

## MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE 'A'** held at the Council Offices, Needham Market on Wednesday 18 January 2017 at 12 noon

**PRESENT:** Councillor: Matthew Hicks (Chairman)  
David Burn  
Roy Barker\*  
Rachel Eburne \*  
John Field  
Kathie Guthrie\*  
Lavinia Hadingham  
Diana Kearsley  
Anne Killett  
Lesley Mayes

Denotes substitute \*

**Ward Members** Councillor: Gary Green  
Barry Humphreys MBE  
Dave Muller

**In Attendance:** Senior Development Management Planning Officer (JPG)  
**Senior Development Management Planning Office (SS)**  
Development Management Planning Officer (RBishop)  
Interim Planning Solicitor (LH)  
Governance Support Officers (LS/HH)

### NA131 APOLOGIES/SUBSTITUTIONS

Councillors Rachel Eburne, Kathie Guthrie and Roy Barker were substituting for Councillors Sarah Mansel, David Whybrow and Gerard Brewster respectively.

### NA132 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Lesley Mayes declared a local non-pecuniary interest in application 4810/16 in her capacity as a member of the Stowmarket Town Council.

### NA133 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

It was noted that Members had been emailed regarding application 4810/16.

### NA134 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS

There were no declarations of personal site visits.

### NA135 PETITIONS

The Senior Governance Support Officer reported receipt of a petition signed by approximately 100 residents of Mid Suffolk opposing application 4810/16, which was before the Committee for consideration (Report NA/03/17 refers).

The receipt of the petition will be reported to the next meeting of the Council in accordance with the Council's Petitions Scheme.

#### **NA136 QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC**

None received.

#### **NA137 QUESTIONS BY COUNCILLORS**

None received.

#### **NA138 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

##### **Report NA/03/17**

In accordance with the Council's procedure for public speaking on planning applications a representation was made as detailed below:

| <b>Planning Number</b> | <b>Application Representations from</b>    |
|------------------------|--|
| 4810/16                | Richard Morrison (Agent for the Applicant) |

##### Item 1

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Application Number: | <b>4810/16</b>  |
| Proposal:           | Erection of a 17.5m tall lattice mast with 3no telecommunications antennae and 2no dishes |
| Site Location:      | <b>STOWMARKET</b> – Mid Suffolk Leisure Centre, Gainsborough Road, IP14 1LH               |
| Applicant:          | Shared Access and CTIL  |

The Development Management Planning Officer referred to the objections from residents as summarised in paragraph 7 of the Report, and updated Members in relation to the objections received from Stowmarket Town Council and from the signatories to the petition referred to in Minute No NA135 above.

Members also had before them the comments of the Heritage Officer together with further information provided by the Agent, circulated prior to the commencement of the meeting. A copy of the ICNIRP Certificate was distributed, at Members' request, during the course of the meeting.

The Development Management Planning Officer advised Members that the height of the proposed mast did not exceed 25m and therefore did not require planning permission. However, the Committee was asked to decide whether prior approval was required, and should be given, replacing the recommendation in the Report.

Members were advised that the National Planning Policy Framework stated that local planning authorities should not seek to prevent competition between different operators or question the need for the telecommunications system or determine health safeguards if the proposal meets International Commission guidelines of public exposure. The relevant certificate had been submitted demonstrating

compliance with the International Commission (ICNIRP) guidelines. The Committee could therefore only consider matters of siting and design/appearance.

The Development Management Planning Officer explained that the distance from the site to the nearest building was 80m increasing to 120m and provided a range of other measurements on screen, and that the mast was of a standard lattice design. The ground unit would be hidden by the surrounding bushes and fence.

The Chairman Councillor Matthew Hicks reiterated that because the Applicant had provided an ICNIRP Certificate, Members could not discuss whether any health risks would be posed by the mast.

Members questioned the Development Planning Officer on whether the local school had been consulted and the height of the ridge of the Leisure Centre, to which the response was that the main objections were from the local residents and that the ridge measured approximately 11.5m.

The issue of the need for the mast was referred to but could not be taken into account, as previously advised. The Officers clarified the position in the NPPF, which was that need was a consideration in the context of preparing a Local Plan under Paragraph 43, but not in context of individual proposals for prior approval in terms of decision making and Paragraphs 45 and 46 were referred to. Consideration of the GPDO also applied in what it set out as material considerations. The Officer confirmed that an exercise regarding possible alternative sites had been undertaken as per requirements.

Richard Morrison, Agent for the Applicant, explained that the proposal would provide telecommunications coverage of 2G, 3G and 4G Network and the proposed mast would be shared between O<sub>2</sub> and Vodafone. The health risk was dealt within the NPPF policy guidelines and the proposal met International Commission Guidelines for public exposure. The CTIL Radio Frequency was 1% below the guideline level at the height of 1.5m and 5 m away from the site and less than 1% at 40m from the site. There was also a declaration of conformity with the ICNIRP public exposure guidelines. He responded to questions from Members about various aspects including the design and height of the mast, which was determined by the surrounding area and its siting. It was established that radio planners considered the coverage and the need of the customers before determining the most suitable location.

Councillor Barry Humphreys, MBE, Ward Member for Stowmarket North, commented that Stowmarket already has adequate 4G coverage and urged Members to listen to the concerns of the residents.

Councillor Dave Muller, Ward Member for Stowmarket North, agreed and referred to 4G coverage interfering with Freeview.

Councillor Gary Green, Ward Member for Stowmarket North, concurred with the two previous speakers and queried the evidence for whether the School had been consulted, what information had been provided regarding the decision process for the chosen site and the amount of the rental fee to MSDC for the site. He considered that the design and the site were unsuitable.

During the debate Members received clarification on alternative sites, the appearance of the mast, the impact on the residents and surrounding areas.

By 5 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions

Decision – That prior approval is required and that prior approval is given to the proposal.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 1.10pm.

.....  
Chairman