the details submitted for the reasons 1& 2 above.

606. TELECOMMUNICATIONS OPERATOR'S ANNUAL ROLL OUT PLANS

The Head of Planning Services presented the officer report with appended spreadsheets showing the individual telecommunication operator roll-outs. He advised that the roll out plans were not binding, the intentions of individual operators might change. He also advised that site sharing is an approach to which consideration should be given by each operator under Government Best Practice guidance and that individual application and notifications should include information on the required coverage area. He asked the Chairman whether the Committee had any comments or questions.

Following Members questions concerning safety and risk assessment under the ICNIRP certification procedure, noting of the number of sites in

Ferring Parish and the proximity of the Silverstone Avenue site to open space, where an appeal case had been determined, the Head of Panning asked the Chairman that any Members who wished to make any further comments should send these to him within 14 days (by end of 27th February).

(The meeting concluded at 4.02pm)